



*Truth
is
Trinitarian*

John V. Dahms

Truth
is
Trinitarian

Late John V. Dahms

Professor emeritus (New Testament)
Canadian Theological Seminary, Regina, Canada

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

Ordinary abbreviations are used for ancient Jewish and Christian writings. Other abbreviations and acronyms occurring in this monograph are in accordance with the following list:

- BSao Bibliotheca Sacra.
- EB W.R. Nicoll (ed.), The Expositor's Bible (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1943.)
- EBC F. E. Gaebelin (ed.), The Expositor's Bible Commentary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979-1992).
- IB G. A. Buttrick (ed.), The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon, 1952-1 957).
- ISBE J. Orr (ed.), The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia (Chicago: Howard Severance Company, 1915).
- JETS Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society.
- JIS Journal of Theological Studies.
- LXX A. Rahlfs (ed.), Septuaginta. Ninth Edition. The Septuagint Version of the Old testament (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1935).
- MS(S) Manuscript(s).
- MT R. Kittel (ed.) Biblia Hebraica, Third Edition. The Massoretic Text of the Old Testament (Stuttgart: Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937).
- NEB The New English Bible, Second Edition (Oxford University 1970).

- NIDNTT Ccl in Brown (ed.), The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975-1978).
- NIV The Holy Bible, New International Version (East Brunswick, N.J.: International Bible Society, 1973, 1978).
- NRSV Holy Bible, New Revised Standard Version (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993).
- RSV The Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version (Philadelphia: A.J. Holman Company, 1962).
- TDNT G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), C. W. Bromiley (trans.), Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1 976).
- TDOT G. J. Botterweck & H. Ringgren (eds.): J.T. Willis (trans.), Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974-).
- TEV Good News Bible. Today's English Version (Toronto: Canadian Bible Society, 1976).
- TWOT R.L. Harris, G.L. Archer & B. K. Waltke (eds.), Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980).
- ZPE M. C. Tenney (ed.), Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975, repr. 1977).

BOOK CONTENTS

Introduction	vii
I. The Biblical Conception of Truth	1
II. Biblical Apologetics	11
III. Biblical Atonement	21
IV. Biblical Salvation	32
V. Biblical Ethics	59
VI. Biblical Feelings and Emotions	78
VII. Biblical Ecclesiology	90

INTRODUCTION

THE TRINITY AS MODEL FOR UNDERSTANDING AND CONDUCT

Orthodox Christianity in its western expression has always held that the Trinitarian doctrine set forth by the Council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451 (with the filio-*e* clause added) is normative for Christians. Moreover, though God acts freely, His actions must be for His own glory, or else they are ultimately purposeless and meaningless. But this means that whatever he does He is expressing Himself. This self-expression, however, cannot be univocal. He cannot create His equal. On the other hand it cannot be equivocal; He cannot deny Himself. His self-expression must therefore be analogical.

If God is expressing Himself in what He does, the Trinitarian pattern ought to be discernible in all that He has done, is doing, and has promised that He will do in the future. Indeed, this pattern ought to be discernible in all that takes place, insofar as evil has not had a disturbing, distorting, or destructive influence. One would have thought that in 1500 years there would have been extensive investigation as to whether the Trinitarian pattern is discernible in the Scriptures, in creation, in redemption, and in history. Actually there has been surprisingly little of such investigation, and most of what there has been has been comparatively superficial.

Our purpose in this monograph is to elaborate the Trinitarian pattern or model, and to provide a few biblical illustrations of its presence. This is a preliminary study only. A volume needs to be written on each of the illustrations provided, and much else needs to be investigated with a view to discovering whether a Trinitarian structure is not manifested. Then, too, the various disciplines studying creation and history need to be critically considered to see whether they too manifest a Trinitarian structure, and, if not, whether the Trinitarian model may not enrich these disciplines, and make them more significant and valuable.

The more widespread the Trinitarian structure is perceived to be, the more credible Christianity is. Of course, inability to discern such a structure in important fields of study will call the credibility of the Christian faith into question, provided, of course, that the search has been thorough, extensive, and unhampered by assumptions which may need to be jettisoned.

It is to be noted that this study largely manifests a repetition of some points I have made in other articles. In those articles many related questions are addressed, not the least of these being the epistemological assumption involved.

The Trinitarian Model

In orthodox Protestant circles it is undoubtedly a work of supererogation to outline the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. By way of reminder, however, we note the following:

1. God is one. There is only one divine being. The classical expression of this doctrine is in Deut 6:4, but it is also asserted in Mark 12:29; John 5:44; 17:3; 1 Cor 8:6; Eph 4:6; Jas 2:19. Moslems and others often accuse Christians of worshipping three gods, but this is not so. Even some ill-informed evangelicals seem to think that there are three gods; the Father, the Son at His right hand, and the Holy Spirit hovering somewhere in the neighborhood of the Father and the Son. But this is not the orthodox view.
2. God, the one divine being, exists in three persons. The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, but there is only one God. How can this be? There is no good analogy. The common analogies frequently set forth either suggest modalism or tritheism. The psychological analogies, whether promoted by Augustine or others, all point towards Unitarianism. The promotion of three centres of

consciousness in one being is probably the best representation of the Trinity, if we can avoid the idea of schizophrenia, the disorder in which three persons, or personalities, inhabit one human body.

3. The Father eternally begets or generates the Son. He does not create the Son. The Father is the fount of deity, as various theologians have said. Moreover, as W.T. Shedd has stated, the Father communicates all His deity to the Son, yet His own deity is neither reduced nor diminished thereby. Parents communicate full humanity to their offspring without diminishing their own humanity.

Some theologians deny the generation of the Son, e.g., B. B. Warfield, J. O. Buswell Jr., Leonard Hodgson, C. C. Richardson. Some think that generation of the Son means that there was a time when the Son was not, but this is not a necessary corollary. There never was a time when the sun did not give forth light, yet light derives from the sun. And theologians generally insist that the generation of the Son is an eternal generation.

Some think that if the Father begets the Son, knowing and having fellowship with the Son means that one is not yet in contact with the fullness of deity. But this fails to take seriously that all the fullness of deity dwells in the Son (Col 2:9; cf. John 14:9; 1 John 2:23; 2 John 9).

4. The Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. The Holy Spirit is not only the Spirit of the Father (Matt 10:20); He is also the Spirit of His Son (Gal. 4:4; cf. Acts 16:7; Rom 8:9; Phil 1:19; 1 Pet 1:11).

Eastern Orthodoxy insists that the Spirit proceeds only from the Father. If so, I fail to see how He can be the Spirit of His Son, or the Spirit of Christ. Also the view that the Spirit proceeds only from the Father is part and parcel of the tendency toward mysticism, and of the tendency to downgrade the significance of history (not the tendency to downgrade the significance of the idea of historical events), both of these tendencies being characteristic of Eastern Orthodoxy.

The creeds emphasize the difference between the generation of the Son and the procession of the Spirit. What is the difference between generation and procession? Various theologians have confessed that the difference eludes them.¹

5. Though the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, He also unites the Father and the Son. This doctrine is not articulated either in the Bible or in the ancient creeds, but it was taught by Epiphanius, Augustine, and John of Damascus in the early centuries of the church.² And ever since there have been theologians, to say nothing of hymn writers, who have embraced it.³

6. The Son is equal to the Father in important ways. (The same is true of the Holy Spirit.) The Son is equal to the Father in that the fullness of deity is in Him, as well as in the Father. He is unequal to the Father in that He is (a) Generated by the Father; (b) Sent by the Father; (c) Has His authority from the Father (Matt 28:18; John 5:19-30); (d) Prays to the Father (Mark 15:34 [Matt 27:46]; Luke 23:34 [?], 46; John 17:1-26; (e) Has "limits in perfect union with the will of the Father" (e.g., Matt. 24:36 [Mark 13:32]).~

Many theologians deny the essential subordination of the Son to the Father. They have asserted that the subordination of the Son is only an economic subordination. But if so, by becoming subordinate to the Father, or subordinating Himself to the Father, His eternal nature of total equality with the Father is violated, to say nothing of the biblical passages which assert or imply eternal subordination (1 Cor 15:24, 28; John 17:24; Eph 3:21; Phil 2:9-11). The idea that the subordination of the Son to the Father is not eternal is due to the influence of rationalism.

7. The Bible represents the Father as a complete person, the Son as a complete person, and the Spirit as a complete person. The fear of tritheism and/or the influence of rationalism, has/have led to much theological discussion concerning the propriety of saying that the Godhead exists in three persons. In this connection there has been, and is, much debate as to the meaning of Dersona, prosOpon, etc. I am not

interested in participating in what debate. I only insist that it is impossible to understand the New Testament witness concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, if one does not accord what is meant by personality to each of them, i.e., if one does not hold that each of them possesses, or is constituted by, cognitive, volitive and affective elements.

8. Though each member of the Godhead is a complete person, the Father is primarily the “idea” person of the Trinity. He has the “idea” of creation, of revelation, of redemption, and of judgment. Though He is a complete person, the Son is primarily the “active” member of the Godhead. The Father created “through” Him (John 1:3; 1 Cor 8:6; Col 1:16; Heb 1:2). Revelation was through Him (John 1:18; 14:9; 2 Cor 4:6; Col 2:3). Redemption is through His death on the cross. The Father has delivered all judgment to Him (John 5:22, 27; Acts 10:42; 17:31). Though He is a complete person, the Spirit is primarily the “affective” person of the Godhead (Rom 15:13; Gal 5:22). We may compare the observation that among people there are some who are primarily architects, some who are primarily artisans, and some who are primarily artists, yet all may be complete persons.

In philosophical terms, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit correspond to essence, existence and the aesthetic. These philosophical terms are defined as follows:

Essence: The ultimate nature of a thing, as opposed to its existence; the idea of a thing (which can be propositionally stated). Some philosophers use “substance” as a synonym for essence, though “substance” is often used with a different meaning. Because essences are not actual, but can be considered as possibly becoming actual, they are commonly thought to be characterized by potentiality. Because essence in itself lacks actuality, it is formal, as opposed to material. According to C. von Wolff, “Knowledge of essences is expressed in propositions which are necessary truths. But these necessary truths are truths about possibilities..”

Existence: Having reality in contrast to essence which is only the idea of a thing. The universe and the things in it have both essence and existence. According to Aquinas, “A substance is composite; it is an essence upon which existence has been conferred. When existence is conferred on an essence, what was hitherto merely possible becomes actual.”⁶ Some philosophers think of God as pure essence. Others say that essentially He is one, but that He exists in three persons. Still others hold that in Him essence and existence are one and the same. (I hold with the second of these alternatives: essentially He is one, but He exists as three persons.)

Aesthetic: Ordinarily used as a synonym for “beautiful” but used by philosophers and theologians of all that relates to the affective or feeling component of a person. Indeed, since Kant aesthetic judgments are “judgments as to feeling.”⁷ And aesthetic contemplation is for the sake of enjoyment.~ That the Holy Spirit ministers “love, joy, peace” means that He ministers primarily in the realm of the aesthetic. Because beauty (and all else that relates to the affections or feelings) does not occur independently, the aesthetic is always thought of as relational. Some philosophers—e.g., Plato—have thought of essence on the one hand, and unformed or chaotic matter on the other, as “originally” existing independently of each other. In our view this is incorrect. In our view essence, existence and “beauty” properly occur together. Though existence is “generated” by essence, and though the aesthetic “proceeds” from essence and existence together, essence never occurs alone, nor do essence and existence occur without being “beautiful.”

Some Implications of the Model

According to our model,

(1) Essence does not occur alone. People have conceived of mermaids, and have enjoyed contemplating the conception, but so far as we can tell, mermaids have never existed, and never will exist. That essence does not occur alone rules out idealism of every kind, including Christian Science. All antinomian tendencies are also ruled out.

(2) Existence does not occur alone. Sin and evil are existential and may be enjoyed (Heb 11:25). However, they lack accordance with truth, i.e., accordance with God. They are characterized by a kind of pseudo-reality. So the Scriptures teach that those who are devoted thereto will be cast into “the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels” (Matt 25:41; of. 13:41 -42; Luke 16:23-24; Rev 20:10, 12-13). Accordingly existentialism, empiricism, humanism, Marxism and pluralism are ruled out.

(3) Essence precedes existence. This rules out Pharisaism, Catholicism, neo-orthodoxy, and all forms of self-salvation.

(4) The aesthetic element must be included in our understanding of reality. This rules out those who teach that feeling is an optional component of Christian salvation.

(5) The aesthetic element is in third place in our understanding of reality. This rules out those who would give it primacy, as in many cults. It also rules out Calvinism which in effect, accords it second place.

The Trinitarian model also has implications for epistemology. It implies that knowledge is first and foremost a cognitive matter, i.e., a matter of familiarity with propositions. It implies, however, that it is also a matter of empirical observation. And, thirdly, the unity of proposition and empirical observation is not logical but aesthetic. By our aesthetic judgment we perceive the unity of certain propositions and such empirical observation as is relevant. In other words, knowledge is not merely a cognitive matter as the rationalists would have us believe. Nor is it merely a matter of sensations which become meaningful as they are filtered through the forms and categories the mind supplies. And certainly feeling does not provide knowledge by itself, if for no other reason than the fact that feeling is always feeling about something. Moreover, feeling with respect to certain propositions alone, or with respect to some, or all, empirical realities alone is ruled out.⁹ The significance of feeling is to enable one to perceive that what is empirically observed accords with a proposition, or propositions which have become the property of one’s mind in some way or another. And this is perceived despite the fact that there may be no logical connection between what is observed and the relevant proposition, either because (a) the proposition is not true; or (b) observation has been faulty; or (c) the aesthetic judgment has been distorted by prejudice.

End Notes:

- 1 E.g., John of Damascus, *qu.* in H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church* (Grand Rapids: Baker; 1966) 282.
- 2 See H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church* 226, 284, 326, 372
- 3 See P Hart/lb *The Unity of God* (London: Mowbray, 1952) 55-57
- 4 G. Schrenk, TDNT 5:992
- 5 Macntyre “Essence and Existence,” *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. P. Edwards (New York: Macmillan, 1967) 3:60.
- 6 J. Burbidge, *Being and Will* (New York: Paulist Press, 1977) 128, describes being as “the ground of will.” This accords, at least in general, with our statement here. It is significant that he has previously indicated, on p. 119, that consistency is “~surrendered” when one brings being and will together. “These categories do not fit unequivocally and directly” (cf. pp. 71-73). He seems to be referring to logical consistency and, if so, I heartily agree. There is no way of logically relating being and wi/b essence and existence, form and content, the intellectual and the volitional, being and becoming.
- 7 J. H. Tufts, “Aesthetic and Aesthetics,” *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, New Edition, ed. J. M. Baldwin (Glouster, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1925 repr. 1960) 1.20.
- 8 J. Hospers, “Aesthetics, Problems of,” *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* 1:36.
- 9 Burbidge, *Being and Wi/b* 156. “Being and will are integrated in self -abandoning love.” (Does “self-abandoning” correspond to the Johannine doctrine that the Holy Spirit does not glorify Himself (John 15:26; 16: 13-15]?). However, when Burbidge goes on to state. “For God... love is not a vague emotion, but dynamic activity that constitutes His very being” (ibid.), I demur. Love seems to be losing its distinctiveness and being included in will. On the other hand, love seems to swallow up being and wi/b instead of maintaining its place as the third component of God’s “very being.” Moreover, when he goes on to state, “Self-abandoning love does not reach completion in the internal dynamics of the divine reality” (ibid.), Burbidge seems to imply that

God is incomplete without the world!

The Biblical Conception of Truth

The late John V. Dahms

Professor Emeritus in New Testament, Canadian Theological Seminary

Published in Global Missiology, Trinitarian Study, Oct. 2003, www.globalmissiology.net

When the term “truth” occurs in the Christian Scriptures it has in view one of the following: (1) a quality of propositions; (2) a quality of persons and/or “things”; (c) a quality of conduct.¹ It may not always be certain which connotation is in view, but our examination of every occurrence of cognates) supports this judgment.

There are those who disagree. For example, Norman Geisler has stated, “One can safely say that the normal and consistent New Testament usage of ‘truth’ is of truth in the cognitive, propositional sense.”² A. F. Holmes has contended that truth is both propositional and personal.³ A. C. Thiselton claims that there are five major connotations or “nuances of meaning” of “truth” in the New Testament.⁴ R. Bultmann finds six connotations.⁵ In our view it is by listing special instances of a connotation, or connotations, separately that one can judge that there are more than three senses of the term.

In what follows we draw attention to representative and significant occurrences of the vocabulary.⁶ It should be noted, perhaps, that what we consider to be the view of truth implicit in the Scriptures need not have been the conscious understanding of any biblical writer, though the author of the Johannine gospel and epistles evinces such an interest in “truth,” and makes such assumptions concerning it, that we would not deny the possibility that he had a conscious and sophisticated understanding of the concept.

I. A Quality of Propositions

That there are numerous passages in which it is assumed that truth is a quality of propositions cannot be gainsaid. In the Old Testament we not only have a recurring emphasis on speaking “truth” or “the truth” (2 Chr. 18:15; Ps. 15:2; Prov. 8:7; 22:21; Jer. 9:5; Zech. 8:16; cf. 2 Sam. 7:28; Eccl. 12:10; etc.), we also have the statement attributed to the Queen of Sheba, “The word was truth which I heard in my own land of your affairs and of your wisdom” (1 Kgs. 10:6 lit.).⁷

In the New Testament there are such statements as the following:

The woman . . . told him the whole truth (Mark 5:33).⁸

I tell you the truth (John 16:7).

I am speaking the truth in Christ (Rom. 9:1).

(They) will turn away from listening to the truth (2 Tim. 4:4).

In addition, statements are often described as “true” or “not true,” e.g.,

The saying holds true (John 4:37).

You know my testimony is true (3 John 12).

Perhaps most significant in this connection is the statement attributed to Jesus, “(I have) told you the truth which I heard from God” (John 8:40).

As a sub-set of statements in which truth is a quality of propositions, there are statements in which “truth” or “the truth” denotes the body of doctrine characteristic of the “true” faith, e.g.,

Truth was cast down to the ground, and the horn acted and prospered (Dan. 8:12).⁹

We cannot do anything against the truth, but only for the truth (2 Cor. 13:8).

You were running well; who hindered you from obeying the truth? (Gal. 5:7).

You have heard before in the word of the truth, the gospel which has come to you . . . (Col. 1:5-6).

Your obedience to the truth . . . (1 Pet. 1:22).

Truth as a quality of propositions is frequently in evidence in the Scriptures.

II. Truth as a Quality of Persons and Things

In the Bible it is frequently implied that truth is a characteristic of persons and “things,” the implication being that they are real and genuine, as opposed to what is only apparent or putative.

The context shows that “a sign of truth” (Jos. 2:12) is “a sure sign” (RSV), and that “a reward of truth” (Prov. 11:18) is “a sure reward” (RSV). “Worship . . . in . . . truth” (John 4:23), whatever else it may be, is worship that is real; and love which is not “in word or speech but in deed and in truth” (1 John 3:18) is love expressed in appropriate conduct, and therefore real. The adjective “true,” as in “the true riches” (Luke 16:11), “the true light” (John 1:9; 1 John 2:8), “the true worshippers” (John 4:23), “true food” (John 6:55 lit.), “the true vine” (John 15:1), “the true grace of God” (1 Pet. 5:12), implies the objective reality of the respective subjects.

Since God is real, He can be described as “the God of truth” (Jer. 10:10; 2 Chr. 15:3 [RSV: “the true God”]), meaning that He exists objectively, as the respective contexts make clear. “The true God” (1 John 5:20; cf. John 17:3; 1 Thess. 1:9), also bears the meaning “the God who is there.”¹⁰ But, since the God of the Bible is not only represented as real, but as the ultimate reality, “the truth” is sometimes virtually a synonym for “deity.”¹¹ And, because of their deity, Christ and the Holy Spirit may be said to be “the truth.”

The most familiar occurrence of this usage is in John 14:6, “I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no one comes to the Father, but by me.” Though there are statements in John 8:40; 12:49; 14:10, 24; 17:8, which might lead one to understand Jesus to mean that He conveys the truth, a number of considerations indicate otherwise:

(a) We know of no evidence that such an expression as “I am . . . the truth” was ever used as an idiomatic way of saying something equivalent to “I make known the truth.”

(b) “No one comes to the Father but by (di’) me,” implies coming to the Father by Christ Himself, not by what He ministers; cf. “He who has the Son has life; he who has not the Son of God has not life” (1 John 5:12; cf. John 6:53-58).

(c) According to the succeeding verse, Jesus immediately followed with the statements, “If you had known me, you would have known my Father also; henceforth you know him and have seen him. . . . He who has seen me has seen the Father” (vv. 7, 9). The emphasis on “seeing” in these verses implies knowledge of experience, not of information only. Such seeing (knowledge) is characteristic of the Johannine gospel and epistles (see 1 John 3:6; 3 John 11; cf. John 6:56; 15:4-7; 1 John 1:3, 6; 2:5-6, 24, 27, 28; 3:6, 24; 4:12-16). Such knowledge moreover, fits Christ being the way and the truth and the life. It does not fit Him merely telling about them.¹²

(d) The other “I am” sayings in John’s gospel, when taken in context, usually indicate that Christ’s person is in view as well as His words and/or deeds (cf. John 6:35-55; 10:1-28; 11:25-26; 15:1-11).

R. Bultmann’s comment on John 14:6 is justified: “So truth . . . is God’s very reality revealing itself—occurring!—in Jesus.”¹³

In John 5:33-34, 36 (“You sent to John, and he has borne witness to the truth. Not that the testimony which I receive is from man The testimony which I have is greater than that of John”), “the truth” is not a proposition, but Christ Himself.¹⁴ John bore witness through the articulation of propositions concerning “the truth,” i.e., concerning Christ, but those propositions, though true, were not “the truth” here mentioned; they were only the means of bearing witness thereto.

In John 8:31-32 (“If you continue in my word, you are truly my disciples, and you will know the truth, and the truth will make you free”) the emphasis on continuing in His “word” may suggest that “the truth” is merely propositional, but the context indicates that the freedom in view is moral freedom, not intellectual freedom (vv. 34-36). And in this gospel it is emphasized that moral freedom requires more than assent to information.¹⁵ Besides believing that His words are true, it is necessary to “receive him” (1:12), to “eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood” (6:53), to be born “of water and the Spirit” (3:5). The truth that makes one free is more than assent to a proposition or propositions, it is Christ Himself, the “ultimate reality.”

According to 1 John 5:7 (6), “The Spirit is the witness, because the Spirit is the truth.” Witness to the fact that Jesus is the Son of God (vv. 5, 10) is borne by the Spirit, whose witness is dependable because He is “the truth,” i.e., because His witness is the witness of “ultimate reality.” The author was well aware that a stronger foundation for faith in the Holy Spirit’s testimony than a dogmatic statement to the effect that the Spirit tells the truth, was necessary (see 1 John 1:1-3; cf. John 5:31-39; 20:30-31). He therefore reminds his readers that the Holy Spirit is Himself the truth; His testimony is the testimony of ultimate reality.¹⁶

We have not exhausted the evidence, but have adduced sufficient thereof to make it clear that “truth” is a characteristic of objects and persons, and is supremely characteristic of deity.

III. A Quality of Conduct

The understanding of truth as a quality of conduct is common in the Old Testament, if, indeed, it is not the most characteristic assumption concerning it therein. Over and over again the Old Testament implies that truth is worthy and commendable conduct. We note a few examples:

All the truth which you have done (Gen. 32:10 lit.).

The deeds of his hands are truth and justice (Ps. 111:7 lit.).

Hezekiah . . . did the good, the right and the truth (2 Chr. 31:20 lit.).

Thou hast done truth, and we have acted wickedly (Neh. 9:33 lit.).

Examples could be multiplied.

In the New Testament the conception of truth as commendable action is in evidence in John 3:20-21, “Every one who does evil hates the light, . . . lest his deeds should be exposed. He who does what is true (lit.: ‘the truth’) comes to the light, that it may be clearly seen that his deeds have been wrought in God.” In these verses the one “who does evil” is contrasted with the one “who does the truth.” In John 5:29 there is a similar contrast between “those who have done evil” and “those who have done good”; and in 3 John 11 the one “who does evil” is contrasted with the one “who does good.” Moreover, the parallel with “did . . . the truth” in 2 Chr. 31:20 is striking.¹⁷ Whatever else may be implied, doing the truth in John 3:21 is engaging in action of a commendable quality.

Again, in 1 John 1:6 (“If we say we have fellowship with him while we walk in darkness, we lie and do not live according to the truth [lit.: ‘do the truth’]”) truth is not, or at least not only, something to be intellectually grasped; it is something to be done, and its practice is practice of a particular quality.

In Phil. 1:18 (“Whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is proclaimed”)¹⁸ the correctness or incorrectness of the propositions being articulated is not the question. In fact it is implied that the propositions being articulated by both sides were true. “Truth” is here the quality of the conduct involved in the articulation of the respective propositions.¹⁹

The Unity of Truth

As we have demonstrated, in biblical usage truth is sometimes a quality of propositions, sometimes a quality of persons and things (especially a characteristic of ultimate reality), and sometimes a quality of conduct or action. Is there any biblical evidence of unity in the conception of truth?

So far as we are aware, there is no evidence thereof, unless it is implicit in the Prologue of John, where “truth” bears a significant relationship to the Logos. According to John 1:14, 17, the coming (*egeneto*) of the Logos in flesh included the coming (*egeneto*) of grace and truth. In this connection

we note: (1) That truth is a matter of propositions corresponds to the Johannine dictum that the Logos was with God; (2) That truth is a matter of ultimate reality corresponds to the asseveration that the Logos was God; and (3) That truth is a matter of action or conduct corresponds to the insistence that the Logos became flesh. In stating that truth is intimately related to the Logos, the Johannine Prologue suggests that the unity of the Logos is also the unity of truth.

The Perspective of Philosophical Theology

Though our study of the biblical conception of truth is complete, we believe it to be instructive to consider what may be learned about truth from philosophical theology.

We begin by noting that a purely existential view of truth—the view that whatever exists is “truth”—implies that there can be no such thing as error or wrongdoing. Indeed, we submit that it is the simple existential view of truth, whether consciously or unconsciously held, which makes such things as homosexuality and involvement with the occult widely acceptable. The fact that such a view of truth does not produce people who are entirely without scruples is due to inconsistency on the part of those concerned, and has no justification in the view itself.

In support of the simple existential view of truth it may be contended that words and propositions are existents. Certainly it is often insisted that words are deeds, a contention which cannot be gainsaid. But the significant question is whether the concepts and ideas expressed in words and propositions are “existential” or not. We simply comment that if the ideal and the existential, essence and existence, being and becoming, form and content, are not to be distinguished, we must give up all talk about error and immorality.

Martin Heidegger, a renowned existentialist, not only insists that truth is neither a matter of propositions, nor a matter of correspondence, but holds that it is “letting-something-be-seen” and that “being false . . . amounts to deceiving in the sense of *covering up*.”²⁰ But, if “the primal being of beings is the will,” as he states,²¹ covering up is just as much a matter of truth as letting something be seen is a matter of truth. Both are due to an exercise of will. His view really leaves no room for a conception of falsity.²² The orthodox Christian must insist, however, that there is error and there is sin, and must therefore oppose the purely existential view of truth.²³ But this means that truth must be a matter of propositions. Whether such a view is exhaustive of the nature of truth, or not, we must consider.

We begin this further consideration by noting that truth is something; it is not nothing. If it were nothing, we would not have a subject to discuss. This is not to say anything about the nature of its existence. Some things exist “materially” as well as “formally,” such as men, mustard and moons. Some things evidently exist only “formally,” such as mermaids, centaurs and unicorns. Whether this “formal” existence is “real” or only “nominal,” is much debated, and does not concern us at the moment. We are only concerned at this point to note that truth is something; it is not nothing.

In the next place, we note that, for an orthodox Christian, at least some truth is eternal. An orthodox Christian must say, for example, that it is eternally true that “God is.”

What are the ways in which truth can be eternally true? If it be assumed that truth is solely a matter of propositions, can it be that God is a proposition, or set of propositions? But a proposition, or set

of propositions, cannot create. Indeed, it cannot do anything whatever; it just is. One may draw out the implications thereof, but that is an action on the part of another, not an action on the part of a proposition or set of propositions. Drawing out its implications only enables the one who draws them out to become more aware of what is already “in” the proposition or propositions. In this connection it may be noted that Plato’s realm of ideas could not produce the extended universe. There had to be unformed matter and a demiurge as well. One may also note Christ’s first and great commandment (“You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength” [Mark 12:30]), and ask, “Can one love a proposition, or set of propositions?”²⁴

Since the idea that God is a proposition, or set of propositions, is untenable, can one hold the simple propositional view of truth and contend that truth corresponds to “reality”? But if the truth with respect to God is not God, but only corresponds to Him, we have two eternals, God, and the truth with respect to Him. This, of course, is contrary to the Athanasian Creed, which affirms that there is only “one eternal.” It also commits us to an ultimate dualism of God and truth, in which neither can be absolute because they condition each other.²⁵

It does not help to suggest that eternal truth is in the mind of God, because then one must ask how it came to be in His mind. Some ideas are eternally created in the mind of God, such as the conception of an extended universe.²⁶ But God could not create the truth that “God is,” because this would have meant that “God is” is not true apart from the creative activity of God. An existentialist may say that God’s being is His activity, but, if so, the correspondence view of truth would only be possible if one held that the truth that “God is” were a creative activity distinct from the creativity in which God posits His own selfhood, since the correspondence view of truth means that truth is to be distinguished from that to which it corresponds. But, if the positing of the truth that God is is to be distinguished from the positing of God’s selfhood, the positing of His selfhood would not make it true that “God is”—surely an intolerable conclusion. The idea that all truth in the mind of God is there as a result of His creative activity is not tenable.²⁷

There is an alternative view, namely, that the truth that “God is” is in the mind of God by way of generation,²⁸ using this term in the same sense, or in much the same sense, as it has in the historic doctrine of the generation of the Son.²⁹ As the Son is eternally generated by the Father, and so is said to be God and to be with God, so the truth that “God is” derives from God in such fashion that it both is God and is “with” Him in His mind. God’s self-consciousness is not something He creates, but is the essence of God Himself “issuing” into His mind. Of course this means that His own being is conceptualized, which, in turn, means that it may be set forth in propositional terms, though I do not think that it needs to be.

There is an important implication of God’s self-awareness, i.e., of His consciousness that He Himself is: His affection(s) has (have) an object.³⁰ The fact that God is, plus the awareness thereof, results in God being the object of the divine affection. God loves Himself.³¹

But, since it is of the very nature of affection to be dynamic, God’s self-love means that He actively expresses that self-love. He does so by acting in such fashion as to glorify Himself. This He does, primarily, in the generation of the Son,³² and in the spiration of the Spirit in conjunction with the Son, and, secondarily, in creating angels, and in creating the extended universe. But this means that the truth that God is cannot be divorced from action. At least God’s primary action may be said to

be the doing implicit in the fact that God is.

Our consideration of philosophical theology has led us to conclude that the truth that God is, i.e., ultimate truth, is the very essence of His being, of His self-consciousness, and of His loving action. It has also led us to see that “God is” is not only inseparable from His being, His self-consciousness and His loving action, but would not be “true” apart from them. In other words, ultimate truth is a matter of reality, of proposition, and of action. This accords with what we observed in our study of the biblical conception of truth. It appeared, however, that the Scriptures only hinted—in the Prologue of John—at the unity and hierarchical relationship of the various senses in which they use the term “truth.” Our study of philosophical theology has made that unity and hierarchical relationship clear.

It is to be noted, furthermore, that our study in the area of philosophical theology has helped to make it clear that the nature of truth accords with the Trinitarian model. According to the historic doctrine of the Trinity, the one divine essence is the essence of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, but the Son is begotten of the Father, and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. As we have seen, “God is” is of the essence of His being, of His self-consciousness, and of His loving action, but we have also seen that His self-consciousness derives from his being, and that His loving action depends on His being and His self-consciousness.³³ This means, of course, that the structure of ultimate truth may be described as Trinitarian.

So far we have only been considering ultimate truth. Does other truth have a similar structure? If other truth is “created” by God, one would expect that it does, inasmuch as in creation God is glorifying Himself, which means that He is expressing Himself, albeit analogically rather than univocally.³⁴ Moreover, we submit that other truth exhibits the same fundamental structure, e.g., “There is an extended universe,” if true, means that there exists that of which the essence may be described as “extended universe.” Dependent on the existence of that reality for its “truth” is the proposition in anyone’s mind, “There is an extended universe.” And on the part of that person there would be an “emotional” response,³⁵ said response being dependent on the reality of the extended universe plus the awareness thereof.³⁶ This being so, a Trinitarian structure is manifest. The same kind of structure can be discerned if we only deal with an idea in someone’s mind. The idea must exist in his/her mind, he/she must be aware of the idea in his/her mind, and he/she must respond in some way to the idea of which he/she is aware.³⁷

That truth always has the kind of structure we have outlined is evident upon careful analysis. This means that an orthodox Christian must insist not only on a Trinitarian view of God, but also on what may be called a Trinitarian view of truth as well.

Endnotes

- ¹Cf. E. J. Carnell, *Christian Commitment* (New York: Macmillan, 1957), 29; R. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John* (New York: Seabury, 1980), 2:228-29; C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: University Press, 1963), 170-76. We have not been able to discern any evidence of change or development in the biblical conception of truth.
- ²“The Concept of Truth in the Inerrancy Debate,” *BSac* 137 (Oct.-Dec. 1980), 333; cf. C. F. H. Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority: Vol. III, God who Speaks and Shows* (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1979), 430, 459; G. H. Clark, “The Bible as Truth,” *BSac* 114 (April 1957), 158. Earlier in the same paragraph Geisler states that John 14:6 “indisputably uses truth of a person as opposed to propositions or expressions about reality”!
- ³*All Truth is God’s Truth* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 34-38.
- ⁴*The Two Horizons* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 411-13; cf. his “Truth,” *NIDNTT*, 3:874-901. We submit that one of his “nuances”—truth as “revealed doctrine”—is only a special instance of truth as “correspondence with the facts.” Also, we question the exegesis by which he arrives at the judgment that “sometimes truth is used in contrast to that which is hidden.”
- ⁵In *TDNT*, 1:241-51.
- ⁶We believe we have avoided the criticisms James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: University Press, 1961), 187-205, has levelled at what A. G. Hebert, T. F. Torrance, *et al.*, have said about the meaning of “truth” in the Bible.
- ⁷Cf. Barr, *Semantics*, 195-96.
- ⁸Unless otherwise indicated, biblical quotations are according to the Revised Standard Version.
- ⁹Cf. “children of truth” (1 Enoch 105:2); R. Bultmann in *TDNT*, 1:244.
- ¹⁰The expression is borrowed from the title of a book by Francis Schaeffer.
- ¹¹Are “truth” and “God of truth” virtually synonymous in 1 Esd. 4:35-41? Cf. R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 1:32.
- ¹²If it be suggested that we should translate, “I am the way, both the truth and the life,” and that we should understand “the truth” as a reference to the propositions He uttered, and “the life” as a reference to what He is in Himself, it must be replied that “the truth” and “the life” are paralleled in such fashion that for one to refer to what Christ does, and the other to what He is, seems to be excluded. Likewise, the suggestion that we should understand Jesus to mean that He is “the true and living way” seems farfetched, especially since we find quite direct ways of making such a point in the Fourth Gospel, e.g., John 1:9; 4:10. Cf. L. Morris, *The Gospel according to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 641 n. 17. But see R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966-70), 1:621-30.
- ¹³*Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Scribner, 1951-55), 2:19.
- ¹⁴Cf. Brown, *John*, 1:355.
- ¹⁵John 15:3 (“You are already made clean by the word which I have spoken to you”) may suggest otherwise. It may be significant, however, that being clean in John 15:3 is *dia ton logon*, not *dia tou logou*, perhaps signifying that the word is the reason, not the means, whereby they are kept (?) clean (cf. J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John* [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928], 480).
- ¹⁶The author is aware of the need for a criterion, or criteria, whereby one may know whether the

testimony one has received is the testimony of the Holy Spirit or not (see 1 John 4:1-6), but once it is established that the one bearing the testimony is the Holy Spirit, the relationship of the Spirit to ultimate reality is highly significant.

¹⁷In Tob. 4:6 (BA), “do the truth” (Tob. 4:6 [S], “do truth”) is contrasted with “walk in the ways of wrongdoing”; cf. Tob. 13:6, “If you turn to him with all your heart and with all your soul to do truth before him”; 1QS 1:4-5, “To keep from every evil and to cling to every good deed; and to do truth and righteousness and justice . . .”

¹⁸Cf. Tob. 8:7, “I am not taking this sister of mine because of lust, but in truth (*ep’ aletheias*).”

¹⁹In this verse it is implied that it is not sufficient that conduct be formally commendable for it to be described as “in truth.” The motive must be commendable as well. This is an advance on John 3:20-21 and 1 John 1:6.

²⁰*Being and Time* (New York: Harper, 1962), 56-57 (emphasis his); cf. 261ff.; and his *What is Called Thinking?* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), xi, 19, 209.

²¹*Thinking?*, 104; cf. 91, 92, 107.

²²For a different criticism of Heidegger’s conception of truth, see Thiselton, *Two Horizons*, 199ff.

²³T. Molnar, *Theists and Atheists* (The Hague: Mouton, 1980), 176, reports that Hans Jonas contended in a lecture at Drew University in 1964 that “Heidegger’s system . . . leads to . . . no distinction between true doctrine and heresy; the very idea of a true doctrine disappears. Since Being’s revelation is undecipherable and only our answer to its call can have a meaning, this human answer can be anything, ‘the Bible as well as Hitler.’ Ultimately, the revelation comes from man.”

²⁴Cf. R. H. Countess, review of *Language and Theology*, by G. H. Clark, in *Christianity Today* (August 7, 1981), 56, “Can one love a proposition? Be consoled by a proposition?”

²⁵That which is conditioned is not absolute.

²⁶Cf. C. S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity* (London: G. Bles, 1952), 51, “(God) loves matter. He invented it.”

²⁷According to the Stoic view, the universe is a fragment of God. But, if truth were a fragment of God, it would neither be God, nor would it correspond to God. Truth would not be truth. At best it would only be a part of truth!

²⁸Why we do not state that it is there by way of procession, we do not stop to discuss. Though we consider the distinction important, so far as we can see it does not materially affect the argument.

²⁹Though we believe that God is tripersonal, we also believe that the Father is the fount of deity. Hence we have not thought it necessary to introduce Trinitarian considerations into our discussion at this point.

³⁰Affection is impossible without some awareness of something existing, an awareness that has a cognitive component. Infants, imbeciles and animals are no exception.

³¹Self-love is essentially good; cf. Mark 12:31; Eph. 5:28-29.

³²In some biblical passages only the Father is said to be God, see 1 Cor. 8:6; John 17:3; Eph. 4:6; Phil. 2:11; cf. Rom. 15:6; 2 Cor. 1:3; 1 Pet. 1:3; Rev. 1:6.

³³The influence of rationalism has led some theologians to deny the hierarchical relationship of members of the Trinity. Orthodox theology, which insists on the generation of the Son and the procession of the Spirit, implies such a relationship. Indeed, it implies a kind of subordination of the Son and the Spirit, but a subordination quite different from that taught by Arius, because it also insists on the unity of the essence. Moreover, it is eternal subordination that is involved.

Economic subordination without eternal subordination is often proposed, but such a view makes the Son deny His own nature, and makes Jesus Christ misrepresent deity when He prays and in much of what He says.

³⁴If God were to give univocal expression to only part of what He is, would He really be expressing Himself? Whatever difficulties there may be in the conception, we suggest that God can only express Himself analogically when He creates.

³⁵“Aesthetic” is perhaps a more accurate term than “emotional” in this context. We have used “emotional” to emphasize that we are concerned with the affective element of personality. We have put the word in quotation marks to signify that we are using it in a somewhat specialized sense.

³⁶We submit that there is always a response of some kind to information received, however insignificant the response may be.

³⁷The idea of evil in God’s mind is somewhat odd. Nevertheless there is partial correspondence with the structure we have outlined. For God to create free creatures, He had to create the idea of evil, i.e., He had to create the possibility of evil, though He did not need to actualize it. Moreover, He had to be aware of this idea. But, whereas other ideas He creates are ideas in which He rejoices, leading Him to actualize them, in the case of evil He responded with hatred towards any actualization thereof. The idea of evil therefore participates in truth, but not completely. No truth is complete which does not include action (cf. Jas. 2:22; Gal. 5:6). Platonic idealism must be rejected in order to take seriously the volitional and affective elements of personality, if for no other reason.

The “truth” involved in the actualization of evil is also odd. It means that there is truth which is not in accord with the ultimate truth that “God is.” But that which does not accord with the truth that “God is” is not true; it is false! The law of contradiction is important, but not an absolute.

Biblical Apologetics

The late John V. Dahms

Professor Emeritus in New Testament, Canadian Theological Seminary

Published in Global Missiology, Trinitarian Studies, January 2004, www.globalmissiology.net

Wherever the Scriptures record an effective apologetic, there are always three components thereof:

- (a) A divinely-revealed proposition or propositions.
- (b) Empirical support for the proposition(s), or reliable report thereof.
- (c) Conviction of the truth of the propositions(s).

In elaborating this thesis we shall seek to be faithful to the entire biblical witness, but shall pay special attention to certain passages, which appear to us to be representative of apologetic material wherever it is found in the Scriptures, namely:

- (a) Ex. 3-4: The elders of Israel are persuaded that Moses was appointed by God to lead them out of Egypt;
- (b) 1 Kgs. 18: The Israelites gathered on Mt. Carmel cease to be uncertain as to whether Yahweh is God or not;
- (c) Acts 17: A number of pagan Athenians become convinced that Jesus has been appointed by God as judge of all the earth;
- (d) John 20:30-31: The author of the Fourth Gospel states that his purpose in reporting the “signs” he has included in his book is to persuade of the fact that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.¹

I. Revealed Propositions

It appears that in the biblical record every explicit attempt to lead people out of ignorance or unbelief begins with an explicit or implicit proposition.

According to Ex. 3:16-17 Moses is instructed to convey to God’s people the proposition that the God of their fathers had appeared to him and informed him that he was to lead them out of Egypt. According to Ex. 4:31 they eventually believed the proposition, though, of course, the mere conveying of the proposition was not in itself sufficient to convince them of its truth. In the time of Elijah the proposition that Yahweh is (the) God was one with which Israelites had long been familiar. Indeed, according to Ex. 6:2, it was revealed to Moses that God’s name is Yahweh.² It is instructive that the conviction, “Yahweh, he is God” (1 Kgs. 18:39 lit.), was only possible because the proposition was familiar to them.

It is likewise significant that those Athenians who “joined him and believed” (Acts 17:34), would never have done so, had they not heard Paul’s assertion, “He (God) has fixed a day on which he will judge the world in righteousness by a man whom he has appointed” (Acts 17:31), an assertion which was of dominical origin according to John 5:27-29, but which Paul may have deduced from his Damascus Road experience in which he saw and heard “Jesus our Lord” (1 Cor. 9:1; cf. Gal. 1:16; Acts 9:17; 22:10; 26:15). John tells us that he advances the proposition, “Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God” (John 20:31), with a view to belief that the proposition is true. That the proposition was divinely revealed is implied in the testimony of John the Baptist, “He who sent me to baptize with water said to me, ‘He on whom you see the Spirit descend and remain, this is he who baptizes with the Holy Spirit.’ And I have seen

and have borne witness that this is the Son of God” (John 1:33-34). It is also implied in Jesus’ response to Peter’s confession (“You are the Christ, the Son of the living God”), “Flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven” (Matt. 16:16-17).

The priority of the propositions which we have noted is not merely accidental or incidental, as the episode of the burning bush makes clear (Ex. 3). Until “God called to him out of the bush” with instruction and information, that the bush was burning but not being consumed, was only an enigma to Moses, exciting his curiosity. Prior to the hearing of the voice the burning bush was devoid of epistemological significance. Perception is always interpreted sensation, which means that sensation is meaningless unless there is a conscious or unconscious assumption or assumptions by which the sensation may be interpreted, an assumption or assumptions, moreover, which is (are) propositionally statable.

Of course one may misinterpret his/her experience(s). An illuminating example occurs in Luke 24:36-43, where the disciples of Jesus are said to have misinterpreted His appearance to them following His resurrection. In accord with convictions they already had, they “supposed that they saw a spirit.” Jesus had to inform them otherwise and demonstrate that their interpretation of their experience could not be correct. Not only does this report illustrate that perception is always interpreted sensation, it also raises the question whether experience can ever prove a positive proposition to be true. It illustrates the fact that experience can prove a proposition to be untrue, and, of course, in so doing it may prove an alternative proposition to be true, provided that one can be sure that there is only one alternative which is plausible. Where such a circumstance does not exist, the most that experience can do is demonstrate that a particular proposition is not true. (Of course, experience may provide a degree of probability that a positive proposition is true.)

In this connection note needs to be taken of what has been asserted by Karl Popper, the respected philosopher of science, “There (is) no such thing as an inductive procedure.”³ Regardless of how often an experience recurs, generalization always requires addition of the hypothesis, “It always happens (given such and such circumstances).” And, though experience may facilitate the advancement of the hypothesis, it does not originate it. It has its origin in a creative mind.⁴

To turn to another consideration: If apologetic begins with propositions, the intelligibility of those propositions is presupposed. This implies, in turn, that the words making up the propositions accord with the law of identity, and that their forms and relationships accord with the grammatical and idiomatic usage of the respective language at the respective time and place. Significant deviation therefore would jeopardize intelligibility, though this does not preclude the according of new connotations to words and phrases, provided that the context makes clear that new connotations are being assumed. Moreover, odd grammatical usages may occur, provided that the meaning is clear. And, of course, the possibility that enigmatic meaning, or double meaning, or etc., may sometimes be intended, cannot be ruled out.⁵

II. Empirical Observation

The second component of a biblical apologetic is empirical observation which is relevant, or reliable report thereof.

With respect to the four examples of an apologetic to which we are giving special attention, we note: (a) In the case of the Israelites in Egypt, Moses’ rod becoming a serpent, his hand

becoming leprous, and the Nile water becoming blood, provided for the relevant observation. (b) In the case of the Israelites on Mt. Carmel, fire from heaven consuming the bull on the altar, and licking up the water in the trench around the altar, was seen to be significant. (c) In the case of the Athenians whom Paul addressed, the report of Jesus' resurrection from among the dead was evidently impressive. (d) The report of the "signs" which Jesus did "in the presence of the disciples" is represented as significant if the readers of the Fourth Gospel are to "believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."

It is to be noted that, in each of these four instances, a miracle, or miracles, either observed or reliably reported, is an important component of the apologetic. Other examples could easily be adduced. Indeed, so common is it that it is doubtful whether special revelation is ever provided without a miraculous manifestation or manifestations accompanying it. Of course there are examples of new revelations (as opposed to the reiteration of special revelation) without any record of miraculous accompaniment thereof. For example, we are informed of a revelation to Noah in Gen. 6:13-21, to Abram in Gen. 12:1-3, and to Jeremiah in Jer. 25:11-12, without a record of any accompanying miracle or miracles.⁶ But it may be that the respective narratives are not recorded with a view to convincing the readers of the reliability of the respective propositions, commands, or promises. Their credibility is not in question. What is of concern is their content.⁷

In this connection it is to be noted that fulfilled prophecy has the same apologetic value as a miracle, since foretelling involves the receiving of information in other than purely natural ways. Hence we read in Deut. 18:21-22, "If you say in your heart, 'How may we know the word which the Lord has not spoken?'—when a prophet speaks in the name of the Lord, if the word does not come to pass or come true, that is a word which the Lord has not spoken . . ."; in Jer. 28:9, "As for the prophet who prophesies peace, when the word of that prophet comes to pass, then it will be known that the Lord has truly sent the prophet"; and in Ezek. 33:33, "When this comes—and come it will—then they will know that a prophet has been among them" (cf. Zech. 2:9, 11; 4:9; 6:15).

On the other hand, in the New Testament the report of fulfilled prophecy is repeatedly represented as attesting the reliability of the Christian message. This is especially prominent in Matthew's gospel, where over and over again we read, "All this took place to fulfil what the Lord had spoken by the prophet" (Matt. 1:22), or words to that effect. The fulfilment of prophecy is represented as justifying the judgment that what has taken place is of special significance. Indeed we may say that if one believes the prophecy, as the Jews did for whom Matthew wrote, one must also believe in Christ (cf. John 5:46). On the other hand, the fact that the respective events had been prophesied meant that the prophets who prophesied them were truly prophets of God, an argument which could be significant for Gentiles who had not had an antecedent conviction concerning the reliability of the Old Testament (cf. 2 Pet. 1:18-19 RSV).⁸

There is, however, a limitation to the view that miracles and/or fulfilled prophecy attest to special revelation. Deut. 13:1-2 warns that a false prophet may arise who "gives you a sign or a wonder, and the sign or wonder which he tells you comes to pass." Jesus is said to have prophesied, "False Christs and false prophets will arise and show great signs and wonders, so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect" (Matt. 24:24; cf. Mark 13:22). Paul wrote, "The coming of the lawless one by the activity of Satan will be with all power and pretended signs and wonders" (2 Thess. 2:9). And in Rev. 13:13 we are told that the second "beast" (called "the false prophet" in Rev. 19:20; 20:10) "works great signs, even making fire come down

from heaven to earth in the sight of men” (cf. Rev. 16:14). In this connection there are certain comments to be made:

(a) The Egyptian magicians were able to duplicate some of the miracles Moses performed, but, when they attempted to duplicate some others, they failed, and had to confess, “This is the finger of God” (Ex. 8:18-19).

(b) Various scholars have noted that the only miracles recorded in John’s gospel were specially notable ones. Was this because only such miracles constituted “signs” attesting that “Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God” (John 20:30-31)?

(c) Though Peter could say that Jesus was “a man attested to you by God with mighty works and wonders and signs which God did through him in your midst, as you yourselves know,” on that same occasion he declares that it is the raising of Jesus from the dead, and His exaltation to heaven, which implies that “God has made him both Lord and Christ” (Acts 2:22-36).⁹ And Peter’s emphasis on the resurrection of Christ as the supreme attestation of His Lordship and Messiahship is characteristic of the New Testament (see Acts passim; Rom. 1:4; 1 Cor. 15:4 20; John 20:27-28).

The resurrection of Jesus is the supreme and incomparable miracle. The raising of Lazarus is not comparable to it, because Lazarus was still subject to death thereafter. He did not have a “spiritual body” after he was raised from the dead (cf. 1 Cor. 15:44, 49; Phil. 3:21). And, whatever the mythology of other faiths may include, there is no historical evidence for the resurrection of anyone other than Jesus at any time or in any place. There are those who insist that Jesus’ resurrection could not have taken place, but their insistence is ultimately based on philosophical presuppositions, not on historical evidence. It is true, of course, that historical evidence is based on empirical observation, and what people believe they have observed may not always accord with the facts. Nevertheless, we constantly rely on what we are convinced that we, or others, have observed. And, though there is no unassailable proof, there is good reason to believe that the disciples were not mistaken in their conviction that the evidence of their senses meant that Jesus had been raised from the dead, and that His body no longer rested in some Palestinian grave or tomb. What is especially significant in this connection is that such a conviction and what it meant was contrary to their prejudices and expectations. Though Jesus is said to have predicted that He would be raised from the dead (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:34; and parallels), they did not believe it (cf. Matt. 28:17; Luke 24:21-26, 36-43; John 20:9, 24-25). Yet they became so convinced that they insisted on proclaiming it, though they knew that persecution and martyrdom were likely to result, as they often did (cf. Acts 4:1-3, 18-21, 33; 5:29-33, 40; 12:1-3; 13:30-37, 50; 1 Cor. 15:14-15, 30-32; etc.).

But, if miracles are so important for faith in special revelation, why did Jesus sometimes refuse to provide an attesting sign (Matt. 12:38-39; 16:4; Mark 8:11-12; Luke 11:29; cf. John 6:30)? Apparently because those requesting the sign—scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees (cf. Matt. 12, 16; Mark 8); “others” of the crowd (Luke 11); certain “people” (John 6)—were asking for the kind of sign which would compel them to believe in Him.¹⁰ Indeed the demand for a sign reported in Matt. 16 and Mark 8 is said to have followed close on the heels of the miraculous feeding of the four thousand, and the demand recorded in John 6 is said to have occurred the day after the feeding of the five thousand. It is no wonder that Jesus implied on more than one occasion that the miracles He had performed provided quite sufficient reason for people to believe in Him (John 5:36; 10:37-38; cf. 14:10-11). But John 11:47 implies that the reason was not compelling. People who were unwilling to respond to Him nevertheless admitted, “This man performs many signs” (cf. Luke 16:31; Acts 4:16).

It is also to be noted, however, that the faith His miracles prompted was not always a worthy faith. There were those who ate of the five loaves whose faith in Him was because they had their “fill of the loaves” (John 6:26). Their faith was motivated by His manifest ability to supply their physical needs and/or desires. It was “not because (they) saw signs,” that is, not because the miracle had led them to perceive who He was. Again we read that when an official “begged him to come down and heal his son, for he was at the point of death” (John 4:47), Jesus responds, “Unless you see signs and wonders you will not believe.” R. E. Brown comments on this response, “It was to lead him to a faith that would not be based on the wondrous aspect of the sign but on what the sign would tell him about Jesus . . . This fits the whole Johannine theology of signs.”¹¹ (It is significant that when the healing of his son was confirmed, the official “believed.” Through the miracle he had apparently come to a worthy faith.)

Before concluding our consideration of empirical observation, it is worth making it explicit that the Bible abounds with evidence that truth is not considered to be self-evident or self-authenticating. Indeed, Jesus is represented as stating on one occasion, “If I bear witness to myself, my testimony is not true” (John 5:31; cf. 8:54).¹² In fact, all that is necessary for a proposition to appear to be self-authenticating is for it to be in obvious accord with one’s own presuppositions. When I was an idealist, the truth of certain propositions appeared to be self-evident as soon as I was confronted with them. But now that I am no longer an idealist, I am convinced that some of those propositions are not true! (Cf. Matt 6:22-23.)

The dogma that it is by the power of the Holy Spirit that some or all of the propositions in the Bible are self-authenticating (to the elect only?) is to misunderstand how the Holy Spirit functions. He does not bring conviction directly, at least not ordinarily. He uses empirical evidence to bring conviction. According to Heb. 2:3-4 the message of salvation “was attested to us by those who heard him (the Lord), while God also bore witness by signs and wonders and various miracles and by gifts of the Holy Spirit . . .” (cf. Acts 6:8-10). And in Rom. 15:18-19 Paul testifies that through him Christ won “obedience from the Gentiles, by word and deed, by the power of signs and wonders, by the power of the Holy Spirit . . .”

Moreover, to suggest that the gospel needs no other attestation than the internal witness of the Holy Spirit is theologically unsound: (a) It fails to recognize that the Incarnation implies that God ordinarily, if not always, convinces of truth in the way in which people are ordinarily convinced; (b) It implies, in effect, that the Spirit is the second person of the Trinity, and puts Christ, who corresponds to that which is existential and empirical, in third place, if He is epistemologically significant at all; and (c) It corresponds to the view that the Spirit proceeds from the Father only, not from the Father and the Son. (The Holy Spirit is not only the Spirit of the Father [Matt. 10:20], but is also the Spirit of Christ [Acts 16:7; Rom. 8:9; Gal. 4:6; Phil. 1:19; 1 Pet. 1:11].)

Furthermore, if the gospel needs no more attestation than that of the internal witness of the Holy Spirit, there is no reason to believe that the teachings of the Bible have greater support than the teachings of some other faiths. Concerning Mormon doctrine we read in Moroni 10:4-5,

When ye shall receive these things, I would exhort you that ye would ask God, the eternal Father, in the name of Christ, if these things are true, and if ye shall ask with a sincere heart, with real intent, having faith in Christ, he will manifest the truth of it unto you, by the power of the Holy Ghost.

And when a disciple of Hare Krishna sought to convert him, a friend of mine asked why he should have faith in Hare Krishna. He was told, "Because of the wonderful peace you will get." And when the present writer asked a neo-orthodox theologian how he might know that an encounter he has had is an encounter with God, the theologian replied, "You get it and you'll know it." This is essentially the same answer as provided by Moroni 10:4-5, by the disciple of Hare Krishna, and by those who consider the Bible to be self-authenticating by the power of the Holy Spirit.

To conclude this section, we note that "traditional Christian theology has always regarded the miracles as the rational ground by means of which reasonable men may believe truths which go beyond the power of reason to establish."¹³ Indeed, "St. Thomas, Bishop Butler and Dr. Mozley . . . agree in holding it to be irrational, even superstitious, to believe in the Christian revelation upon the 'mere word' of Jesus alone."¹⁴ In the nineteenth century, however, it came to be held that it is not miracles but "the powerful appeal which Jesus makes to the spiritual, rational and moral consciousness of mankind" which validates belief in Christianity.¹⁵ This development was due to (a) the assumption that nature is so uniform that belief in miracles is impossible, unless one so emasculates the concept of miracle, that it cannot witness to the supernatural; and (b) the assumption that the spiritual, rational and moral consciousness of mankind is fundamentally uniform.¹⁶ In recent years both assumptions have been called in question.¹⁷

According to the biblical evidence, the movement from ignorance or unbelief to a worthy faith is based on the conviction that faith has appropriate empirical support, and that special revelation has the support of well-attested miracle(s).

III. Conviction of the Truth of the Respective Proposition(s)

It may be thought that it is sufficient that a given proposition is supported by an empirical "sign" or "signs." But the question of the kind of support miracles provide must be considered. This is because the empirical signs are not logical evidence of the truth of the respective proposition or propositions. Logical considerations have an important part to play in the acquisition of knowledge (cf. Isa. 1:18; Matt. 6:26; Luke 24:38-42; John 20:24-27; Rom. 4:10), but the empirical facts or events do not provide logical proof that the respective proposition(s) is/are true. (Between the ideal and the existential there is a gulf which cannot be logically bridged.¹⁸)

By no logical procedure can one get from a rod turned into a serpent, a hand become leprous, and Nile water transformed into blood, to the conclusion that Moses was appointed by God to lead Israel out of Egypt, unless one assumes (a) that these things could only take place if God performed miracles, and (b) that God brought them to pass in support of Moses' claim to be God's appointee for the purpose indicated. That the Egyptian magicians were able to turn their rods into serpents and Nile water into blood (Ex. 7:12, 22), indicates that the first of these assumptions is unwarranted. Though it turned out that Moses could perform greater wonders than they could, so that they concluded that "The finger of God" made those greater wonders possible (Ex. 8:19), this was not a logical conclusion on their part. They could have just as logically concluded that Moses was simply a greater magician than they were, and that they would be able to duplicate what he had done, if only they had the opportunity to learn his techniques.

When fire fell from heaven on Mt. Carmel, the people need not have concluded that "the Lord, he is God" (1 Kgs. 18:39). They could have concluded just as logically that Elijah had

used some kind of trickery, or that Baal could have done the same had he not been heedless of his prophets, as Elijah himself suggested, albeit in mockery. Moreover, we may note that the second beast of Revelation “works great signs, even making fire come down from heaven in the sight of men” (Rev. 13:13).

The resurrection of Jesus is not logical proof of His deity (cf. John 20:28; Rom. 1:4). All that it proves logically is that dead men do not necessarily stay dead. Rare as it may be, dead men may come forth from the grave immortal and incorruptible, and subsequently ascend into “heaven.” Indeed, the Bible promises that all God’s people who have died will one day rise from the dead immortal and incorruptible, and “be caught up . . . in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air.” Christ is but “the firstfruits” of the people of God who sleep in death (1 Cor. 15:23; 1 Thess. 4:17). There is no logical reason why the firstfruits must be thought to be divine when the rest are not.

Logic provides no reason to believe that anything empirical attests the proposition(s) it is represented as attesting. Logic is of great importance, but it is unable to show that empirical facts and/or events attest to the truth of revealed propositions.

By what means, then, can empirical facts and/or events be judged to attest revealed propositions? By an aesthetic judgment to the effect that the respective miracle or miracles does/do attest the truth of the revealed proposition(s), that is, by the “feeling” that the proposition(s) must be true.

Since it is the power of the Holy Spirit, i.e. aesthetic power, which convinces of divine truth on the basis of empirical evidence, it is understandable why intelligent people may be convinced that “a notable sign has been performed,” and yet be unconvinced of the truth to which the sign is intended to attest (Acts 4:16; cf. John 11:44-48). The love of self and sin—a matter of the affections as well—leads them to resist the Holy Spirit (Acts 7:51; cf. Heb. 3:8, 13, 15; 4:7).¹⁹

Of course aesthetic appreciation is often untrustworthy. It is not trustworthy when (a) it is aesthetic appreciation of what is solely ideal;²⁰ (b) it is aesthetic appreciation of what is solely existential;²¹ and (c) it is aesthetic appreciation of what is a combination of the existential and the ideal, with the existential having priority.²²

If what one appreciates is only ideal, there is no reason to believe that that idea, or system of ideas, is to be preferred to an idea, or system of ideas, which is incompatible therewith. If what one appreciates is solely existential, there is no reason to believe that what is appreciated is to be preferred over something else, or some other things, which exist. There may be those who believe that they appreciate everything that exists, but, if so, they deceive themselves. No one appreciates pain just because it exists. There are those who claim that evil is a form of good, and they may think they believe it, but observation of their conduct soon reveals that in fact they do not believe it. And those who aesthetically appreciate a combination of what is existential and what is ideal, with appreciation of what is existential having the priority, are in the same predicament as those who appreciate only what is existential. If what is ideal influences the appreciation of what is existential, the appreciation of what is existential does not have priority. The only worthy position is one in which there is appreciation of a combination of what is ideal and what is existential, with what is ideal having priority, and what is ideal being aesthetically supported by what is existential. This means that only an idea, or system of ideas, which has significant existential support is

worthy. It also means that, if an idea, or system of ideas, has strong existential support, albeit of an aesthetic nature, those components of existence which do not accord with the respective idea, or system of ideas, are unworthy.

It may be objected that what is aesthetically pleasing to some is not aesthetically pleasing to others. Though there is a measure of truth in such a statement, it must be remembered that there is a large measure of agreement as to what is aesthetically pleasing and what is not. Almost everyone agrees that a rose is beautiful, and almost everyone agrees that garbage by the roadside, or a suppurating ulcer, is not. In addition, tastes may need to be acquired. One reared on the prairies may need to acquire an appreciation for mountains, and vice versa. One may need to acquire a taste for classical music. A westerner probably needs to acquire an appreciation of certain non-rationalist types of thinking. Moreover, we have just been at pains to set forth circumstances in which the aesthetic judgment is not to be trusted. On the other hand, appreciation of that which ought to be appreciated is often blocked by some prior appreciation. A person's liking for the satisfaction of the physical appetites may hinder him from acquiring a taste for intellectual pursuits. The love of self and sin may keep one from acquiring love for Christ. Indeed, Christians hold that an unworthy love of self and sin has such a hold upon us, that it is only by the power of the Holy Spirit that we can ever really acquire love for Christ (cf. Mark 10:17-22; John 16:7-11; 1 John 4:7; etc.).

It may be contended that one does not choose one's likes and dislikes. What he/she appreciates is determined for him/her. But is this true? Are our affections not influenced by our commitments? The Scriptures teach that he/she who repents and believes the gospel is born of God, and he/she who is born of God has God's love abiding in him/her (cf. 1 John 3:17; 4:7).²³ Our commitment may not itself effect a change in our affections, but God by His Spirit does so for those who are committed (cf. 1 Thess. 3:12; 4:9-10).

Everyone relies at times on his/her aesthetic judgment. There are no consistent rationalists. For example, many believe the proposition that their mothers love them. Moreover, they believe it because they have empirical evidence which accords with that proposition. But that empirical evidence provides no logical reason for believing the proposition. If one is thoroughly logical he/she could just as easily conclude that what is empirically observed is evidence that the maternal instinct is expressing itself and nothing more. But even if they are made aware of this possibility, the majority are still convinced that they are justified in believing that their mothers love them. They trust their feelings in the matter! And their lives would be greatly impoverished if they did not do so. Indeed, if one never trusted one's feelings, one's existence would be barren indeed.

It is significant that this biblical apologetic is consistent with the Trinitarian doctrine of God which has prevailed historically in Western orthodoxy, both Roman and Protestant. Of course this is only to be expected if (a) truth is one; (b) the Western doctrine of God is sound; and (c) the Bible is reliable.

Endnotes

1. Cf. W.C. van Unnik, *Sparsa Collecta* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 1:53-54).
2. That He was known by the name Yahweh long before the time of Moses is implied in Gen. 4:26; 16:2, 5; 22:14; etc. According to the Documentary Hypothesis these passages reflect a tradition divergent from the tradition recorded in Ex. 6:2. Cf. B. S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974), 68, 112-14.

3. D. Miller ed., *Popper Selections* (Princeton, N.J.: University Press, 1955), 30-31.
4. In our opinion only God is creative, so that all seminal ideas must ultimately derive from Him, and be inspired by Him. They may be distorted (cf. John 21:22-23). They may be doubted (cf. Gen. 15:8; Acts 10:13-14). They may be denied (e.g. Gen. 3:4). Their implications may be drawn out (cf. 1 Cor. 11:22-34). They may be misapplied (cf. Luke 4:6-12). Perhaps alternatives may be embraced due to dislike thereof (cf. Matt. 12:24; Rom. 1:23, 24). But fundamentally new ideas are always His gift.
5. John 1:14 implies a somewhat different understanding of logos from what had prevailed previously. Odd grammatical usage occurs in Rev. 1:16. It is commonly recognized that hupsoo is use is used in John 3:14 with a double meaning.
6. According to Gen. 15:7-20 Abram receives the promise that God would give him "this land to possess." But, though he acknowledges that the promise is from God, he asks, "O Lord God, how am I to know that I am to possess it?" And God apparently responds with what G. von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary, Revised Edition* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973), 188, calls "strange phenomena." (Cf. Jud. 6:36-40; Isa. 7:3-17.)
7. With respect to the credibility of Jeremiah, see Jer. 28:15-17; cf. 28:9; 26:10-19.
8. Cf. J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981), 320-21.
9. Acts 2:24 makes it clear that "made him" in v. 36 does not imply that He only became Lord and Christ at, or after, His resurrection. It means, "Made him to be recognized as Lord and Christ." Cf. V. Taylor, *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching* (London: Macmillan, 1958), 30, 194; I. H. Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 80.
10. Cf. D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 200; W. L. Lane, *The Gospel according to Mark* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 277. According to Matt. 12:39-40; 16:4; Luke 11:29-30, He did promise "the sign of Jonah," which is interpreted as "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Matt. 12:40). Of course, such a sign would not attest to Jesus until after His death, and even then would not compel belief on the part of the general public, because the resurrection appearances were restricted to those "who were chosen by God as witnesses" (Acts 10:41).
11. *The Gospel according to John* (i-xii), Second Edition, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966), 195.
12. Cf. John 8:14, "Even if I do bear witness to myself, my testimony is true." In John 5:31 He is stating that, if one had only His statement concerning Himself, one would be justified in rejecting the statement as unworthy of credence. In John 8:14 He is simply affirming that what He says about Himself is true. Indeed, He goes on to insist that besides His own witness to Himself, there is the witness of the Father to Him (8:18). Cf. L. Morris, *The Gospel according to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 324-26, 440.
13. A. Richardson, *Christian Apologetics* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947), 156.
14. *Ibid.*, 162.
15. *Ibid.*
16. Cf. *ibid.*, 163-164.
17. Belief in the absolute uniformity of nature has been undermined, if not shattered, by quantum physics with its indeterminacy principle. It is insisted that this principle is only significant on the "micro" level. But does not admission of indeterminacy on this level open up the possibility of an effect, however rare, on the "macro" level, an effect which would be indistinguishable from a miracle? Might a theologian identify indeterminacy on the "micro" level as an expression of the freedom of God, and any "miracle" deriving therefrom as also an expression of His free will? More extensive and more profound acquaintance with people of other cultures, to say nothing of the pluralization of Western

society, has well nigh rendered belief in the uniformity of the spiritual, rational and moral consciousness of mankind passé.

18. Cf. J. Burbidge, *Being and Will* (New York: Paulist Press, 1977), 77, 118.
19. If reality is a thoroughly logical system, there is no such thing as freedom. God is not free. No one can help having the convictions he has. If one's convictions change, it was inevitable that they would change and that that change would be in the particular way and at the particular time that the change took place.
20. Cf. Idealism in its various forms.
21. Cf. Materialism and Existentialism in its various forms.
22. Cf. Thomism and neo-orthodoxy.
23. For the interpretation of 1 John 3:17, see I. H. Marshall, *The Epistles of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 194-95.

Biblical Atonement

The late John V. Dahms

Professor Emeritus in New Testament, Canadian Theological Seminary

Published in Global Missiology, Trinitarian Studies, April 2004, www.globalmissiology.net

A study of atonement in the Bible reveals a three-fold concern and provision: consecration, expiation and fellowship. This three-fold structure is evident in the sacrificial system of the Old Testament as well as in what we are told concerning the death of Christ in the New Testament. Of course this is not surprising since the sacrificial system of the Mosaic covenant foreshadowed the sacrifice of our Lord (Heb. 10:1; cf. 8:5; 9:23, 24; Col. 2:17).

In this study focus is on the sacrifices prescribed in Lev. 1-7, because, as we shall see, all that is said concerning sacrifice in the Old Testament, and all that is taught concerning our Lord's self-offering, can be related thereto.

Consecration

Not only is it significant that the first prescriptions set forth in Lev. 1-7 are those concerning the burnt offering (see Lev. 1:3-6:7; 6:8-7:36; 7:37), it is also significant that prior to the Sinaitic legislation¹ the sacrifice which is most prominent is the burnt offering (see Gen. 8, 22; Ex. 10, 18).² Especially significant in this connection is the fact that there is no reference to a sin offering or a guilt (trespass) offering before Ex. 29. And, if one examines the book of Job, which some take to be as ancient as the writings of Moses,³ only the burnt offering is mentioned therein (Job 1:5; 42:8).⁴ Moreover, in the Old Testament generally the burnt offering is apparently the most

¹For the most part the documentary hypothesis concerning the Pentateuch is disregarded in this paper.

²The Hebrew term *minh* is commonly used to designate the grain (cereal offering must have a different connotation in Gen. 4:3-5, where it is used of Abel's animal sacrifice. IN view of its occurrence with the meaning of "gift" in Gen. 32:11-33:10; 43:11-26, it probably has the meaning "gift offering" in Gen. 4, perhaps as an expression of homage, which, as we shall see, was apparently the foremost emphasis in the burnt offering.

What is probably to be regarded as a sacrifice in connection with covenant-making is reported in Gen. 15:7-21. (G. von Rad, *Genesis*, Revised Edition [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972], 186, contends, however, that it is improbable that a sacrifice is in view.) That the Passover was considered a sacrifice is indicated in Ex. 12:27 (see also Ex. 23:18; 34:25). The "sacrifices" mentioned in conjunction with burnt offerings in Ex. 10:25 (cf. 10:9); 18:22, are undoubtedly peace offerings of an early type, as is probably the case with the sacrifice Jacob is said to have offered in Gen. 31:54. (See Ex. 20:24; 24:5; 1 Sam. 6:15; 15:22; 2 Kgs. 5:17; S. R. Driver, *The Book of Exodus* [Cambridge: The University Press, 1918], 83, 164, 207; H. H. Rowley, *Worship in Ancient Israel* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967], 52; R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel* [New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961], 2:417.)

³See R. K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 1040-41.

⁴According to Vincent Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice* (London: Macmillan, 1937), 51, "The *sin-offering* and the *guilt-offering* belong to the post-exilic period." R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 2:429, argues, however, that they must have existed at least as early as the last years of the monarchy. It is notable in this connection that, though the burnt offering (and the cereal and peace offerings) are mentioned rather frequently in Deuteronomy and in what is called the Deuteronomic history, reference therein to sin and/or guilt offerings occurs only in 1 Sam. 6:3-17 and 2 Kgs. 12:16. Moreover, in the 1 Samuel passage it is the Philistines who are represented as offering a guilt offering to the God of Israel. Furthermore, in this literature there is no specific reference to sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins. Ex. 23:21; Deut. 29:19; Jos. 24:19; 1 Kgs. 8 *passim*; 2 Kgs. 5:18; 24:4, refer to divine pardon, but not in conjunction with sacrifice. (But see 1 Sam. 6:3-17; 2 Kgs. 12:16.) In Deut. 21 a circumstance is described in which divine forgiveness is

important of the sacrifices that individuals are to offer. And not only is this sacrifice to be offered by individuals, it is the sacrifice which, together with the cereal offering, is to be offered daily on behalf of all God's people, evidently in recognition of the corporate nature of their existence.⁵

It is generally agreed that the burnt offering, the only offering in which the whole animal is consumed on the altar, represents total commitment to God, whether of the individual worshipper or of the people of God corporately. As N. Micklem has observed, "The whole burnt offering signifies total self-oblation to God ..."⁶

It would seem, therefore, that when it is stated that the burnt offering "make(s) atonement" for someone, and is "a pleasing odour to the Lord" (Lev. 1:4, 9), the meaning is that a positive relationship with God is established or renewed. Though the Hebrew verb translated "make atonement" usually implies the establishment or renewal of such a relationship by sacrifice which effects the expiation of sins committed, it is also used of the establishment or renewal of such a relationship by sacrifice which effects the expiation of sins committed, it is also used of the establishment or renewal of such a relationship when the forgiveness of sins is not particularly in view (e.g., Ex. 30:12-16; Num. 31:50; cf. Deut. 32:43; Prov. 13:8; Is. 43:3-4). The latter would appear to be the case in Lev. 1:4. Unless something of the significance of the sin and/or guilt offerings was always, or had become, attached to it, the burnt offering is there represented simply as the means whereby at-one-ment with God is secured or renewed.⁷

That this understanding is the correct one finds support in Gen. 22. There we are told that Abraham was instructed to offer Isaac "as a burnt offering," and that the ram which was finally sacrificed in his place was "offered ... up as a burnt offering." The instruction to offer up Isaac is said to have been a means of testing Abraham, and Abraham's willingness to make this sacrifice is said to have been evidence that he really did "fear God." In other words, his readiness to sacrifice his only son whom he loved—indeed the very child with whom God was said to have promised to establish His covenant (Gen. 17:19, 21)⁸—demonstrated Abraham's unconditional consecration to God, and the offering of the ram "instead of his son" evidently represented that complete consecration.⁹ The communication of v. 12 (and vv. 16-18) shows that God was well pleased and that a blessed relationship with Him ensued. The ram was not offered to expiate any sin or sins on Abraham's part, and the substitution involved was a "consecratory substitution," not a penal substitution.¹⁰

partly contingent on the killing of a heifer by breaking its neck, but "this was not a sacrifice in the normal sense" (P. C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976], 279).

⁵The continual burnt offering is first prescribed in Ex. 29:38-42. For further reference thereto, see Num. 28:1-10, 15, 23; Ezra 3:5; Neh. 10:33; 1 Chron. 16:40; Dan. 8:11-13; 11:31; 12:11; (cf. 2 Kgs. 16:15; Ezek. 46:13).

⁶In *IB*, 2:15. Cf. H.-J. Kraus, *Worship in Israel* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966), 116. For a different view, see B. A. Levine, *In the Presence of the Lord* (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 22-27.

⁷Cf. N. Micklem in *IB*, 2:15-16; cf. M. Noth, *Leviticus*, Revised Edition (Philadelphia, Westminster, 1977), 22; G. J. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 28; L. Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), 18-19, 143.

⁸Critical scholarship, however, assigns Gen. 17 to the Priestly strand of the Pentateuch, whereas Gen. 22 is assigned to the Elohist material.

⁹Cf. G. Friedrich in *TDNT*, 7:83. See also Jud. 11:31-39; and note Ex. 18:11-12; 24:5-8.

¹⁰I suggest that burnt offerings appropriately represented self-consecration at a time of thanksgiving upon the fulfilment of a vow (Num. 6:14; 15:3; Ps. 66:13-15), and in connection with cleansing from pollution (Lev. 12:6; 14:13, 19; 15:15, 30). Thanksgiving to God is not real unless it includes consecration to Him, or the renewal thereof. A vow is either a vow to be God's, or, if it is a vow to devote something to God, it is only a worthy thing to do as part and parcel

The second offering considered in Lev. 1-7 is the cereal offering (see Lev. 2:1ff.; 6:14ff.; 7:37). Moreover, the sacrifice of a cereal offering is ordinarily associated with the sacrifice of a burnt offering. Indeed, the continual burnt offering always had a cereal offering associated with it (Num. 28).

The cereal offering was undoubtedly understood as a gift to God, in accord with the fact that in non-cultic usage the Hebrew term designating it clearly meant “gift” (e.g., 2 Sam. 8:2, 6; 2 Chron. 26:8; Ps. 45:12). The offering thereof was “an act of dedication and consecration to God ...”¹¹ Indeed, it may be that it particularly represented the consecration to God of what one’s toil had produced.¹² If so, it was a suitable complement to the burnt offering.¹³

It may be noted that the memorial portion of the cereal offering, the portion burned on the altar, was, like the burnt offering, “a pleasing odour to the Lord” (Lev. 2:9); i.e., it resulted in God being well disposed toward the offerer.¹⁴

That consecration offerings should have been the foremost sacrifices in the Old Testament cultus suggests that total surrender to God is the foremost requirement for human salvation. And, indeed, this is precisely what is implied in the fact that repentance is represented as man’s first need, if he is to inherit eternal life.¹⁵ Moreover, this fits the fact that the New Testament gives pre-eminence to

of one’s self-giving to God. And the beginning of a new stage in life, as when one is cleansed from pollution, is a time when one needs to be devoted to God and to express that devotion.

In commenting on Job 1:5 (“[Job] would ... offer burnt offerings ...; for Job said, ‘It may be that my sons have sinned’”) H. H. Rowley, *Job*, Revised Edition (Greenwood, S.C.: Attic Press, 1978), 30, says, “It is clear that it was offered to expiate any sins that might have been committed.” I doubt it. Job is said to have added, “And cursed God in their hearts.” I understand that what is meant is that they turned against God (ASV: “renounced God”), as the same terminology in 1:11 and 2:9 indicates. If so, Job’s burnt offering was consecratory, not expiatory. Moreover, Job’s three friends were exhorted to offer burnt offerings because “you have not spoken of me what is right” (Job 42:7). This may mean that they were required to make such offerings as a way of confessing that they accepted the correction of their understanding of God’s dealings with people (see Job 42:7-8), and were still consecrated to Him. According to J. G. Janzen, *Job* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985), 264, 266, repentance was involved in these sacrifices by Job’s three friends. This accords with what I have suggested.

¹¹Wenham, *Leviticus*, 71; cf. A. S. Herbert, *Worship in Ancient Israel* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1963), 115; H. Ringgren, *Sacrifice in the Bible* (New York: Association Press, 1962), 15.

¹²Cf. S. H. Kellogg in *EB*, 1:253; Wenham, *Leviticus*, 72.

¹³If so, it seems strange that the cereal offering was not entirely consumed on the altar, that only a portion of it was burned and the rest “left ... for Aaron and his sons” (Lev. 2:10). However, the part that was burned is called “the memorial portion” (Lev. 2:9, 16; cf. 5:12; 8:15; 24:7; Num. 5:26), a term which TEV renders, “a token that it (the entire cereal offering) has all been offered to the Lord” (cf. NEB; Wenham, *Leviticus*, 68 n. 3; R. de Vaux, *Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice* [Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1964], 30). On the other hand, Ringgren, *Sacrifice*, 16, states that the term means that “the offering is made in order to bring the one who gives it in remembrance before God, or, in other words, to remind God of his existence and his needs.”

¹⁴Drink Offerings were associated with burnt offerings and cereal offerings (see Ex. 29:40-41; Lev. 23:13, 18, 37; Num. 15:4-10, 24; 28:7-29:39; cf. 1 Sam. 7:6; 2 Sam. 23:17). Num. 15:24 (“a burnt offering ... with its cereal offering and its drink offering”) indicates that drink offerings were also consecration offerings. (So A. F. Rainey, “Sacrifice and Offerings,” *ZPE*, 5:207.) The offering of firstfruits (see Ex. 23:19) was in recognition of the entire harvest of the fields as being from God (see Deut. 26:10-11; cf. Ringgren, *Sacrifice*, 18-22; Rowley, *Worship*, 136). Surely such recognition, when sincere, implied consecration to God.

¹⁵Repentance is essentially “total surrender, total commitment to the will of God” (J. Behm in *TDNT*, 4:1002; cf. Acts 20:21; 26:20; Rev. 16:9). This “unconditional turning to God” implies “unconditional turning from all that is against God” (Ibid.). And so the New Testament speaks of repenting of sins (Acts 8:22; Heb. 6:1; Rev. 2:21-22; 9:20-21; 16:11; cf. Jer. 26:3; 36:3, 7; Ezek. 3:19; 18:21, 23, 27; 33:12, 14, 19). But unreserved and unconditional consecration to

recognition of the Lordship of Christ when it deals with what is required if one is to secure salvation (Acts 16:31; Rom. 10:9; cf. Acts 2:36; 5:31; Rom. 10:13; 1 Cor. 1:2; 2 Cor. 4:5; 2 Pet. 1:11; 2:20; 3:2, 18; Phil. 2:11).

This emphasis is also in accord with the doctrine of Rom. 6:4-11,

We were buried with him by baptism into death ... If we have been united with him in a death like his ... We know that our old self was crucified with him so that the sinful body might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin ... The death he died he died to sin ... So you must consider yourselves dead to sin.

And similar Pauline teaching is to be found in Gal. 2:20, “I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I (*ego*) who live ...”; in Col. 2:12, “You were buried with him in baptism”; in Col 3:3, “You have died [with Christ]”; and in 2 Tim. 2:11, “If we have died with him, we shall also live with him.” Likewise, in John’s Gospel we have Jesus represented as referring to His impending death with the words, “For their sake [the sake of those ‘whom thou gavest me’] I consecrate myself, that they also may be consecrated in truth” (John 17:19).¹⁶

According to 2 Cor. 5:14, “We are convinced that one has died for all; therefore all have died.” One might have expected the conclusion of this statement to be some such assertion as, “Therefore all shall live” (cf. Rom. 5:18, “One man’s act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men”).¹⁷ But Paul does not say so. He is not only concerned to emphasize Christ’s death for us; he is also concerned to emphasize our death with Him.¹⁸

It is to be noted in this connection that the death of Christ does not merely make possible our death to sin. That it does do so may be implied in 1 Pet. 2:24, “He himself bore our sins in his body on the tree, that we might die to sin and live to righteousness.”¹⁹ But Rom. 6, to say nothing of the other passages we have quoted, says more than this. If Christ’s death only made it possible for us to die to sin, Paul could hardly have said, “Consider yourselves dead to sin” (v. 11); he would have had first to exhort to die to sin. In Rom. 6 and elsewhere it is not only stated that His death to sin made our death to sin possible, but that we “died in Christ’s death.”²⁰ As F. F. Bruce renders Rom. 6:6, “The person we formerly were was crucified with him.”²¹

What such crucifixion with Christ means is indicated in Rom. 6:10-11, “The death he died he died to sin ... So you must also consider yourselves dead to sin”; in 2 Cor. 5:15, “He died for all, that those who live might live no longer for themselves but for him who for their sake died and was raised”; and in Gal. 2:20, “It is no longer I (*ego*) who live, but Christ lives in me.” Christ’s death is more than an inspiration to yield to Him and so become His. Indeed, if we are to yield to Him and become His, we need more than inspiration to do so, because of the bondage of our wills (cf. Rom. 7:14-23). Only Christ, whose will was not bound, could yield totally to God, which He did, the ultimate expression thereof being when He “became obedient unto death, even death on a cross”

God is the essence of repentance.

¹⁶Cf. L. Morris, *The Gospel according to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 731-32.

¹⁷See also Rom. 8:2-3; 2 Tim. 1:10.

¹⁸Cf. P. E. Hughes, *Paul’s Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962), 195-96.

¹⁹Cf. J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981), 123.

²⁰F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 143.

²¹*Ibid.*, 144.

(Phil. 2:8). And it is only by being united with Him in His death that we die to self and sin.²² It is only thus that “the old selfish ego is dethroned,”²³ and we are no longer “helpless in sin’s power.”²⁴

It is commonly and correctly emphasized that we need to turn to God in repentance, that is, give ourselves totally and unconditionally to Him. But there is more to be said on the basis of the verses we have been examining. Though repentance does not occur apart from the exercise of our wills, we cannot of ourselves effectually will what is necessary. Only Christ can do so. He willed the complete surrender to God that we cannot effectually will, and He could, and did, carry out what He had willed by dying on the Cross. It is only “in Christ Jesus” (Rom. 6:11) that we can effectually will to be His and do what He would have us do. Paul exhorts Christians (!), “Work out your own salvation ...,” but immediately adds, “God is at work in you, both to will and to work for his good pleasure” (Phil. 2:12-13). In other words, the “powerful inward working of God affects both the will and the work, the decision of the will and the practical deed. To will and to do *is the fruit* of God’s work in the believer (cf. Eph. 2:8, John 15:5).”²⁵

In this connection we may note concerning John 17:19 (“I consecrate myself, that they also may be consecrated in truth”), “He dies for them, to do for them that which they could not do for themselves ... He dies with a view to the disciples being sanctified, being set apart for God.”²⁶ And according to Heb. 10:10, “We have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all” (cf. 2:10-11; 10:29; 13:12).

For Christ to be our Saviour He had to accomplish several things by His death. The first of these was to effect the full surrender to God which we could will but could not accomplish.²⁷ This is already adumbrated in the consecration offerings of the Old Testament, especially the burnt offering, which powerfully witnesses to the fact that there is no true and wholehearted commitment to God without the death of another.²⁸

Expiation

Beginning with the Mosaic legislation, the sin and guilt (trespass) offerings are prominent Old Testament sacrifices. Though the rituals for these two offerings differ considerably (see Lev. 4:1-6:7; 6:24-7:10)²⁹, both of them were prescribed with a view to “atonement” because of particular

²²Cf. P. T. Forsyth, *The Work of Christ* (London, 1948), 194, qu. in L. Morris, *The Cross in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), 224 n. 39; M. D. Hooker, “Interchange in Christ,” *JTS* xxii ns (Oct. 1971), 359.

²³V. Taylor, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation*, Second Edition (London: Macmillan, 1960), 118.

²⁴C. E. B. Cranfield, *Romans: A Shorter Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 139.

²⁵J. J. Miller, *The Epistles of Paul to the Philippians and to Philemon* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955), 92. Emphasis mine.

²⁶Morris, *John*, 732.

²⁷Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, 283.

²⁸According to T. A. Hart, “Anselm of Canterbury and John McLeod Campbell: Where Opposites Meet?,” *The Evangelical Quarterly* lxii/4 (Oct. 1990), 311-33, McLeod Campbell had a view which “affirm(ed) the necessity for and the accomplishment of an *objective atonement* between God and man in which the divine wrath over human sin is dealt with,” but which also insisted that Christ’s death was “a total self-offering to God,” a self-offering “which we were utterly unable to make, and (made) it on our behalf” (pp. 330-31). Whatever criticism of McLeod Campbell’s view of the atonement may be justified, emphasis on vicarious consecration is an essential element of a thoroughly biblical understanding of Christ’s death.

²⁹Cf. Wenham, *Leviticus*, 105.

offenses. Usually these were offenses unwittingly committed, but certain sins of omission occasioned sin offerings (Lev. 5:1-13), and certain deliberate sins occasioned guilt offerings (Lev. 6:1-7; 19:20-22).³⁰ Both, moreover, are distinguished from other sacrifices in that they are said to be prompted by awareness of guilt³¹ (Lev. 4:13, 27; 5:2, 3, 4, 5, 17; 6:4, 7; Num. 5:6), and are offered with a view to forgiveness (Lev. 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13, 16, 18; 6:7; 19:22; Num. 15:25, 26, 28).³²

The chief difference between the two kinds of offerings³³ seems to have been that guilt offerings were for offenses for which the damage done could be assessed. (Besides the offering of the sacrifice prescribed, 120% compensation to the person(s) suffering the loss was required.³⁴)

Because of its significance with respect to particular sins and transgressions, it is appropriate to mention in this connection the ritual of the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16). The sprinkling of the blood of the sin offering in the Holy of Holies, which symbolized the immediate presence of God, apparently signified and emphasized that the sacrifice really did avail for the pardon of offenses (cf. Heb. 9:11-14). The ritual in which the “scapegoat” bore all the iniquities of the people of Israel “upon him to a solitary land” emphasized the expiation of sin in a particularly dramatic way (cf. 1 Pet. 2:24 RSV mg.).³⁵

In considering expiatory sacrifices in the Old Testament, it is important to take note of Isa. 53:10 where God is described as making the servant of the Lord a guilt offering, and as having “laid on him the iniquity of us all” (Isa. 53:6).³⁶ This apparently implies the transfer of sins to the sacrificial victim, a concept characteristic of the scapegoat ritual, and possibly also true of the guilt and sin offerings, depending on the significance of placing the hand on the head of the victims in these offerings.³⁷

³⁰There was no sacrificial provision for sin “with a high hand.” See Num. 15:30-31.

³¹“Guilt feelings” is the correct understanding, according to J. Milgrom, *Cult and Conscience* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 6-10, 109 n. 407. See also D. Kellermann in *TDOT*, 1:430, 437.

³²Guilt and forgiveness are never specifically mentioned in connection with other sacrifices, except perhaps in 1 Chron. 21:3-27.

According to Wenham, *Leviticus*, 108 n. 11, “Sacrificial laws generally conclude with a statement of forgiveness and atonement.” This is incorrect with respect to forgiveness.

³³See de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 2:421, for the difficulty of distinguishing the sin and guilt offerings.

³⁴J. Gray, *I & II Kings*, Second Edition (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970), 588; N. Snaith, *Leviticus and Numbers* (Greenwood, S.C.: Attic Press, 1967), 40. The sin offering—sometimes in conjunction with another offering or other offerings—is prescribed on a number of occasions for the removal of “uncleanness” (Lev. 12:6-7; 14:19-20; 15:15, 30; 16:15-19; Num. 6:11-12). In these cases “atonement” is made, but nothing is said about guilt or forgiveness, except that it is said of the Nazarite who had inadvertently touched a dead body, “He sinned” (Num. 6:11). See Wenham, *Leviticus*, 23-25, 188, for suggestions as to why uncleanness of the kind in view needed atonement.

³⁵Cf. S. H. Kellogg, “The Book of Leviticus,” *EB*, 1:303, 305; K. H. Rengstorff in *TDNT*, 2:631; Kelly, *Peter and Jude*, 122. I suspect that Lev. 16:16 (“He shall make atonement for the holy place”) and Heb. 9:23 (“It was necessary for ... the heavenly things [to be purified] ...”) may mean that there needs to be an end to the divine wrath against sin. If so, the sprinkling of the blood not only signified pardon, but also emphasized propitiation as a necessary basis for that pardon. Cf. Morris, *Apostolic Preaching*, 154.

³⁶Since the guilt offering was always a ram (Lev. 5:14-6:7), it is surprising that Isa. 53:7 compares the suffering servant to “a ewe that before its shearers is dumb.” Is it possible that Isa. 53:10 refers to a sin offering, rather than to a guilt offering? In Lev. 5:6 the sin offering prescribed is a female lamb or goat (cf. Lev. 4:32) and is called an ‘*sm*, the term commonly used to denote the guilt offering. Cf. NRSV.

³⁷See Wenham, *Leviticus*, 61-62; de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 2:416; Rowley, *Worship*, 133.

Though the New Testament is concerned primarily with our need for wholehearted surrender to Christ so that we no longer live for ourselves but for Him (2 Cor. 5:15), it is also concerned with particular sins, as is apparently the case with the Old Testament.³⁸ We need to “confess our sins” (1 John 1:9; cf. Matt. 3:6; Acts 19:18; Jas. 5:16). We need to pray for the forgiveness of our sins (Luke 11:4; cf. Acts 8:22). We need to be concerned whether particular deeds are sinful or not (1 Cor. 5:9-11; 6:9-10; 7:28, 36; 8:10-12; Eph. 4:26; Heb. 10:26; 1 John 5:16-17). We need to have our sins forgiven (Acts 2:38; 22:16; 26:18; Rom. 4:7; Heb. 8:12; Jas. 5:15; etc.)

It is in order to meet this need for the forgiveness of particular sins (as well as in order that we may be consecrated to God) that Jesus died. Not only do we have numerous passages which speak of Christ’s death for our sins (e.g., 1 Cor. 15:3; Gal. 1:4; Eph. 1:7; Heb. 9:28; 10:12; 1 Pet. 2:24; 1 John 4:10; Rev. 1:5), we have it specified in Matt. 26:28 that “the death of Christ has the forgiveness of sins for its purpose.”³⁹ Christ is there credited with the statement, “This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins.”⁴⁰

Though Christ died as our representative in consecration to God, so that those who are “in Christ Jesus” are “dead to sin” (Rom. 6:11), He also died as our substitute, so that we do not need to “die” for the sinful deeds of which we have been guilty. “Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us” (Gal. 3:13). “For our sake he made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God” (2 Cor. 5:21).⁴¹ “He himself bore our sins in his body on the tree” (1 Pet. 2:24); cf. “Christ, having been offered once to bear the sins of many” (Heb. 9:28).⁴² Statements such as these clearly imply that in His death Christ “actually [took] the sinner’s place.”⁴³ “Substitution is the only unforced way of interpreting” such passages.⁴⁴

In this connection we note the repeated emphasis on faith as the condition for receiving pardon for sins. To the woman of the street, “a sinner” who had washed His feet with her tears and anointed

³⁸In the texts in which both the burnt offering and the sin offering (and/or guilt offering) are prescribed, sometimes the burnt offering is mentioned first (e.g., Lev. 7:37; 12:6-8; 23:18-19; Num. 6:14; 7:12-88; 15:24, 25; 28:13-15), and sometimes the sin offering is mentioned first (e.g., Ex. 29:10-18; Lev. 5:7; 8:14-21; 10:19; Num. 8:12; Ezek. 45:17, 25). In Lev. 14:19 it is specifically stated that the sin offering is to precede the burnt offering, and this would seem to be the prevailing order when the focus is on sin(s) committed or on uncleanness which has been contracted. (In Num. 6:14-16 we have both orders with respect to the Nazirite whose time of separation has been completed!)

³⁹Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, 127.

⁴⁰According to A. H. McNeile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980), 383, the sin offering is in view in Matt. 26:28.

⁴¹M. D. Hooker, “Interchange,” 349-61, argues that in 2 Cor. 5:21 and Gal. 3:13, “It is as man’s representative, rather than as his substitute, that Christ suffers.” F. Bchsel in *TDNT*, 1:450-51, contends, however, that in these passages, “Paul is stating a view of substitution.” He even calls it “penal substitution.” In my view Büchsel is correct. Cf. F. F. Bruce, *Galatians*, 166.

According to Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, 103, there is “a definitely substitutionary idea” in the terminology of Mark 10:45 (Matt. 20:28). Cf. Bchsel in *TDNT*, 4:342-44. Most scholars agree. But neither *lutron* nor *anti* (see Matt. 17:27) requires this interpretation. Only if Isa. 53 is consciously in view is substitution necessarily indicated.

According to F. Bchsel in *TDNT*, 4:349, *antlutron* (1 Tim. 2:6) is “materially the same as” *lutron* (cf. J. Jeremias in *TDNT*, 5:711 n. 442). If so, substitution is not necessarily present, unless Isa. 53 is being reflected.

⁴²According to J. Schneider in *TDNT*, 5:39, “Predominant here (1 Pet. 2:24) is the idea of substitution.” Cf. G. Schrenk in *TDNT*, 3:280; Kelly, *Peter and Jude*, 123; Morris, *Cross*, 324.

⁴³J. S. Stewart, *A Man in Christ* (New York/London: Harper, n.d.), 240.

⁴⁴Morris, *Cross*, 223-24.

them with ointment, Jesus said, “Your sins are forgiven,” and went on to explain, “Your faith has saved you” (Luke 7:47-50). To Cornelius Peter said, “Every one who believes in him [Jesus] receives forgiveness of sins through his name” (Acts 10:43; cf. 13:38-39). In writing to the Romans Paul quotes Ps. 32:1, “Blessed are those whose iniquities are forgiven,” and makes it clear in the immediate context that those who are justified by faith in Jesus Christ have this benefit (Rom. 3:22; 4:5-9). Most significant for our purpose is the emphasis in Gal. 3:11-14 that the curse which Christ became for us provides redemption “through faith.” We submit that as repentance is correlated with Christ as our burnt offering, so faith is correlated with Christ as our sin offering (and/or guilt offering).⁴⁵

Fellowship

Beginning with Ex. 20:24 we find peace offerings (NIV: “fellowship offerings”) closely associated with burnt offerings.⁴⁶ According to Lev. 7:11-18, these peace offerings were of three types: (1) Thanksgiving offerings,⁴⁷ (2) Free will offerings, and (3) Votive offerings (apparently presented upon the fulfillment of a vow to God).

The general conception which appears to have been at the heart of these offerings was that of peace with God and fellowship both with Him and with His people. The fact that certain parts of the sacrificial animal were burned “on the altar as food offered by fire (lit., ‘food of fire’) to the Lord” (Lev. 3:11; cf. 3:16, “food offered by fire for a pleasing odour”), plus the fact that other parts were given to the priests for their consumption, plus the further fact that the worshipper and his family and/or friends feasted on the remainder of the animal (Lev. 7:15-16, 20; cf. Deut. 12:7) are indicative of fellowship with God, with His priests, and with fellow worshippers, a fellowship characterized by the joy and gladness which are concomitants of peace with God (cf. Deut. 12:12, 17-18; 27:7; 1 Kings 8:64-66; Ps. 54:6-7).⁴⁸

⁴⁵Faith is fundamental to repentance and to acceptance of the Lordship of Christ—see Acts 16:31; Rom. 10:9-10—but it would appear that this faith is primarily the conviction that certain propositions are true (see Rom. 10:9; cf. Acts 2:36; 17:30-31; Rom. 1:4; Phil. 2:11; Heb. 11:6). The faith that relates to justification and the pardon of sins is rather the confidence that one is an object of divine grace (see Rom. 4:5-8; Gal. 3:6-14 [cf. Acts 13:38-39]; Phil. 3:9). “It is personal reliance upon God’s redemptive work in Christ” (Taylor, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation*, 47). Cf. C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932), 15; Morris, *Apostolic Preaching*, 240.

⁴⁶Prior to Ex. 20:24 we have *zeba* occurring in Gen. 31:54; 46:1; Ex. 10:25; 12:27; 18:12. B. Lang in *TDOT*, 4:23 notes that it is debated whether *zeba* is a synonym for peace offering or not. According to M. Noth, *Leviticus*, Revised Edition (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977), 30, “The technical term for the peace offering is in Hebrew *zeba*.”

⁴⁷According to Wenham, *Leviticus*, 78, thanksgiving offerings are better described as confession offerings, and the confession involved may be either “confession of sin” or “confession of faith arising out of a man’s experience of God’s mercy.”

⁴⁸Cf. H. Ringgren, *Sacrifice*, 23, 27; A. S. Herbert, *Worship*, 17; Rowley, *Worship*, 123. The fact that the priests consumed a portion may be because they represented God as eating. But, since a portion was burned on the altar as “food offered by fire to the Lord,” we think it more likely that the eating of a portion by the priests signified communion with the whole people of God. That the priests were representative of the whole people of God is suggested in Ex. 28:11-12, 21, 29 (cf. S. R. Driver, *The Book of Exodus* [Cambridge: The University Press, 1918], 306; R. E. Clements, *Exodus* [Cambridge: The University Press, 1972], 182; R. A. Cole, *Exodus* [Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1973], 199, 200).

According to Rowley, *Worship*, 124, it is unlikely that the idea of the food of God is understood literally in the Old Testament.

With few exceptions the peace offering is always mentioned in conjunction with some other offering or offerings. Moreover, it is almost always mentioned last in any list of sacrifices prescribed and/or offered.⁴⁹ That it should be paired with the burnt offering and follow it, as is often the case (e.g., Ex. 20:24; Num. 10:10; Deut. 27:7; Jos. 8:31; Jud. 20:26; 1 Sam. 10:8; etc.), is appropriate inasmuch as total commitment to God is the most fundamental requirement for peace with Him. That it should follow the sin offering (or the guilt offering) when such is prescribed (see Lev. 9:1-22; Num. 6:14-17; 7:1-88; 2 Chron. 29:31-35; Ezek. 43:18-27; etc.) is also appropriate, since particular sins must be dealt with, as well as complete consecration made, before peace with God can be established and fellowship with Him enjoyed.⁵⁰

Be it noted, moreover, that fellowship with God (and with one another) is secured through sacrifice offered in addition to the sacrifices of burnt offering, cereal offering, sin offering and guilt offering. Apparently we are to understand that “holy” communion is a concern and privilege in its own right.

When considering the peace offering, the Passover ritual is of special interest. According to Ex. 12, the celebration of Passover featured participation in a family meal on the flesh of a slain lamb, after the application of the blood of that lamb to the entrance of the home.⁵¹ The circumstances of the meal, which might include the members of a neighbouring family, somewhat resemble the peace offering.⁵² The application of the blood, on the other hand, is reminiscent of the burnt offering, since it was apparently a way of confessing—and doing so at the cost of a life—“We are the Lord’s,” though without the emphasis of the burnt offering on *total* commitment to God.

But the passover celebration meant more than this. Peace offerings always implied peace with God, and therefore freedom from the visitation of divine displeasure, but Passover not only drew explicit attention to that freedom: deliverance from “the destroyer” was remembered (Ex. 12:23; Heb. 11:28), but, in addition, escape from Egypt was commemorated (Deut. 16:3). Passover drew attention to the implications of peace with God, implications which were not only personal and social, but political as well.

And the New Testament makes the same points as the peace offering (and the Passover celebration). Not only does Christ’s death provide for consecration to God and pardon for our sins, it establishes a blessed relationship with God and with those who are His. In specific reference to His own death Jesus said, “I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to myself”

⁴⁹The main exception is in Lev. 1:1-6:7. However, in Lev. 6:8-7:36, and again in Lev. 7:37-38, it is listed after the sin and guilt offerings. Cf. Levine, *In the Presence*, 20.

⁵⁰Wenham, *Leviticus*, 118, thinks that the prescriptions for the burnt, cereal and peace offerings precede the prescriptions for the sin and guilt offerings in Lev. 1:1-6:7 because they are “the ‘food offerings’ producing ‘a soothing aroma for the Lord.’” I wonder whether the order may not reflect an earlier stage when the sin and guilt offerings had not yet become recognized sacrifices.

⁵¹Cf. Driver, *Exodus*, 410. At a later time the Passover was to be celebrated at Jerusalem (cf. Deut. 16:2-6), and its blood applied to the altar there (2 Chron. 35:11; Jub. 49:20).

⁵²Driver, *Exodus*, 407; cf. F. Brown, S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs (eds.), *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1907, repr. 1959), 820. According to P. C. Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 242, the later prescription requiring that the Passover be celebrated at Jerusalem intimated that the whole nation was “one large family of God.”

(John 12:23; cf. 12:33). And Peter wrote, “Christ died ... that he might bring us to God” (1 Pet. 3:18; cf. Col. 1:20).⁵³

In Rom. 5:10 Paul asserts, “We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son,” and in the succeeding verse describes that reconciliation as something we have “received.” It is God’s gift by way of Christ’s death. Similarly he states in 2 Cor. 5:18-19 with respect to the cross, “God ... through Christ reconciled us to himself ... God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself.” In similar vein in Eph. 2:15-16 he declares that Christ died “that he might create in himself one new man in place of the two, so making peace, and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross.” These verses state that as a result of Christ’s death “Jews and Gentiles ... are now ‘reconciled’ to one another and to God.”⁵⁴

In this connection we are reminded of what is said concerning the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor. 10:16-17, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation (koinonia) in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation (koinonia) in the body of Christ? Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread." Whatever else these verses mean, they at least indicate that through Christ's death we are drawn into fellowship (koinonia) with Him and with those who are His, a fellowship which is expressed and "cemented" by participation in the Lord's Supper.⁵⁵

But in this connection there is more to be said about Christ’s death, some of which was adumbrated in the Passover celebration. Beyond the blessedness of reconciliation and fellowship, though related thereto, is deliverance from the supernatural powers arrayed against us. In reference to His death Jesus said, “The ruler of this world is judged” (John 16:11; cf. 12:31; Heb. 2:14-15). And in writing of the cross Paul declared, “He [God] disarmed the principalities and powers ... triumphing over them in Him [Christ]” (Col. 2:15). And so, by the sacrifice of Himself, Christ secured for us deliverance from “the thralldom of sin”⁵⁶ (Tit. 2:14; cf. Gal. 1:4).

However, the deliverance Christ secured by His death is not only deliverance of his people from the thralldom of sin, a political deliverance is also secured which will extend to the whole world. “The kingdom of the world” will “become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever” (Rev. 11:15). Indeed, there will be deliverance of cosmic proportions. According to Col. 1:20 it is God’s purpose “to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his [Christ’s] cross” (cf. Eph. 1:10).⁵⁷ And His people evidently have an essential part to play in the fulfillment of that cosmic purpose.⁵⁸ According to

⁵³According to K. L. Schmidt in *TDNT*, 1:326 n. 6, in 1 Pet. 3:18 we have a “reminder of the reconciling death of Christ.”

⁵⁴M. Barth, *Ephesians* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1974), 1:266.

⁵⁵Cf. F. Hauck, *TDNT*, 3:805-6; C.T. Craig in *IB*, 10:114-15; Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, 138-39, 211.

Wenham, *Leviticus*, 82-83, affirms that the Lord’s Supper is “related to the peace offering,” and discusses the parallel therewith, but without emphasizing fellowship as we have done. That fellowship with Christ is in view is clear from the contrast with “fellowship (koinonous) with demons” in 1 Cor. 10:20.

⁵⁶Driver, *Exodus*, 412. According to Kelly, *Peter and Jude*, 75, “Deliverance from captivity, not removal of sin, is the primary theme” of the Jewish Passover, and of the New Testament identification of Christ as our paschal lamb. See 1 Pet. 1:18-19; 1 Cor. 5:7.

⁵⁷Col. 1:16-20 seems to imply that the principalities and powers are to be reconciled to God, despite the fact that He is said to have “disarmed” them, and also despite the fact that we are contending against them (Eph. 6:12).

⁵⁸Is this in view of the statement that God has purposed “that through the church the manifold wisdom of God might

Rom. 8:19-23, “The creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the sons of God,” evidently because it will then “be set free from the bondage to decay and obtain the glorious liberty of the children of God.” It seems that just as the solidarity of mankind with the rest of creation (cf. Gen. 2:7; 3:19) meant that the rest of creation was dragged down with man in his fall (cf. Gen. 3:17), so also the solidarity of God’s people with the rest of creation will result in the liberation of the rest of creation.⁵⁹ The reconciliation and peace secured at Calvary are unlimited in their extension.⁶⁰

Conclusion

The sacrificial system of the Old Testament was an interim provision because of man’s most important spiritual needs: his need for total consecration to God; his need of divine pardon for his sins, and his need for blessed fellowship with God and with His people. Moreover, it makes clear that costly sacrifice is necessary if these needs are to be met. In so doing it foreshadows the sacrifice of Christ which truly fulfils those needs (Heb. 10:1; cf. Col 2:16-17). The New Testament shows how the sacrifice of Christ meets those needs: in His death He represented us in surrender to God, He substituted for us in taking our place of sin, and he reconciled us (and all His creation) to Him who is God over all.

It only remains to note that the atonement Christ provided manifests the Trinitarian structure which characterizes the Godhead. The one sacrifice of the one Christ is consecratory, expiatory and reconciliatory. In being consecratory it corresponds to the Father; in being expiatory it corresponds to the Son; and in being reconciliatory it corresponds to what we have seen to be the case concerning the Holy Spirit.

now be made known to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places” (Eph. 3:10-11)?

⁵⁹Human solidarity with the material universe is “explained” in Gen. 2, 3. Human solidarity with the angelic realm is neither stated nor explained, so far as I am aware. However, such passages as Eph. 3:10-11 may indicate that there is this solidarity.

⁶⁰Paradoxically, this does not imply universalism. See Matt. 25:46; Rev. 20:10; etc.

Biblical Salvation

The late John V. Dahms

Professor Emeritus in New Testament, Canadian Theological Seminary

Published in Global Missiology, Trinitarian Studies, July 2004, www.globalmissiology.net

According to the Scriptures salvation includes the following steps and stages:

- I.1 Conviction that the message of salvation is true, and that one ought to respond to it.
- I.2 Repentance, i.e., the reorientation of one's life so that one purposes to live no longer for oneself, but for God.
- I.3 Confidence that the sacrifice which has been offered has provided for our spiritual welfare.

These steps on man's part are followed immediately by the following actions on God's part, actions which are temporally simultaneous but related to each other in a significant order:

- II.1 Justification, i.e., according to unrighteous people the status of righteousness in His sight.
- II.2 Regeneration, i.e., change in the attitude of the individual so that love for God and for His people has priority in one's life. This change provides the dynamic whereby one is able to fulfill the commitment made in repentance.
- II.3 Adoption, i.e., the establishment of a blessed relationship with God, more or less comparable to that of an obedient and well-loved son to his father.

Upon this work of God three things normally follow:

- III.1 Sanctification, i.e., the lifelong process whereby the change begun in regeneration continues toward perfect likeness of character to Jesus Christ.
- III.2 Service to Christ in which there is constant effort to magnify Him in word and deed.
- III.3 Glorification, i.e., the work of the Holy Spirit at the end of the age whereby there is entry into a state of perfect likeness to Christ and perfect service to Him.

I.1 Conviction that the Message is True

Throughout the Scriptures salvation always begins with the conviction that the "revealed" word is true.

This is implied in the statement of Gen. 15:5-6 concerning Abram (Abraham). The Lord said to him, "Number the stars, if you are able to number them ... So shall your descendants be." And Abram "believed God; and he reckoned it to him as righteousness." Whatever else may be implied in the statement that he "believed God," at the very least, and first and foremost, it is implied that Abram believed that what God had promised would come to pass. As Rom. 4:21 expresses it, he was "fully convinced that God was able to do what he had promised."¹ Likewise, with respect to the instruction to sacrifice his son, we are told in Heb. 11:19, "He considered that God was able to raise men even from the dead."² But in Gen. 15:6 it is explicitly stated that Abram's conviction that God's word to him was reliable was basic to the "righteousness" which was reckoned to him.³

To take two other notable examples from the Old Testament: (a) It was only when the elders of Israel “believed” that the Lord had appointed Moses to lead His people out of Egypt that the escape of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage became a possibility (see Ex. 4:29-31;⁴ cf. 4:1-9), though, of course, much else was also necessary for the effecting of that escape. (b) It was only when Israel was convinced that “the Lord, he is God” (1 Kgs. 18:39) that escape from the blandishments of Jezebel’s idolatrous prophets into a relationship with the living God became possible.⁵

In the New Testament it is repeatedly indicated that it is a basic necessity that people believe the fundamental message concerning Christ to be true, if they are to be saved. In accordance therewith the apostles in their proclamation to non-Christians constantly emphasized the resurrection of Jesus and the evidence that it had really taken place (Acts 2:24-32; 3:15; 5:30-32; 10:40-41; 13:30-37; 17:31; cf. 1:22; 4:33; 22:14-15; 26:16). Perhaps the most striking statement making this emphasis is in Acts 17:31, “He has given assurance (*pistin*) to all men by raising him from the dead.” It is in accord with this need for people to believe the gospel message to be true, that we have it stated in Luke 1:3-4, “It seemed good to me ... having followed all things closely for some time past, to write an orderly account for you, ... that you may know the truth concerning the things of which you have been informed”; and in John 20:31, “These [signs] are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name.”⁶

In this connection it is worthy of note that “faith comes from what is heard” (Rom. 10:17), implying that one must be informed concerning the gospel and be convinced that it is true. And this is said in a context concerned with the way in which people may be “saved” (Rom. 10:9-14).

But to be convinced that the gospel message is true is not sufficient for salvation. As Jas. 2:19 points out, “Even the demons believe—and shudder” (cf. Matt. 8:29; Mark 1:24, 34; Luke 4:41). And the rich young ruler apparently believed that Jesus could give a reliable answer to the question, “What must I do to inherit eternal life,”⁷ but, on receiving the answer, “went away sorrowful, for he had great possessions” (Mark 10:17-22). “A faith which consists merely in convictions”⁸ is of no avail for the inheriting of eternal life.

I.2 Repentance

What is needed for salvation besides an intellectual conviction is first and foremost repentance, i.e., total and unconditional commitment to God and to His will. In the Old Testament this is described as “returning” or “turning about”⁹ to the Lord (e.g., Isa. 1:27), a “returning” or “turning about,” however, with “seriousness and readiness for the practical consequences of relationship with God”¹⁰ (Hos. 6:1-6). It must be returning or turning about “with all your heart” (Hos. 2:12; cf. 1 Sam. 7:3-4; 1 Kgs. 8:47-48; Jer. 3:10; 4:1-2; Isa. 58:1-5; Ps. 51:17). What is involved in this turning to God is indicated in such passages as Jer. 35:15, “Turn now every one of you from his evil way, and amend your doings, and do not go after other gods to serve them” (cf. Jer. 8:6; Ezek. 14:6; 18:30).

That this turning to God is an essential requirement, if salvation is to be enjoyed by those who do not have it, is implied in such passages as Hos. 6:2-3, where returning to God is with view to His healing, binding up, reviving and raising up to live before Him. And this returning is a “press(ing)

on to know the Lord.”¹¹ Likewise, in Joel 2:12ff. returning to the Lord with all the heart results in His “pity on his people,” and visiting them both with promises of deliverance from their physical plight and with great spiritual blessing as well (2:18ff.).¹²

In the New Testament it is also stated that repentance (*metanoia*) is “toward God (*eis theon*)” (Acts 20:21; cf. Luke 1:16, 17; Acts 9:35; 11:21; 14:15; 15:19; 26:18, 20; 2 Cor. 3:16; 1 Thess. 1:9). And again it is emphasized that this means bearing “fruit (i.e. the deeds and the character) which emerges from a total reorientation of life ... “¹³ (cf. Matt. 3:8; Acts 26:20; 2 Cor. 7:9-10; Rev. 2:5).

As in the Old Testament, repentance is represented as necessary for salvation. Indeed, 2 Cor. 7:10 speaks of “repentance that leads to salvation.” With such a phrase we may compare Acts 11:18, “repentance unto life,” and the statements which represent repentance as necessary for entrance into the kingdom of God (kingdom of heaven), e.g., Matt. 3:2; 4:17 (Mark 1:15), and for the obtaining of divine forgiveness, e.g., Mark 1:4 (Luke 3:3); Acts 2:38; 8:22; cf. Mark 4:12; Acts 5:31; 26:18.¹⁴ And, of course, the emphasis on repentance as necessary if one is to escape the visitation of God’s wrath (e.g., Matt. 3:8; 2 Pet. 3:9; Rev. 2:5, 16, 21-22; 3:3) points in the same direction.

Because everyone needs salvation, God “commands all men everywhere to repent” (Acts 17:30).¹⁵

I.3 Trust

The Scriptures indicate that there is a further requirement if one is to enjoy God’s salvation, or to continue to enjoy it, namely, trust in his saving activity. This “faith” is to be distinguished from mere intellectual conviction that the words of God are true. It is confidence that God’s saving activity avails, or has availed, for the party in question.

The Old Testament emphasizes steadfast and “unremitting loyalty”¹⁶ to God, an emphasis, that is, on what is worthy of those in a covenant relationship with God, and so also in accord with the kind of commitment involved in turning, or returning, to the Lord.¹⁷ There is, however, another emphasis in the Old Testament as well, an emphasis on trusting in the Lord for salvation.¹⁸

Though the exhortation to trust in the Lord is usually mentioned apart from the urgency of (re)turning to the Lord, we do have it coupled therewith in Isa. 30:15, “In returning and rest you shall be saved; in quietness and in trust shall be your strength”;¹⁹ and in Hos. 12:6, “You, by the help of your God return, hold fast to love and justice, and wait continually for your God” (where waiting on the Lord is equivalent to trusting in Him²⁰). Moreover, we have it stated in Isa. 26:2-3 that “the righteous nation” is the one that “keeps faith,” and that the blessed person is the one who “trusts in thee.”²¹ On the other hand, Ps. 78:22 condemns Israel in the wilderness because “they had no faith in God, and did not trust his saving power.”²²

As we have indicated, trust in the Lord is trust in the salvation He will provide. Of course, in the Old Testament that salvation is commonly salvation from personal and/or national foes/calamities, e.g., Ps. 27:1-3 speaks of being confident when “evildoers assail ... uttering slanders,” when “a host encamp(s) against me” and “though war arise against me.”²³ Likewise, Ps. 91:1-13 promises that those who trust in God will be delivered from “the snare of the fowler,” “the deadly pestilence,”

“the terror of the night,” “the arrow that flies by day,” “the lion and the adder”; and Ps. 46 promises that those whose “refuge and strength” is the Lord will not fear “though the earth should change,” “though the mountains shake,” “though its [the sea’s] waters roar and foam,” though “nations rage, the kingdoms totter.”

On the other hand, the salvation resulting from trust in the Lord is occasionally spoken of as being spiritual in nature. When it is declared in Ps. 32:10, “Steadfast love surrounds him who trusts in the Lord,” the context indicates that that steadfast love involves the forgiveness of his transgression and the covering of his sin (32:1, 5).²⁴

When the author of Ps. 143:8 declares, “In thee I put my trust,” he has deliverance from his enemies in mind (vv. 3-4, 9, 11-12), but also, and probably even more in mind, is his own lack of righteousness (v. 2). He is concerned about his need to be taught “the way (he) should go” (v. 8), to be taught to do (God’s) will” (v. 10), and to be led “on a level path” by God’s “good spirit” (v. 10). Perhaps most important of all, he says, “My soul thirsts for thee like a parched land” (v. 6).²⁵ In Ps. 25 the Psalmist expresses his “trust” in God (v. 2), and his confidence that “no one whose hope is in you will ever be put to shame” (v. 3 NIV; cf. NEB, TEV; contrast RSV, NRSV). As a result he expects that “the God of (his) salvation will not allow his “enemies (to) exult over (him).” But this is not the only kind of salvation he expects. He also expects divine pardon for his sins (v. 7), divine “instruction” and guidance in relation to ways that are right (vv. 4, 5, 8, 9, 12), even divine “friendship” (v. 14 RSV; cf. TEV).²⁶

Psalms 130 does not contain the usual word for trust but two words each meaning “wait,” “wait for,” “hope”. These terms assume trust in God.²⁷ The Psalmist declares, “I wait for the Lord, my soul waits, and in his word I hope, my soul waits for the Lord” (vv. 5-6), and urges Israel to “hope in the Lord” (v. 7). The end result of such waiting and hoping is “forgiveness” (v. 4). “With him (the Lord) is plenteous redemption. And he will redeem Israel from all his iniquities” (vv. 7, 8).²⁸

And if belief in the sense of trust is an important prerequisite for salvation in the Old Testament, it is doubly so in the New Testament.²⁹ It is explicitly stated in Eph. 2:8, “By grace you have been saved through faith” (cf. John 3:15-16; Acts 16:31; Rom. 3:25; 2 Tim. 3:15; etc.). That this faith is faith “in God,” as in the Old Testament, is stated in Acts 16:34; Rom. 4:3, 17; Tit. 3:8; Heb. 6:1; 1 Peter 1:21; cf. John 14:1.³⁰ Ordinarily, however, it is faith in the Lord Jesus which is required (e.g., John 6:35; Acts 16:31; 19:4; 20:21; 2 Tim. 3:15; etc.).

That this faith is trust in Christ³¹ is frequently in evidence. 1 Pet. 1:8 says of its readers, “though you do not now see him, you believe in him and rejoice with unutterable and exalted joy.” As J. N. D. Kelly states, “Here faith stands for unswerving trust, the confidence that, although they cannot at present see him, they will, for he is the Christ whose coming is at hand.”³² In 2 Tim. 1:12 Paul testifies, “I know whom I have believed, and I am sure that he is able to guard until that Day what has been entrusted to me.” As R. Bultmann says, “believing here includes “trusting.”³³ And one could multiply examples, but some of the most important are those which emphasize that the faith which saves is the faith which entails hope, e.g., Rom. 4:17, “In hope he believed”; Rom. 8:24-25, “In this hope we were saved. Now hope that is seen is not hope. For who hopes for what he sees? But if we hope for what we do not see, we wait for it with patience.” On the former passage C. E. B. Cranfield comments, “Abraham’s faith meant hoping in God’s promise.”³⁴ On the latter passage

J. Murray remarks, “Hope is imbued with the same confidence which characterizes faith.”³⁵ We would simply add that faith which is orientated toward eschatological salvation includes hope (cf. Gal. 5:5).³⁶ And, of course, that faith which includes hope is the view of the author of Heb. 11:1, “Faith is the assurance of things hoped for ...” (cf. vv. 7, 8, 10, 13, 22, etc.).

But we must not leave this topic without noting that “believe on (*eis* or *eipi*)³⁷ Christ Jesus” implies trust in Christ, as is evident in Rom. 9:33; 10:11; 1 Pet. 2:6 (all quoting Isa. 28:16), “He who believes in him will not be put to shame”; in Rom. 10:14, where it is implied that belief in Christ “leads to calling upon Him”,³⁸ and in 1 Tim. 1:16, which speaks of “those who were to believe in him unto eternal life.”³⁹

That faith is conjoined with repentance as a requisite for salvation is indicated in Mark 1:15, “The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent and believe the gospel”; Acts 20:21, “Testifying both to Jews and to Greeks of repentance to God and of faith in our Lord Jesus Christ”; Heb. 6:1, “A foundation of repentance from dead works and of faith toward God ...” In Acts 2:38 Peter urges, “Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.” “Believing is not explicitly mentioned ..., but it is certainly implied, as is confirmed by the opening words of v. 44.”⁴⁰ The fact that both repentance and faith occur in the same salvation context in Acts 11:17-18; 17:30-31; 19:4; 26:18-20; cf. 3:16-19, is surely significant.⁴¹ The fact that in many instances, particularly in the Johannine and Pauline literature, faith alone is mentioned as the requisite for salvation, is to be explained on the basis that saving faith is thought of as embracing and including repentance, i.e., turning from self and sin to God.

Though it is not so clearly stated in the Old Testament, the Scriptures everywhere assume that salvation is dependent on (a) Conviction that the message of salvation purporting to be from God is true; (b) Commitment to a life of faithful recognition of, and service to, the Lord; (c) Trust that the Lord saves, or will save, those who are committed to Him.⁴²

The basis on which the Lord saves is set forth in our chapter on the atonement. What He does in effecting salvation engages our attention in what follows.

II.1 Justification

Justification, i.e., the divine judgment that a person is “right before God”⁴³ is a conception of both Testaments.⁴⁴

In the Old Testament the classical text is Gen. 15:6, “He (Abram) believed the Lord, and he reckoned it to him as righteousness.” It is significant that righteousness is reckoned to Abram on the basis of his faith in a promise, not because of anything he had done. As G. von Rad has stated, “His (Abraham’s) righteousness is not the result of any accomplishments, whether of sacrifice or acts of obedience ... Belief alone has brought Abraham into a proper relationship to God.”⁴⁵

The imputation of righteousness is also affirmed of Phinehas in Ps. 106:30-31, “Phinehas stood up and interposed, and the plague was stayed. And that has been reckoned to him as righteousness ...” Though in this case the reckoning as righteousness is said to be the consequence of an action on the

part of Phinehas, as A. F. Kirkpatrick has stated, “The zeal of Phinehas was an act of faith. He was a true son of Abraham (Gen. xv.6).”⁴⁶

Though there are no other Old Testament passages in which righteousness is said to have been imputed, it is implied from time to time that people may be accepted by God and enter into a right relationship with Him quite apart from merit on their part. Often they are said to be forgiven, e.g., (i) Ps. 32:1-2, “Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputes no iniquity.” It is to be noted that the Hebrew word rendered “impute” is the same as the word rendered “reckon” in Gen. 15:6. (ii) Ps. 51:9, “Hide they face from my sins, and blot out all my iniquities ...” (cf. vv. 1-7). It is significant that we read, “Thou hast no delight in sacrifice ...” (v. 16), and that it is subsequent to the blotting out of his sins and the reception of a clean heart that the Psalmist “will teach transgressors thy ways,” and will “show forth thy praise.” (vv. 13-15). Though more than imputed righteousness is needed, it is assumed that such righteousness is possible and is not dependent on sacrifice or on good works. (iii) Ps. 143:2, “Enter not into judgment with thy servant; for no man is righteous before thee.” God is being asked not to impute iniquity, despite his sin(s). LXX “sharpens the Mas. (Massoretic text)”: “In thy sight shall no man living be justified” (cf. Gal. 2:16; Rom. 3:20). (iv) Of special significance is Isa. 43:25, “I, I am he who blots out your transgressions for my own sake, and I will not remember your sins” (cf. Ps. 25:11). As C. R. North comments, “Here Yahweh’s wiping out of Israel’s transgressions springs from pure grace; he forgives because it is his nature to do so.”⁴⁷

There are some Old Testament passages which may seem at first sight to imply that justification is dependent upon righteous conduct, e.g., Deut. 6:25, “It will be righteousness for us, if we are careful to do all this commandment before the Lord our God, as he has commanded us” (cf. Deut. 24:13; 1 Kgs. 8:32; Ps. 24:4-5). The same Hebrew word for “righteousness” occurs here (and in Deut. 24:13; Ps. 24:5) as in Gen. 15:6.⁴⁸ However, immediately prior to this verse the people of Israel to whom the instruction is given, are described as those whom “the Lord brought ... out of Egypt with a mighty hand ... that he might bring us in and give us the land ...” (6:21, 23). And in the passage following we read, “The Lord set his love upon you and chose you ... The Lord has ... redeemed you from the house of bondage ... Know therefore that the Lord your God is God, the faithful God who keeps covenant ...” (7:7-9). It is clear from these statements that 6:25 is spoken to those who are already accepted by God and are in a right relationship with Him. It has to do with the maintaining of that relationship rather than with the establishment of it. P. C. Craigie has stated that God’s people are “to revere and obey God in order that they might *continue* to experience his presence in history and *continue* to hear his words.”⁴⁹ In our opinion acquittal rather than experience is in view.⁵⁰ However, he is correct in speaking of continuation rather than commencement. It is our judgment that the same may be said of similar emphases elsewhere in the Old Testament.⁵¹

In this connection a word may be added concerning Hab. 2:4. Whatever may be said of Paul’s use of this verse in Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:11, in MT it is apparently saying, “The righteous ... will live through his faithfulness,”⁵² i.e., “the righteous ... will ‘live’ provided that he is faithful.”⁵³ If it is true that “in the Old Testament the righteous man is the one who is accepted before God,”⁵⁴ we have a similar emphasis to that in Deut. 6:25: In the first place one is given a status of righteousness, i.e., justification, but, if this status is to continue, one must fulfill God’s will for daily life and conduct.

In the New Testament justification is especially prominent in the writings of Paul and James (cf. Luke 18:9-14). Paul emphasizes that human merit is not a condition of justification, rather God “justifies the ungodly” through faith (Rom. 4:5; cf. Gal. 2:16; Eph. 2:8-9; Phil. 3:9; etc.). Indeed, justification is a gift (Rom. 5:15, 17⁵⁵). However, the apostle Paul is not an antinomian (cf. Rom. 6:1-7:6). He holds that the faith which leads to justification is a faith which “work(s) through love” (Gal. 5:6; cf. Eph. 2:10), and he emphasizes the urgency of worthy character and conduct, warning Christians that those who continue to engage in certain practices will not “inherit the kingdom of God” (1 Cor. 6:9-10; Gal. 5:16-21; Eph. 5:3-6).

At first sight it may appear that James disagrees with Paul. He states that “a man is justified by works and not by faith alone” (2:24). However, it must be understood, in the first place, that James is operating with a different connotation of “faith” than Paul assumes when considering justification. James is operating with the connotation of faith as the conviction that the gospel message is true, as is evident from his statement that “even the demons believe” (2:19). Paul, when speaking of justification through faith, is operating with the connotation of faith as trust (see I.3 above). In this connection it is to be noted that James describes faith without works as “barren” (2:20), as needing completion (2:22), and as “dead” (2:26). In the second place, in the passage under consideration, he is not concerned with the way in which one gains acceptance with God. (He intimates that it is a gift of God in 1:18, “Of his own will he brought us forth by the word of truth ...”). He is concerned to combat the antinomian view that good works need not characterize the life of the Christian. And, as we have seen, Paul himself was concerned to do likewise.

There are other passages in the New Testament in which justification is not specifically mentioned, but is assumed, that is, acceptance with God is assumed, on whatever basis. Moreover, continuing therein is emphasized. In Mark 13:13 apostles of Christ (see v. 3 and note use of second pronoun plural) are told, “He who endures to the end will be saved” (cf. Matt. 10:22; 24:13; Luke 21:19; 2 Tim. 2:12; Jas. 1:12; Rev. 13:10; 14:12). The Epistle to the Hebrews, addressed to “holy brethren” (3:1), repeatedly warns against failing to “hold fast our first confidence firm to the end” (3:14; cf. 2:1; 3:6, 12; 4:11; 6:4-8, 11; 10:26-31, 35-38; 12:15-17).⁵⁶ Jude reminds his “beloved” (v. 3) of “him who is able to keep you from falling, and to present you without blemish before the presence of his glory with rejoicing” (v. 24).

In this connection 2 Pet. 1:3-11 is of special interest. The passage begins with the assertion that “his (God’s or Jesus’) divine power has granted to us all things that pertain to life and godliness ...” (Note that “has granted” is in the perfect tense in Greek, so that what was given in the past is still enjoyed). J. N. D. Kelly comments, “Christians generally ... owe their possession of everything that makes for life and godliness, i.e. eternal life ... and sound ... religion, not to any achievement of their own but to his divine power.”⁵⁷ We take it that acquittal is included in what has been granted.⁵⁸ But, having stated what God (or Christ) has given us and the purpose of the gift, our author proceeds in v. 5 to urge his readers to “make every effort to supplement (their) faith with virtue ...,” and goes on to declare that by so doing his “brethren” will “confirm (their) call and election ... (and will) never fall, so there will be richly provided for (them) an entrance into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.” Their status is a gift of God, but continuance therein, and entrance into Christ’s kingdom, depend, at least in part,⁵⁹ on their faithfulness.⁶⁰

When all is said and done, justification has basically the same significance for the Deuteronomist, for James, and for 2 Peter, as it does for Paul. The chief difference between justification in the Old Testament and justification in the New Testament is in the relationship of Christ thereto.⁶¹

II.2 Regeneration

Regeneration, i.e. the transformation of an individual's "heart" by divine action, so that he/she may be described as a "new creation" because of altered motives and purposes, is chiefly an eschatological expectation in the Old Testament.⁶² The classical statement in this respect is Jer. 31:31-33,

The days are coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, not like the covenant which I made with their fathers ... But this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put my law within them, and I will write it upon their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people ...

(Cf. Jer. 24:7; 32:38-40⁶³). Commenting on this passage, J. A. Thompson states, "They (Israel) had not merely refused to obey the law or to acknowledge Yahweh's complete and sole sovereignty, but were incapable of such obedience."⁶⁴

In Ezekiel likewise we have anticipation of a future day when a new heart I (the Lord) will give you, and a new spirit I will put within you; and I will take out of your flesh the heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes and be careful to observe my ordinances (36:26-27; cf. 11:19).

And we have such a doctrine adumbrated already in Deut. 30:6, "The Lord your God will circumcise your heart and the heart of your offspring, so that you will love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul, that you may live."

But, though regeneration is an eschatological expectation in the Old Testament, it must be noted that God's people were expected to have some experience of a heart characterized by love for God and His will, however much the experience may have fallen short of the experience of Christians in this respect.⁶⁵ Israel is exhorted, "These words which I command you this day shall be upon your heart" (Deut. 6:6; cf. 11:18; 30:14). And the Psalmist could say, "Oh, how I love thy law! It is my meditation all the day" (119:97. Similar statements are frequent in Ps. 119; cf. Ps. 19:8). Moreover, the Holy Spirit was the guide of God's people (Ps. 143:10; cf. Neh. 9:20), and was so personally involved with them that they could rebel against Him and grieve Him (Isa. 63:10).

But the most significant passage in this respect is Ps. 51:10, 12b, "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and put a new and right spirit within me ... Uphold me with a willing spirit." Here we have the transforming power of God in view. Indeed, the first word in the rendering above represents a Hebrew term "used of the creative operation of God, bringing into being what did not exist before."⁶⁶ Likewise, in the request for "a new and right spirit," and for a "willing spirit," "it is not the restoration of what was there before that he desires, but a radical change of heart and spirit."⁶⁷

There are other Old Testament passages which seem to teach a regeneration which is not eschatological. The first to note is 1 Sam. 10:6, 9, “The spirit of the Lord will come mightily upon you (Saul), and you shall prophesy with them (a band of prophets) and be turned into another man’ ... When he turned his back to leave Samuel, God gave him another heart ...” The concept of “another heart,” at least at first sight, seems to be equivalent to the “new heart” promised in Ezek. 11:19; 18:31; 36:26-27. And J. Mauchline compares it not only with that promise but with such New Testament experiences as are set forth in 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15.⁶⁸ Likewise P. K. McCarter Jr. remarks, “The reception of inspiration was believed to involve ... the emergence of a new self.”⁶⁹ On the other hand, H. W. Hertzberg avers, “We should not ... think of a conversion in the spiritual sense, but merely of a readiness in Saul for the intervention of the Lord, in a way yet unknown.”⁷⁰ And other scholars take more or less similar positions.⁷¹ However, Ezek. 36 and Ps. 51 provide reason to believe that these positions do not do full justice to the concept of “another man,” “another heart.” In our opinion, therefore, regeneration is in view in 1 Sam. 10:6, 9.

It is possible that regeneration which is not eschatological is implied in Ps. 40:6-8, “Thou hast given me an open ear ... Thy law is within my heart.”⁷² Inasmuch as the open ear is God’s doing, it may be thought that having the law in the heart is also His doing, especially if A. F. Kirkpatrick’s suggestion is to be accepted that “ears” here “may include ‘the ears of the heart’”.⁷³ In our opinion, however, regeneration, i.e. a change of the heart or inward disposition wrought by God is not necessarily implied. The only divine action clearly in view is conviction of the truth of His word. Though Jeremiah and Ezekiel speak of the law of God in the heart as a work of God in the Messianic age, Prov. 3:3; 7:3, urge those addressed to “write” the commandments of wisdom “on the tablet of your heart” (cf. Deut. 6:6).

The idea of regeneration seems to be implied in Ps. 119:36-37, “Incline my heart to thy testimonies, and not to gain! Turn my eyes from looking at vanities; and give me life in thy ways.” L. C. Allen notes that we have here an appeal for “divine working ... with particular emphasis upon a right sense of moral and material values.”⁷⁴ Though “give me life” is a frequent appeal in this Psalm (vv. 25, 37, 40, 88, 107, 149, 154, 156, 159; cf. vv. 17, 50, 77, 93, 116, 144), an appeal which sometimes may be simply for the preservation or extension of physical life (see vv. 87-88, 107, 116-117, 149-150, 154-159), in vv. 36, 37, the life that is in view is rather to be compared with the “newness of life” in which we are “no longer ... enslaved to sin” (Rom. 6:4, 6). It is more or less reminiscent of “the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus (which) has set me free from the law of sin and death ... in order that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us” (Rom. 8:2, 4).⁷⁵

It is possible that something like regeneration is in view in Ps. 143:10, “Teach me to do thy will, for thou art my God! Let thy good spirit lead me on a level path.” Commenting on this verse, L. C. Allen states, “To know what to do ... needs supplementing with the power to turn knowledge into achievement.”⁷⁶ If Allen is correct, regeneration is close to the surface in this petition.

Apart from the eschatological promises of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, there are few clear references to regeneration in the Old Testament.⁷⁷ Ps. 51:10, 12b, is the chief witness thereto.⁷⁸

In the New Testament regeneration is emphasized. It is (new) birth in John 1:13; 3:3-8; 1 John 2:29; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1, 4, 18; 1 Pet. 1:3, 23; 2:2; Jas. 1:18; Tit. 3:5. It is (new) creation in 2 Cor. 5:17;

Gal. 6:15; Eph. 2:10, 15⁷⁹; 4:24; Col. 3:10. It is the coming of the “new” in Rom. 6:4; 7:7, 2 Cor. 5:17; Tit. 3:4; cf. Rom. 12:2; Eph. 4:22-24; Col. 3:10.⁸⁰ It may be added that J. Behm, in commenting on Heb. 6:6, which speaks of the impossibility of again renewing those once enlightened to repentance, comments, “The miracle of becoming a (new creation) occurs only once” in Heb.⁸¹ Though this is implicit in the verse, new creation is not explicitly in view. New creation is conditional on repentance, but is not to be confused therewith.

That regeneration is a divine work in those who have faith is repeatedly emphasized. It is usually said to be God’s work (John 1:13; 1 John 2:29;⁸² 3:9, 4:7; 5:1, 4, 18; Jas. 1:18; 2 Cor. 5:17-18; Eph. 2:8-10); but sometimes it is attributed to the Holy Spirit (John 3:5-8; Tit. 3:5); and in one passage it is said to be effected by Christ (Eph. 2:15). However, there is no discrepancy. “Spiritual life comes from God through the agency of ... the Spirit.”⁸³ Moreover, creation by Christ in Eph. 2:15 “signifies ... an execution of God’s decision.”⁸⁴

Regeneration is the work of God by means of “the word of God” (1 Pet. 1:23; cf. Jas. 1:18), and is conditional upon faith (John 1:12-13), and the baptism which externalizes both repentance and faith (John 3:5; Tit. 3:5⁸⁵). Moreover, it is essentially the transformation of one’s attitudes and motives: “He who loves is born of God” (1 John 4:7; cf. Eph. 4:19-24; Col. 3:10-15). The results are: (1) continued conviction that “Jesus is the Christ” (1 John 5:1; cf. 2:22; 4:2-3);⁸⁶ (2) righteous conduct: “Every one who does right is born of him” (1 John 2:29; cf. 3:9; 5:4, 18; Rom. 6:1-4; Gal. 6:14-15; Eph. 2:10; 4:24; Col. 3:5-17); (3) “a living hope” (1 Pet. 1:3).

It is to be noted that justification and regeneration are closely connected in Tit. 3:5-7, “He saved us ... by the washing of regeneration and renewal in the Holy Spirit, which he poured out upon us richly ..., so that we might be justified by his grace and become heirs in hope of eternal life.” This translation (RSV) could leave the impression that justification is conditional upon regeneration. Careful examination of the Greek text reveals, however, that what is being said is that both justification and regeneration are necessary for heirship. Nothing is stated concerning the relationship between justification and regeneration. If justification were conditional on regeneration, Paul could not have stated that God “justifies the ungodly” (Rom. 4:5).⁸⁷

II.3 Adoption

In the Old Testament the relationship of God’s people to Himself is infrequently described as that of sonship,⁸⁸ and when such terminology does occur, it is commonly used of His people corporately (e.g., Ex. 4:22-23; Jer. 31:9; Hos. 11:1; cf. Deut. 1:31; 8:5). But note Deut. 14:1, “You are the sons of the Lord your God”; Isa. 1:2, “Sons have I reared and brought up”; Jer. 3:22, “Return, O faithless sons.”⁸⁹

In this connection it is to be noted that in the verse following Deut. 14:1 “the sons of the Lord your God” are described as “a people holy to the Lord your God, and the Lord has chosen you to be a people for his own possession” (cf. Deut. 7:6-8). And Jer. 3:19 speaks of God as setting the house of Israel “among my sons.” The fact that His people have the relationship of sons to Himself is God’s doing (cf. Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:5).⁹⁰ And we shall cite other Old Testament Scriptures which bear similar testimony.

Though the idea of the relationship of sonship to God on the part of individuals is uncommon in the Old Testament, that a blessed experience was enjoyed because of being specially related to Him is frequently emphasized.

Again we must give foremost attention to Ps. 51. Besides the prayer for forgiveness (vv. 7-9) and the prayer for moral renewal (vv. 10, 12b), we have a prayer for the blessedness of divine fellowship (vv. 11:12a)⁹¹: “Cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thy holy Spirit from me. Restore to me the joy of thy salvation, and uphold me with a willing spirit.” Though some have understood being cast away from God’s presence to refer to expulsion from the holy land, E. R. Dalglish has argued on the basis of the individualistic emphasis in the psalm, and in consideration of Pss. 11:7; 16:11; 21:7; 73:27-28; 140:14, that “it is the intimate fellowship, the privilege of proximity, and the attendant joys for which the Psalmist yearns.”⁹²

In light of the parallelism, for God to take His holy Spirit from him would mean that the Psalmist would no longer enjoy that “intimate fellowship ... and the attendant joys.”⁹³ Restoration of the joy of salvation would imply that he had not been cast away from God’s presence, that His holy Spirit had not been taken from him.

It has been commonly held that this petition with its reference to possessing the Holy Spirit was the petition of “a select personage,” because “throughout the Old Testament there is no suggestion that the spirit was bestowed nationally but was reserved for a select personnel, to wit, the early judges, skilled workmen, the prophets, and the king.”⁹⁴ But we contest this judgment for the following reasons: (1) With the exception of Ps. 51:11 all the Old Testament references to the Holy Spirit apparently have to do with empowerment for ministry of one kind or another.⁹⁵ Ps. 51:11, however, as Dalglish states, has as its subject “the divine-human fellowship.”⁹⁶ (2) Though it be granted that Ps. 51 was the psalm of a king and sets forth the petitions of a monarch, one must ask whether divine-human fellowship was not the possession of devout lay people in Israel who had no special ministry to fulfill. Moreover, is the joy of salvation in Ps. 51:12 not the result of the presence and the work of the Holy Spirit in the heart (cf. Ps. 16:11, “In thy presence there is fullness of joy”), and did the devout lay person in Israel not experience such joy? In fact “all the people” are told, “The joy of the Lord is your strength” (Neh. 8:10; cf. Ezra 6:22; Neh. 12:43).⁹⁷ It may be noted also that the blessing of “the people of Israel” by the priests was to include a petition that the Lord would give them peace (Num. 6:23-26; cf. 1 Sam. 1:17; Ps. 29:11; 85:8; Isa. 48:18). Moreover, were the peace offerings not prescribed as a means of giving expression to fellowship with God plus the joy and the peace that were the concomitant thereof, a fellowship, a joy and a peace inspired by the Holy Spirit at work in their hearts, even though Ps. 51:11-12 be the only Old Testament passage which makes such connection with the Holy Spirit explicit? Of special interest in this connection is Deut. 27:6-7, “You shall offer burnt offerings ... and you shall sacrifice peace offerings, and shall eat there; and you shall rejoice before the Lord your God.” It is appropriate to quote Rogerson and McKay,

*Thy Holy Spirit ... is, as the parallelism shows, a synonym for thy presence. But the experience of God’s presence brings the joy of a restored relationship, together with the will and power to endure in faithfulness (cf. Ezek. 36:27), and is therefore comparable with the New Testament experience of God’s Spirit (cf. Gal. 5:22).*⁹⁸

One further point: Though the New Testament states that “the Spirit had not yet been given” prior to the glorification of Christ (John 7:39; cf. John 20:22; Acts 2:16-17, 33; 11:15; etc.), it does contain intimations of a ministry of the Holy Spirit in Old Testament times which was not restricted to empowerment for ministry. Most significant of these intimations, assuming that “spiritual” means “Spirit-derived,”⁹⁹ is 1 Cor. 10:1-4, “Our fathers (i.e., those with Moses in the Wilderness) ... all ate the same spiritual food and all drank the same spiritual drink. For they drank from the spiritual Rock which followed them, and the Rock was Christ.”

Though the divine fellowship mediated by the Holy Spirit undoubtedly lacks the richness that is available to God’s people since Christ has lived, died, risen, and ascended, the joy of salvation was experienced by every “broken and contrite heart” (Ps. 51:17) in Old Testament times.

“Adoption” is the term used in Rom. 8:15, Gal. 4:5 and Eph. 1:5, to describe the relationship of God’s people to Himself.¹⁰⁰ The description of His people as His sons (e.g., Matt. 5:45; 17:25-26; John 1:12;¹⁰¹ Rom. 8:14-17, 19; 9:26; Gal. 4:4-7; 2 Cor. 6:18;¹⁰² Heb. 2:10;¹⁰³ is another way of representing the same relationship, though without the suggestion of election which we have in the term “adoption.” And the description of Christians as “born” of God (John 1:13; 3:3-8; 1 John 2:29; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1, 4, 18; cf. 1 Pet. 1:3, 23; Tit. 3:5) has similar import. That this relationship is the work of the Holy Spirit (John 3:5-8; Rom. 8:15-16; cf. John 6:63; Gal. 4:6; 5:25; Tit. 3:5-6; Heb. 6:4-5) is reminiscent of Ps. 51:10-12 (cf. Ezek. 36:27; 37:14).

Though the Holy Spirit has other functions, he is often represented in the New Testament as ministering subjectively to those who have responded to the Gospel.

The subjective ministry of the Holy Spirit is first of all to inspire a consciousness of being in an intimate relationship to God to be compared with the intimate relationship of a son to a beloved father: “God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts crying, ‘Abba! Father!’” (Gal. 4:6; cf. Rom. 8:15-16, 23; John 14:17-20; 1 John 3:24; 2 Cor. 1:22; 5:5; Eph. 1:13.)¹⁰⁴ In accord therewith Paul can say, “God’s love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given to us” (Rom. 5:5). Likewise he can say, “The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace” (Gal. 5:22; cf. Rom. 14:17; 5:1-11; 15:13; John 7:38-39).¹⁰⁵

God’s immediate saving work on behalf of those who heartily respond to the gospel, and His work in them, may be summarized as justification, regeneration and adoption. This is the witness of both testaments, though the testimony thereto is more clear and abundant in the New Testament. Moreover, both the understanding and the experience of His grace is much richer since Pentecost (John 7:38-39; Acts 2:33). And again we must note the Trinitarian pattern: justification, which takes place in heaven, corresponds to the Father, regeneration corresponds to the Son, and adoption is the work of the Holy Spirit. (The Holy Spirit is said to regenerate—cf. John 3:8—because He applies the regenerating power of Christ’s death to us.)

III.1 Sanctification

When we turn from what takes place upon response to God’s Word in the life of God’s people and its sequel, we must first consider sanctification.

Sanctification is used in two senses in the Bible. It is used, first of all, in the sense of consecration to God, i.e., in the sense of being set apart from the secular for the divine. Accordingly the site of the temple is called the “holy mountain” (Isa. 11:9; 56:7), the temple itself is called holy (1 Chr. 29:3; Isa. 64:11), the Sabbath is called holy (Gen. 2:3); etc. The nation of Israel is “holy” because God chose “it to be a people for his own possession” (Deut. 7:6; cf. 26:19; Ex. 9:6). But individuals are also holy because set apart for God and/or His work, e.g., Aaron (Ex. 28:36-38; Ps. 106:16) and priests (Lev. 21:7). In Ps. 34:9 God’s people are called saints (lit. “holy ones”). This seems to mean that it is not only the nation as a corporate body which is holy, but the members thereof as well. The fact that these “saints” are called upon to “fear the Lord” indicates that their holiness is one of status rather than of character. Likewise, in the New Testament we have the church described as “a holy nation” (1 Pet. 2:9¹⁰⁶). On the other hand, all Christians can be called saints (e.g., Acts 9:13, 32; 26:10; Rom. 12:13; 15:25, 31; 16:2, 15; 1 Cor. 6:1; 16:1, 15; cf. “sanctified” in 1 Cor. 1:2; 6:11).

But we are not now concerned with sanctification in the sense in which all of God’s people are holy. We are concerned with sanctification in the sense of moral purity, a kind of sanctification which is not fully accomplished at the moment of regeneration, so that the “holy” people are exhorted to “be holy” (e.g., Lev. 19:2; 1 Pet. 1:14-18).

That this holiness includes moral purity is clear from what follows in Lev. 19,¹⁰⁷ and is especially evident in Isa. 6, where a vision of the Lord emphasizes His holiness and leads to the anguished cry, “Woe is me! For I am lost; for I am a man of unclean lips ...; for my eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts (Isa. 6:1-5).¹⁰⁸

It is to be noted, however, that, though God’s people are exhorted, “Consecrate yourselves ..., and be holy” (Lev. 11:44), purification is not restricted to one occasion in a person’s life. We have report of Jacob’s struggle with the angel at Peniel (Gen. 32:24-32), a struggle in which, in the judgment of various scholars, “inner purification,” “moral change,” was effected in Jacob,¹⁰⁹ and this despite the fact that he is represented as previously devoted to God and characterized by at least a measure of moral integrity, perhaps as a result of his experience of the ladder to heaven (see Gen. 28:10-22; 30:33; 32:1-2, 9-12).¹¹⁰

Other examples of moral sanctification in the Old Testament are more difficult to document, though G. Stählin has stated that the stories of Enoch, Noah, Abraham and David “give illustrations of the purifying and walking of man before and under God.”¹¹¹ Moreover, we read concerning Samuel, “The boy Samuel continued to grow both in stature and in favor with the Lord and with men” (1 Sam. 2:26). And the emphasis on the fear of the Lord as “the beginning of wisdom” (Ps. 111:10; Prov. 9:10; cf. Prov. 1:7; 15:33) intimates that the individual who fears God is expected to progressively improve the quality of his conduct,¹¹² though it is not made clear that this progress is a matter of divine grace.

What is at best implicit in the Old Testament is explicit in the New Testament. There the necessity of moral improvement on the part of Christians is repeatedly emphasized, e.g., 2 Cor. 7:1, “Let us cleanse ourselves from every defilement of body and spirit, and make holiness perfect in the fear of God”; 1 Thess. 4:3, “This is the will of God, your sanctification: that you abstain from immorality ...”;¹¹³ 1 John 3:3, “Every one who thus hopes in him purifies himself as he is pure.”

These Scriptures, and others as well, emphasize that the believer's will must be exercised, if sanctification is to take place, but elsewhere it is made clear that purification is a work of God in the heart of the child of God, e.g., 1 Thess. 5:23, "May the God of peace sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be kept sound and blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ"; 2 Cor. 3:18, "We all, with unveiled face, beholding the glory of the Lord, are being changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another; for this comes from the Lord who is the Spirit"; Col. 3:10, "(You) have put on the new nature, which is being renewed in knowledge after the image of its creator"; 2 Pet. 1:3, "His divine power has granted to us all things that pertain to life and godliness."¹¹⁴ Though implied elsewhere, Phil. 2:12-13 makes it explicit that both the exercise of the human will and the grace of God are involved in sanctification, but also makes clear that the prompting of the believer's will is a matter of divine grace: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for God is at work in you, both to will and to work for his good pleasure."

That the sanctification in view is primarily a matter of moral improvement is clear from the Scriptures quoted. It receives extended elaboration in Rom. 12:1ff.; Eph. 4:22ff.; Col. 3:8ff., 1 Pet. 1:14ff.; 2 Pet. 1:3-7.

That it is (normally at least) continuous improvement is indicated by the use of the present tense in Rom. 12:2, "Be transformed by the renewal of your mind"; 2 Cor. 3:18, "(We) are being changed into his likeness ..."; Eph. 4:23, "Be renewed in the spirit of your minds"; Phil. 2:12-13, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for God is at work in you both to will and to work for his good pleasure"; Col. 3:10, "The new nature ... which is being renewed ..."; Heb. 12:14, "Strive for peace with all men, and for the holiness without which no one will see the Lord"; 1 John 3:3, "Every one who thus hopes in him, purifies himself as he is pure"; cf. 2 Cor. 4:16; 1 Thess. 4:10; Heb. 6:1; 2 Pet. 1:10; 3:18. The aorist tense frequently occurs as well, e.g., Rom. 12:1; 13:14; 2 Cor. 7:1; Eph. 4:22, 24; Col. 3:8, 12; 1 Thess. 3:12-13; 5:23; 1 Pet. 1:5; 2:1-2. However, in the dependent moods—and all the examples we have noted are in one or another of these moods—the aorist tense "denotes action represented as a simple event or fact without reference either to its progress or the existence of its result."¹¹⁵

On the other hand, that a crisis or crises may be involved in sanctification, as we have seen to be probable in Jacob's case, is not ruled out. Indeed, the "now" in Col. 3:8 ("Now put them all away; anger, wrath, malice ...")¹¹⁶ may imply that a critical commitment should be made. With this we may compare the instruction to "Christians" in Rome who seemingly think it possible to "continue in sin." They are enjoined, "You ... must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 6:1, 11; cf. 6:12-14). Even to begin to consider oneself dead to sin and alive to God would involve a kind of crisis in one's life. But even more indicative of a critical entrance to a new stage of Christian existence is evident in the "now" of Rom. 6:18-19, "Having been set free from sin, (you) have become slaves of righteousness ... So now yield your members to righteousness for sanctification."¹¹⁷ Of course the exhortations of Rom. 6 are addressed to Christians whose commitment at their baptism may have been defective, due to a defective understanding of what submission to the rite was intended to signify.

Though but imperfectly adumbrated in the Old Testament, the New Testament represents sanctification (moral purification) as an essential characteristic of Christian existence (Heb. 12:14), indeed, we would say the foremost characteristic.

III.2 Service to God

In the Old Testament the people of God are repeatedly described as those who serve the Lord in contrast to those who serve other gods. Indeed, on the occasions when Israel gave her allegiance to other gods, she is described as serving those gods. And perhaps it is appropriate at this point to take note of Ps. 2:11-12, where the kings and rulers of the earth are exhorted, "Serve the Lord with fear, with trembling kiss his feet." Here serving the Lord is closely associated with kissing, "a sign of homage and submission," i.e., a sign of a "vassal relationship."¹¹⁸

To serve the Lord meant primarily to worship the Lord. In Ex. 3-12 the Lord is repeatedly represented as saying to Pharaoh through Moses, "Let my people go, that they may serve me" (e.g., Ex. 8:1). And this service is interpreted as sacrificing to the Lord in the wilderness (Ex. 3:18; 5:3, 8, 17; 8:8, 25-29; cf. 10:9). In accord with this understanding of service to the Lord we note that in Ps. 100:2 "Serve the Lord with gladness!" has as its parallel, "Come into his presence with thanksgiving." Likewise in Ps. 102:21-22 "praise" and "serve the Lord" are paralleled. Indeed, RSV has "worship the Lord" in v. 22, rather than the literal rendering, "serve the Lord." In this connection it is to be noted that it is difficult to know whether "serve" in the recurrent warning not to "worship ... and serve" other gods (e.g., Deut. 4:19) is more than a synonym for "worship."¹¹⁹ Indeed, H. Strathmann points out that the Hebrew word meaning "serve" is often rendered in LXX by a Greek word meaning "to serve or worship cultically, especially by sacrifice."¹²⁰

That this worship is corporate is frequently indicated. Such verses as Ps. 22:22 ("In the midst of the congregation I will praise thee"; cf. v. 25) are representative of what is expected from the devout Israelite, as may be seen from Ex. 12:27; 1 Chron. 29:20; 2 Chron. 20:18; Ezra 3:10-11; Ps. 107:32; 149:1; etc. On the other hand, individual worship¹²¹ by leaders of the Israelites is reported in Ex. 34:8; Jos. 5:14-15; Jud. 7:15; 2 Sam. 12:20; cf. Ezek. 46:2. Individual worship by the ordinary Israelite is not specifically mentioned very often, but is apparently in view in Deut. 26:10; 1 Sam. 1:3;¹²² cf. Lev. 4:27-35; 7:12-13; Job 1:20.

Besides the worship of God both corporate and individual, the service of God in the Old Testament involves a ministry to all of His people. We are unaware of explicit statements to the effect that every one of God's people was to have a ministry to other members of the holy nation. However, we read of occasions when all His people are instructed to participate in communal praise. In Ps. 106:48; Deut. 27:15-26, "all the people" are to respond with "Amen" at certain junctures of communal worship (cf. Neh. 5:13; 8:6). It is probable that the recurring refrain of Ps. 136 was to be sung by all the worshippers,¹²³ and no doubt other Psalms, or portions thereof, were to be sung by the entire congregation. Though such conduct is described as praise to the Lord, was it not also, in effect, a ministry on the part of each person to all the others participating with him/her? Another, and different kind of spiritual ministry, is perhaps implied in Jer. 31:34, "No longer shall each man teach his brother, saying, 'Know the Lord,'" though it is not intimated that this was a responsibility, to say nothing of the possibility that what is meant is that this kind of exhortation

was merely common, not universal.¹²⁴ All in all, even if it is not explicitly stated, there are intimations that each Israelite had a ministry to contribute to the welfare of the people of God.

But the ministry of the people of God was also to be a ministry to those who were not of Israel, even though this responsibility was not always taken seriously. Such a ministry is already implicit in Ex. 19:5-6, “All the earth is mine, and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests.” According to J. Muilenburg, this means, “Among the peoples of the world she will serve as priests ...; she will perform the priestly functions of instruction and intercession.”¹²⁵ A similar statement occurs in Isa. 61:6, albeit as an eschatological promise, “You (God’s people) shall be called the priests of the Lord, men shall speak of you as the ministers of our God.”¹²⁶

That Israel was to have a ministry to other nations is emphasized in Isa. 43:10, 12, “‘You are my witnesses,’ says the Lord, ‘and my servant whom I have chosen ... I declared and saved and proclaimed, when there was no strange god among you; and you are my witnesses,’ says the Lord.” And on this passage Muilenburg has commented,

He is describing Israel’s mission in the world... Her mission is to be God’s witness and elected servant. She exists to fulfill his purposes and do his will ... Through her witness and service she will come to know that Yahweh is God of all the nations. That God is God and the only God, this is Israel’s witness, her mission as servant, and the meaning of her election.¹²⁷

A similar emphasis occurs in Isa. 44:8, where it is declared to “Jacob, my servant”: “You are my witnesses! Is there a God besides me? There is no Rock; I know not any.” As A. A. Trites affirms, “Her (Israel’s) task is to bear witness to all peoples and nations that Yahweh alone is God, and that beside him there is no Savior.”¹²⁸

Israel’s responsibility to have a ministry to other nations is set forth in Exodus 19 and in the latter chapters of Isaiah, but we also find that certain individuals have the responsibility to be directly involved in such a ministry. To what extent, if any, the oracles concerning other nations in Isa. 13-23; Jer. 46-51; Ezek. 25-32 (cf. Amos 1-2) were proclaimed among these nations is uncertain. On the other hand, Elijah is represented as performing miracles of mercy in Zarephath (1 Kgs. 17), and, in our opinion, v. 24 (“Now I know that you are a man of God, and that the word of God in your mouth is truth”) would seem to imply that this ministry included witness concerning the true God and His word to a non-Israelite, if not to non-Israelites.¹²⁹

Of course Jonah is represented as the outstanding example of ministry to non-Jews, whether one considers the book of Jonah to be an historical record or not. In his case we have travel to another land for the express purpose of proclaiming the Lord’s message to the inhabitants thereof, albeit a message of impending destruction. It is clearly implied that God has “pity” on benighted people of other nations (4:11), and may call upon particular individuals amongst His people to bear His message to them.¹³⁰

In the New Testament the service of God continues to be emphasized, and, at least in one respect, receives more emphasis. It is stated that Christians have been “created in Christ Jesus for good works” (Eph. 2:10), that “faith apart from works is dead” (Jas. 2:26), and that “we (Christians and

perhaps others as well) must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that each may receive good or evil, according to what he has done in the body” (2 Cor. 5:10).

In the first place these good works include worship. With respect to the proper object of worship, Jesus quotes Deut. 6:13, “You shall worship the Lord your God and him only shall you serve” (Matt. 4:10 [Luke 4:8]).¹³¹ And according to Phil. 3:3 Christians may be described as those who “worship God in spirit.” In this connection it is not amiss to note the eschatological doctrine of Rev. 22:3, “His servants shall worship him.”¹³²

That this worship is to be corporate is implied in such passages as Rom. 15:6, “That together you may with one accord glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ”; Eph. 5:19-20, “Singing and making melody to the Lord with all your heart, giving thanks in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ to God the Father” (cf. Col. 3:16).¹³³ On the other hand, private *worship* is in view in Matt. 6:6 (“When you pray, go into your room and shut the door and pray to your Father ...”) as is evident from the inclusion of “Hallowed be thy name” in the model prayer which follows Matt. 6:9-13). And, on the frequent occasions when personal thanksgiving to God is mentioned, private worship is probably indicated, e.g. Rom. 1:8; 14:6; 16:4; 1 Cor. 1:4; 10:30; Eph. 1:16; Phil. 1:3; 1 Tim. 1:12; 2 Tim. 1:3; Phile. 4. In the New Testament it is taken for granted that worship both corporate and individual is the foremost service to be rendered to God.

But service to God is not only a matter of worship, it is also a matter of service to the Christian community. That such service is to be rendered by every Christian is clearly stated in 1 Cor. 12:4-7, though it is also made clear that not all render the same kind of service. “To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good,” but “there are varieties of service.” That the Christian community, and service thereto, is in view is evident in that the edification of the church is the specific concern (14:5, 12; cf. v. 19). Moreover, in Eph. 4:11-13 it is affirmed that the saints, i.e., all members of the Christian community, are to be involved in “the work of ministry, for building up the body of Christ, until we all attain ... to mature manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ ...” There are those in the church who are responsible for the equipping of the saints for their various ministries, but every Christian has a ministry to fulfill.¹³⁴

But the New Testament makes clear that the service of God has another dimension. “God’s own people” are “a royal priesthood” responsible to “declare the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light” (1 Pet. 2:9).¹³⁵ As J. N. D. Kelly comments, “The Church ... as God’s elect people, has the function of proclaiming His saving acts.”¹³⁶ And according to G. Schrenk, “What is really meant is a ministry of witness to all humanity.”¹³⁷ Similarly, we have “The Great Commission”: “Go ... and make disciples of all nations ...; and lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age” (Matt. 28:19-20; cf. Mark 16:15; Luke 24:46-47; John 20:21). D. Hill comments on the concluding clause, “The period indicated—from the Resurrection and enthronement of Christ till the final consummation—is for Matthew the era of the Church’s life and mission.”¹³⁸

But though the church as a whole has a mission to all humanity,¹³⁹ the New Testament makes clear that certain individuals within the church are to be personally active in serving God by making disciples.¹⁴⁰ Some are to be evangelists (Eph. 4:11; cf. Acts 21:8; 2 Tim. 4:5), and, though it may be argued that the ministry of such is a ministry to the church as well as to the outside world (cf.

Eph. 4:12-16; 2 Tim. 4:2), it is clearly, if not primarily, a ministry to those not yet a part of the body of Christ. And, of course, we have New Testament evidence that some are called to such service. According to Rom. 10:14-15 particular individuals are “sent” to preach good news to those who would otherwise have no reason to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. Indeed, according to Acts 26:17-18 Paul was such a one. Christ sent him to the Gentiles “to open their eyes, that they may turn from darkness to light ...” (cf. Acts 13:2-3; Gal. 1:15-16; Eph. 3:7-9). Moreover, there were those who were neither apostles, nor the associates of apostles, who carried on a ministry to non-Christians (cf. Acts 11:19-20).

III.3 Glorification

The Christian life reaches its climax in what is known in theology as glorification, a glorification, moreover, which is both communal and individual.

In the Old Testament an ideal destiny for the community of God’s people is frequently in view. This eschatological expectation comes to climactic expression in such passages as:

- (a) Isa 9:6-7 with its promise of a child; who “is named” Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. His authority shall grow continually and there shall be endless peace for the throne of David and his kingdom. He will establish it and uphold it with justice and with righteousness from this time onward and forevermore (cf. 2:1-4; 11:1-12:6; 65:17-25; 66 18-23; Mic 4:1-4; 5:1-4; Jer 33:14-26; Ezek 34:22-31)
- (b) Dan 7:13-14, 27. I saw one like a human being...To him was given dominion and glory and kingship, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; His dominion is an everlasting dominion that shall not pass away...The kingship and dominion...shall be given to the people of the holy ones of the Most High: their kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom and all dominions shall serve and obey them (cf. 2:44).

Typical expectation in the Old Testament was that of a coming Messiah under whom righteousness, peace and prosperity would characterize the nation.

Besides the future promised to the nation, confidence in a glorious hereafter for the devout individual surfaces occasionally in the Old Testament. Two individuals, Enoch (Gen. 5:24) and Elijah (2 Kgs 2:11) were said to have been taken into God’s presence, apparently as a special privilege and reward, and some have thought that the same future is implied for the Suffering Servant in Isa 53:8.¹⁴¹ That each of the righteous will have this privilege is sometimes seen in Ps 16:10, “You do not give me up to Sheol, or let your faithful one see the Pit”; in Ps 49:15, “God will ransom my soul from the power of Sheol, for he will receive me”; and in Ps 73:24, “You will guide me with your counsel, and afterward you will receive me with honor.” But other scholars are of the opinion that eschatology is not really to be found in these verses.¹⁴² The eschatological glorification of each one of God’s people does seem to be in view, however, in Job 19:26. “After my skin has been...destroyed, then in (or ‘without’) my flesh I shall see God”¹⁴³; and is surely evident in Isa 26:19, “Your dead shall live, their corpses shall rise. O dwellers in the dust, awake and sing for joy”; and in Dan 12:2-3,

Many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. Those who are wise shall shine like the

brightness of the sky, and those who lead many to righteousness, like the stars forever and ever.

(In these Danielic verses it is almost certain that “many” means “all.”¹⁴⁴)

In the New Testament we have the promise that the kingdom of God, which was inaugurated with Christ’s ministry, will have an eschatological consummation. That consummation, described as “the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ” (2 Pet 1:11; cf. Luke 1:33; Eph 5:5), will be characterized by endless blessedness for the people of God.¹⁴⁵ That is a kingdom implies, of course, that this blessedness is corporate and communal, as a variety of Scriptures testify, e.g., (1) Eph 5:27 where we are informed that it is Christ’s purpose to “present the church to himself in splendor”; and (2) Heb 11:16 and Rev 21:1-22:5 which describe the Christian’s destiny as not only a “heavenly” country, or “a new heaven and a new earth.” but which also may be described as a “city” with all the social, political and communal implications of the term.¹⁴⁶

But glorification is not only a communal matter. For God’s people it is also an individual matter. According to Rom 2:6-7, 10, “he will render to every man according to his work; to those who by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, he will give eternal life...Glory and honor and peace for everyone who does good, the Jew first and also the Greek.¹⁴⁷ The use of “anyone (tis and houtos) in Rom 8:9 makes it clear that individual glorification is in view in Rom 8:17, which states that Christians are to be “glorified with him,” and in Rom 8:30, which declares, “Those whom he justified he also glorified.”¹⁴⁸

Similarly, according to 1 Pet 5:1, Peter is “one who shares in the glory to be revealed,” and in c.4 elders are informed that they may “Obtain the unfading crown of glory.” That Peter is accorded individual glorification suggests that the same may be true of the elders he is addressing. Perhaps we may go on to state that therefore the glorification of all Christians is through of as the glorification of individuals in 1 Pet 1:7, “the genuineness of your faith...may redound to praise and honor and glory at the revelation of Jesus Christ.” Through 1 Pet 2:5, 9, emphasize the corporateness of God’s people, in 2:5 Christians are called “living stones,” which suggests that they are thought of as individuals, as well as constituting a corporate body.¹⁴⁹

Conclusion

As we have seen when considering other doctrines, a Trinitarian structure is evident in the biblical doctrine of salvation. Some elements of the structure are not obvious in the Old Testament. The partial and preparatory nature of the Old Testament revelation is thereby evident. But even with respect to these elements, there are hints and intimations as we have seen.

It is of special note that the Trinitarian structure of the salvation is complex. Not only is the structure as a whole three-fold. And not only do the three divisions thereof correspond to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, i.e., to the essential, the existential, and the aesthetic. The fact that this is so corresponds to the fact that, though the members of the Trinity together constitute a unity of what is essential, existential and aesthetic, each member of the Trinity is a complete person, characterized by that is essential, existential and aesthetic.

Endnotes

¹Of Sarah it is said in Heb. 11:11, “She considered him faithful who had promised” (cf. Gen. 18:11-13).

²That Abram was convinced that what “the Lord” said was true is also implied in such passages as Gen. 12:4, 7; 13:18.

³According to Jas. 2:21-24, if his intellectual certainty had not been “completed” by “works,” he would not have been justified.

⁴The same verb occurs in both Ex. 4:31 MT and Ex. 4:31 LXX as in Gen. 15:6 MT and Gen. 15:6 LXX respectively.

⁵According to Ex. 18:11, Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, confessed, “Now I know that the Lord is greater than all gods.” Since Jethro is also known as Hobab (Num. 10:29; Jud. 4:11), this is probably the first of the considerations which led Moses’ father-in-law to join the chosen people. In Isa. 40-55 the salvation of God’s people is proclaimed. In these chapters it is repeatedly argued that Yahweh is the true and living God, the Creator of the universe who has wrought mightily in days past (40:21-28; 41:21-24; 44:7-20; 46:3-13). It seems to be implied that enjoyment of the salvation being proclaimed is contingent upon the conviction that Yahweh is such a God, and therefore able to fulfil what is being promised.

According to Jonah 3:5, “The people of Nineveh believed God,” that is, they believed (the same Hebrew verb as in Gen. 15:6 MT; a compound of the same Greek verb as in Gen. 15:6 LXX) that Jonah’s message was true and could be trusted. (Cf. L. C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976], 223.) This belief led to the kind of conduct which averted the destruction Jonah had prophesied.

⁶See also Luke 24:36-43; John 5:32-39; 8:28; 20:19-20, 24-28; 1 Cor. 15:4-5; 1 Thess. 2:13; 1 John 1:1-3.

⁷Cf. W. L. Lane, *The Gospel according to Mark* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 364-65.

⁸G. Delling in *TDNT*, 1:452.

⁹See E. Würthwein in *TDNT*, 4:984.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, 4:982-83.

¹¹According to J. Jeremias in *TDNT*, 5:767 n. 15, knowing God in Hos. 2:19-20 and in Jer. 31:31-34 implies “fellowship with God.” Cf. J. A. Thompson, *The Book of Jeremiah* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 581; F. I. Andersen and D. N. Freedman, *Hosea* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1980), 284.

¹²Cf. Jer. 3:21-4:2; Hos. 14:1-7. See also 2 Chron. 20:1-19; Isa. 33:13-22; Jonah 3:5-10.

¹³D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 92-93.

¹⁴Note also the relationship between repentance and (a) fellowship with Christ (Rev. 3:19-20); (b) reception of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:38); and (c) times of refreshing (Acts 3:19).

¹⁵The first part of Acts 17:30 seems inconsistent with Rom. 1.

¹⁶A. Weiser in *TDNT*, 6:188.

¹⁷The Hebrew word used to convey this emphasis is commonly rendered “faithful.” Neh. 9:8 is significant in this connection, “Thou didst find his (Abraham’s) heart faithful before thee, and thou didst make with him the covenant ...” According to A. Jepsen in *TDOT*, 1:296, “faithful” here probably means “completely devoted to thee.”

¹⁸According to A. Jepsen in *TDOT*, 2:89, the Hebrew word most commonly used in this connection basically means “feel secure, be unconcerned ... rely on something or someone.”

¹⁹Even if the returning in view is primarily returning from dependence on Egypt to the obligations of the nation to Assyria, returning to God is implied, because the returning is returning to His will.

According to O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13-39* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974), 296, this verse represents “Yahweh as the God of repentance ... the basis of confidence ... of peaceful calm ... and of the ability to wait in silence.” J. N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 555, notes, “The line is probably chiasmic with ‘returning’ paralleling ‘quietness.’” If so, repentance and trust are closely linked. Of course “rest” and “quietness” are characteristics of “trust,” so that our point is established even if a chiasmic structure is not really present.

²⁰J. L. Mays, *Hosea* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969), 165, states that “wait” here means, “Wait in the humility of self-denying trust on the intervention of his God”; and L. J. Wood in EBC, 7:217, states that it means “to ‘wait’ in expectancy for God to bring them the same kind of blessing he had brought Jacob.” It is possibly implied that “hold fast ...” and “wait ...” (both of which are imperatives after “return” in the indicative) indicate what must characterize return. If so, our point is not significantly affected.

²¹The connection between “faith” or “faithfulness” and “trust” is somewhat loose because the one describes the nation, the other a person.

²²In Ps. 112:6-7 we have the “righteous” described as “trusting in the Lord.”

²³Cf. 2 Kgs. 18:30; Jer. 39:18; Ps. 40:1-4; 56:1-4; 62:1-8; 71:4-6; 2 Chron. 13:18; etc.

²⁴Cf. P. C. Craigie, *Psalms 1-50* (Waco, Texas: Word, 1983), 268. Returning to the Lord is implied in v. 5 (“I acknowledged my sin to thee ...”), especially in light of vv. 3-4, “When I declared not my sin ...”

²⁵According to L. C. Allen, *Psalms 101-150* (Waco, Texas: Word, 1983), 285, this psalm has an “almost Pauline emphasis upon (covenant) grace and faith.”

²⁶For an alternative rendering of v. 14 see NEB and NIV. Though Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 216, renders as in RSV and TEV, on p. 217 he notes that the respective Hebrew word “could be translated ‘counsel.’”

²⁷According to A. Weiser in *TDNT*, 6:193, they “belong to the sphere of inquiry into faith because later in the OT they were used in the same sense as terms for faith.”

²⁸It should be noted that the salvation envisioned in the Old Testament is not one in which “good works” are fundamental and basic. In the first place, the good works required in the Old Testament are good works on the part of those already “redeemed.” The Ten Commandments are given to those to whom it is said, “I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage” (Ex. 20:2). “The promise of redemption (given in Ex. 6:2-9) has been fulfilled. Israel has been delivered” (B. S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974], 401). “The Decalogue ... spells out what God requires from a covenant people whom he delivered without demanding a prior commitment” (Ibid., 402). Cf. P. C. Craigie, (*The Book of Deuteronomy* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1976), 150, 151, 194. Moreover, those who “return” to the Lord do so “by the help of your God” (Hos. 12:6; cf. Isa. 44:22; Jer. 31:18, 33; Ezek. 11:19; 36:25-27).

²⁹“Believe” is used in a variety of senses in the New Testament.

³⁰In most instances in which faith is said to be “in God,” the salvation of Gentiles, or of Old Testament persons, appears to be in view. The salvation of Gentiles involves turning to the living God (cf. 1 Thess. 1:9), and the salvation of Old Testament persons was prior to the advent and sacrifice of Christ. That faith “in God” should occur in Heb. 6:1 is strange, unless the saving faith of Old Testament saints is in view, as well as the saving faith of Christians (cf. 6:12-15; 11:4-39).

³¹It also leads to good works, as is clear from Jas. 2:22, “Faith was completed by works” (cf. Gal. 5:6).

³²J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981), 57. Note the eschatological perspective of faith in these passages, a perspective of trust common in the Old Testament, as we have seen. Cf. R. Bultmann in *TDNT*, 6:221.

³³In *TDNT*, 6:211.

³⁴*Romans: A Shorter Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 93. Though the promise quoted in Rom. 4:17 is found in Gen. 17:5, Rom. 4:3 (“Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness”) makes it clear that Paul also has in view the similar promise of Gen. 15:6.

³⁵*The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 1:309.

³⁶Cf. Lam. 3:26, “It is good that one should wait quietly for the salvation of the Lord.” In Ps. 77:22 LXX “believe” and “hope” are used more or less synonymously. R. Bultmann in *TDNT*, 2:531, describes hope in Rom. 8:24-25 as “trust in a divinely given future.” On Gal. 5:5 see E. Schweizer in *TDNT*, 6:426.

³⁷According to R. Bultmann in *TDNT*, 6:203, *pisteuein eis* “in the sense ‘to believe in,’ ... is neither Gk. nor LXX,” i.e., it is found neither in secular Greek nor in the Septuagint.

³⁸R. Bultmann in *TDNT*, 6:211.

³⁹As *ibid.* states, “unto eternal life” “shows that the predominant sense is that of expectant confidence.” Cf. J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981), 55.

⁴⁰F. F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Book of the Acts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 78 n. 81.

⁴¹John Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960), III.iii.1, insists that “repentance ... follows faith, and is produced by it.” In the Scriptures, however, repentance is always listed before faith. Is Calvin’s view due to a failure to distinguish faith as an intellectual conviction, which, of course, precedes repentance, from saving faith which is trust in the Saviour? And, if so, does he fail to make this distinction because he is influenced by Platonist thought?

⁴²We have used the term “the Lord” because of its ambiguity, i.e., sometimes it refers to God, sometimes to Jesus Christ.

⁴³G. Schrenk in *TDNT*, 2:204.

⁴⁴For evidence that the Hebrew verb “to justify” means “declare righteous,” not “make righteous,” see Deut. 25:1, where judges are expected to “justify the righteous” (cf. Ex. 23:7; Ps. 51:4; Isa. 5:23; 43:9). See L. Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), 234; G. Schrenk in *TDNT*, 2:212-14.

⁴⁵*Genesis*, Second Edition (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972), 185; cf. H. W. Heidland in *TDNT*, 4:289, 291.

⁴⁶*The Book of Psalms* (Cambridge: University Press, 1939), 631.

⁴⁷*The Second Isaiah* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), 130; cf. G. A. F. Knight, *Deutero-Isaiah* (New York: Abingdon, 1965), 107.

⁴⁸In 1 Kgs. 8:32 the cognate verb meaning “to justify” occurs.

⁴⁹*Deuteronomy*, 175. Emphases mine.

⁵⁰According to G. Quell in *TDNT*, 2:177 n. 11, “righteousness” in Deut. 6:25 “almost amounts to a conferred acquittal.”

⁵¹In Ps. 24:4-5 God’s people going up to worship at the temple are in view. Again, it is the continuance of being right with God that is assumed.

⁵²H. Ringgren in *TDOT*, 4:337.

⁵³Cf. C. L. Taylor in *IB*, 6:989.

⁵⁴L. Morris, *Preaching*, 244; cf. 235-36.

⁵⁵Cf. Cranfield, *Romans*, 117.

⁵⁶“Righteousness” in Heb. 11:7 is not justification. Cf. G. Schrenk in *TDNT*, 2:200.

⁵⁷*Peter and Jude*, 300.

⁵⁸Note that the Greek word for “grant” is rare in the New Testament, but is a cognate of “gift” in Rom. 5:17, where we read of “the gift of righteousness” (i.e., justification). Moreover, Rom. 5:17 states that those who receive “the gift of righteousness (will) reign in life.” And Cranfield, *Romans*, 120, renders the concluding phrase of Rom. 5:18, “justification issuing in life.”

⁵⁹According to 1 Pet. 1:5, it is “by God’s power (that we) are guarded through faith for a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time”; cf. Phil. 2:12-13.

⁶⁰Comparison with 1 Cor. 6 and Gal. 5 with reference to eschatological entrance into the Kingdom is striking.

⁶¹The basis upon which God justified Old Testament people was the death of Christ (Rom. 3:25; cf. Heb. 10:4). Cf. Cranfield, (*Romans*, 74; F. Büchsel in *TDNT*, 4:344-49. It appears, however, that Old Testament people did not need to be aware of this fact.

⁶²Is this due to the belief that all the circumcised are God’s people, unless they have forfeited membership therein, and so been “cut off from among his people”? (Cf. Ex. 12:15; 30:33; Lev. 17:4; Ezek. 14:8; see also Ezra 10:8.)

⁶³Ezek. 18:31 urges, “Cast away all the transgressions which you have committed against me, and get yourselves a new heart and a new spirit.” Here Ezekiel seems to say (a) a new heart and a new spirit are possible now; (b) one can change “one’s basic attitude” (H. Braun in *TDNT*, 6:470; cf. F. Baumgärtel in *TDNT*, 3:607). How is this to be reconciled with Ezek. 11:19; 36:26-27? (Cf. E. Würthwein in *TDNT*, 4:988; K. L. & M. A. Schmidt in *TDNT*, 5:1026.)

⁶⁴*Jeremiah*, 580.

⁶⁵In our view the experience of Christians transcends that of the Old Testament saints because the life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus have intervened, as a result of which the Holy Spirit is active amongst men in a new way, beginning with Pentecost.

⁶⁶Kirkpatrick, *Psalms*, 292; cf. E. R. Dalglisch, *Psalms Fifty-one* (Leiden: Brill, 1962), 152; C. Maurer in *TDNT*, 7:908 n. 37.

⁶⁷Kirkpatrick, *Psalms*, 292.

⁶⁸*I and 2 Samuel* (Greenwood, S.C.: Attic, 1971), 99.

⁶⁹*I Samuel* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1980), 183; cf. L. M. Eslinger, *Kingship of God in Crisis* (Decatur, Ga.: Almond, 1985), 326.

⁷⁰*I & II Samuel* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), 86.

⁷¹Cf. P. R. Ackroyd, *The First Book of Samuel* (Cambridge: University Press, 1971), 84; E. Jacob in *TDNT*, 9:628; B. F. Philbeck, Jr., in *Broadman Bible Commentary*, 3:35.

⁷²In LXX (most MSS) and in Heb. 10:5 the first clause is rendered, “A body hast thou prepared for me.” Ps. 40:6-7 receives a Messianic interpretation in Heb. 10.

⁷³*Psalms*, 211. Cf. A. Weiser, *Psalms*, 337-39.

⁷⁴*Psalms 101-150*, 142.

⁷⁵Cf. 2 Cor. 3:6; John 10:10; Kirkpatrick, *Psalms*, 705, 723; D. Kidner, *Psalms* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982), 232, 250, 256.

In Ps. 80:18; 85:6, we have prayers for “the restoration of ... national life,” rather than for regeneration. Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 292, argues that in Ps. 36:9 (10) “the reference is to mortal life, not everlasting life, as proposed by Dahood (*Psalms*, 1:221-22).”

⁷⁶*Psalms 101-150*, 285.

⁷⁷Generation in Ps. 2:7 and in Ps. 110:3 LXX “is no more than institution to the position of son and heir” (F. Büchsel in *TDNT*, 1:668).

Is the paucity of references to individual regeneration in the Old Testament due to the conception of the nation as “created” by God (Isa. 43:15; cf. 27:11; 43:7, 21; 44:2, 21, 24; 45:11; Jer. 18:1-6)?

⁷⁸Wisd. 7:25-27 says that wisdom, “a breath of the power of God, and a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty,” “renews all things; and in every generation she passes into holy souls and makes them friends of God and prophets.” If the meaning is that she makes souls holy, and, in every generation enters into some of those made holy to make them “friends of God and prophets,” we apparently have a doctrine of divine regeneration in view. (According to J. Behm in *TDNT*, 3:451, “renew” in Wisd. 7:27 is used “in the religious sense.” In our opinion, however, this interpretation reads more into the verb than is warranted.)

⁷⁹In this verse the creation of a new corporate entity is in view; cf. Col. 3:10-11; Gal. 3:27-28.

⁸⁰It is only at Tit. 3:5 that we have the idea of rebirth in Pauline writings, and even there it is paralleled by “renewal,” with which it is more or less synonymous.

⁸¹In *TDNT*, 3:451.

⁸²With the majority of scholars, we understand *autou* in this verse to refer to God, not to Christ. See R. E. Brown, *The Epistles of John* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1982), 384.

⁸³Marshall, *Epistles*, 168; cf. Eph. 2:22.

⁸⁴M. Barth, *Ephesians* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1981), 308; compare Col. 1:16 with Eph. 3:9).

⁸⁵In our opinion both of these verses refer to water baptism; cf. E. Haenchen, *John 1* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 200-201; Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles*, 252.

⁸⁶Cf. Marshall, *Epistles of John*, 226-27.

⁸⁷In 1 Cor. 6:11 washing apparently has to do with the guilt of sin, not its power, and sanctification means being set apart for God as in 1 Cor. 1:2, not moral purity.

⁸⁸Though “adoption” does not occur, we have such teachings as Deut. 7:6, “The Lord your God has chosen you to be a people for his own possession.”

⁸⁹The term has an eschatological reference in Hos. 1:10, “It shall be said to them, ‘Sons of the living God.’”

⁹⁰Isa. 1:2 speaks of God having reared and brought up His sons. It does not say that He made them His sons.

⁹¹Cf. Dalglisch, *Psalms Fifty-one*, viii, 155.

⁹²*Ibid.*, 155-57.

⁹³Cf. 1 Sam. 16:14; Kirkpatrick, *Psalms*, 292; Dalglisch, *Psalms Fifty-one*, 161.

⁹⁴Dalglisch, *Psalms Fifty-one*, 158-59.

⁹⁵Joel 2:28-31, quoted in Acts 2:17-21, seems not to be an exception.

⁹⁶*Psalms Fifty-one*, 161.

⁹⁷A. A. Anderson, *The Book of Psalms* (Greenwood, S.C.; Attic, 1972), 1:399, states that joy “is one of the characteristic elements of the Israelite religious life.”

⁹⁸J. W. Rogerson and J. W. McKay, *Psalms 51-100* (Cambridge: University Press, 1977), 19-20. M. Buitendijk, *The Psalms* (New York: Ktav, 1969), 192, states that in Ps. 51 the holy Spirit “denotes ... ‘the divine spirit’ or power of good within man,” not the “gift of prophecy” as in Isa. 63:10-11. We agree that quite a different function of the holy Spirit is in view in Ps. 51 from what is in view in Isa. 63. We would note, however, that the ministry of divine fellowship with its concomitant of “the joy of salvation” is lacking in Buitendijk’s statement.

⁹⁹So F. W. Grosheide, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 220-21; cf. C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), 222; L. Goppelt in *TDNT*, 6:146.

¹⁰⁰In Rom. 8:23 it is used of their eschatological relationship, suggesting that the relationship is not now in its final stage. In Rom. 9:4 it is apparently used of Israel corporately (cf. Ex. 4:22-23; Jer. 31:9; Hos. 11:1; C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975, 1979), 2:461.)

¹⁰¹Always *tekna* in John; *huios* is reserved for Christ.

¹⁰²Here we have “my sons and daughters, says the Lord Almighty.”

¹⁰³In Matt. 5:9 (?); Luke 6:35; 20:36; Rev. 21:7, the relationship so described is eschatological. Cf. E. Schweizer in *TDNT*, 8:389-92.

¹⁰⁴See Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:136-40; Heb. 6:4.

¹⁰⁵In our opinion love, joy and peace provide the dynamic for the patience, kindness, goodness, etc., included in the fruit of the Spirit, according to Gal. 5:22-23. Cf. Neh. 8:10; Gal. 5:6; 2 Cor. 5:14-15.

¹⁰⁶V. 10 surely implies that the nation of Israel is not in view. Cf. 4:3-4.

¹⁰⁷Cf. O Procksch in *TDNT*, 1:92.

¹⁰⁸According to Procksch in *TDNT*, 1:93, “The concept of holiness is central to the whole theology of Isaiah. The Trisagion of his initial vision (Isa. 6:3) remained normative for his picture of God.”

¹⁰⁹E.g., C. A. Simpson in *IB*, 1:727; W. R. Bowie in *IB*, 1:722-29; E. A. Speiser, *Genesis* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1964), 257; R. Davidson, *Genesis 12-50* (Cambridge: University Press, 1979), 186.

¹¹⁰Cf. G. von Rad, *Genesis* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972), 286. Gen. 35:1-4, 9-15, may be understood as setting forth a further stage or stages in Jacob’s spiritual development.

¹¹¹In *TDNT*, 6:708.

¹¹²Cf. Stählin in *TDNT*, 6:708, 713.

¹¹³The word translated “sanctification” here is a cognate of the word rendered “holiness” in 2 Cor. 7:1. According to Procksch in *TDNT*, 1:113, 114, the former means “sanctifying,” the latter “means ‘sanctification’ or ‘holiness’ rather than sanctifying, but as a quality rather than a state.”

¹¹⁴The Greek verb translated “has granted” is in the perfect tense, signifying that we continue to possess “all things that pertain to life and godliness.”

¹¹⁵H. P. V. Nunn, *A Short Syntax of New Testament Greek*, Fifth Edition (Cambridge: University Press, 1956), 78.

¹¹⁶We suggest that vv. 5-6 quote, or at least give the substance of moral instruction to candidates for baptism. V. 7 states that the readers had heeded the instruction. V. 8 tells them that they are to (begin?) advance to another moral level (cf. 1 Cor. 3:1-4).

¹¹⁷Cranfield, *Romans: A Shorter Commentary*, 145, speaks of “the new self-surrender to which they are being summoned.”

¹¹⁸Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 68.

¹¹⁹Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 136-37.

¹²⁰In *TDNT*, 4:60.

¹²¹Cf. Jonah 2:1-9.

¹²²Cf. R. W. Klein, *1 Samuel* (Waco, Texas: Word, 1983), 6.

¹²³Allen, *Psalms 101-150*, 231.

¹²⁴There are a number of passages in which it is stated that all the members of the community contributed to projects for the welfare of the people of God, e.g., Ex. 36:2-7; Neh. 3:1-4:22; 10:34; 13:12, but these would not ordinarily be described as “spiritual” ministries.

¹²⁵In IB, 5:712. For evidence that instruction was an important function of priests, see Lev. 10:11; Deut. 33:10; cf. 2 Chron. 17:8-9; Mal. 2:6-9.

¹²⁶Cf. J. L. McKenzie, *Second Isaiah* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1968), 181; A. S. Herbert, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah: Chapters 40-66* (Cambridge: University Press, 1975), 164; Muilenburg in IB., V, 712. R. N. Whybray, *Isaiah 40-66* (Greenwood, S.C.: Attic, 1975), 243, argues, however, that no mission to Gentiles is envisioned here, solely recognition of superior status.

¹²⁷In IB, V, 488. In this connection we may also note Isa. 43:21, “My chosen people, the people whom I formed for myself that they might declare my praise.” (The reference, however, is eschatological.)

¹²⁸*The New Testament Concept of Witness* (Cambridge: University Press, 1977), 44. There are those who hold that Israel is the “servant” addressed in Isa. 42:6-7, “I have given you as a covenant to the people, a light to the nations, to open the eyes that are blind, to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon, from the prison those who sit in darkness”; and in Isa. 49:6, “I will give you as a light to the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth.” (So Knight, *Deutero-Isaiah*, 75, 185-86.) However, there is reason to believe that a different Servant is in view in these passages. See North, *The Second Isaiah*, 106-13, 186.

¹²⁹According to F. W. Farrar, *The First Book of Kings* (Minneapolis: Klock & Klock, 1981), 375, “Elijah was the first missionary sent from the Jews to the heathen.” But surely this statement outruns the evidence. J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1951), 296, declares that there was “no evangelization of the alien.” In this connection it may be noted that Naaman’s embracing of the God of Israel seems to have been without explicit witness to him (see 2 Kgs. 5:15-19).

¹³⁰Various Old Testament passages represent God’s people as bearing witness to others concerning their God (e.g., Ex. 5-11, 18; Dan. 2-6), sometimes with positive results (e.g., Ex. 18; Dan. 2-6), but, apart from Jonah, are they ever represented as approaching them with the primary purpose of conveying God’s message? Noah is represented as “a herald of righteousness” in 2 Pet. 2:5 and elsewhere, but there is no Old Testament evidence of this. In Matt. 23:15 the scribes and Pharisees of Jesus’ day are said to “traverse sea and land to make a single proselyte.”

¹³¹The Greek verb translated “serve” means “worship.” See H. Strathmann in *TDNT*, 4:62-65.

¹³²NIV has “serve” here, but see Strathmann in *TDNT* 4:62-65. Moreover, “worship” accords with the emphasis of Rev. 4, 5, an emphasis that keeps recurring in the Apocalypse.

¹³³The context is that of the assembled congregation. So also 1 Cor. 14:15-17; cf. Luke 19:37-38; Eph. 3:21; Heb. 2:12. The Lord’s Supper must be seen as including worship, if for no other reason than that giving thanks is particularly mentioned (see 1 Cor. 10:16-17; 11:17-34). Of course it may be argued that worthy prayer of any kind includes an element of worship.

¹³⁴Concerning this interpretation of Eph. 4:11-13, see Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:477-84.

¹³⁵According to J. Schniewind in *TDNT*, 1:69, the Greek word rendered “declare” is used in the sense of “publish abroad” or “solemnly proclaim.”

¹³⁶*Peter and Jude*, 100.

¹³⁷In *TDNT*, 3:251. An even more extensive ministry is indicated in Eph. 3:10, “That through the church the manifold wisdom of God might now be made known to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places.”

¹³⁸ *Matthew*, 362.

¹³⁹ Kelly, *Peter and Jude*, 98, says of 1 Pet. 2:9, “The emphasis is not on the role of Christians as individuals but as a corporate body.” D. Hill, in the passage quoted, may be implying likewise concerning Matt. 28:19-20, especially since he states that “the disciples” (v. 16) are “representative of the Church” (*Matthew*, 361).

¹⁴⁰ Under ordinary circumstances at least, all Christians are to acknowledge Christ before men (Matt. 10:32-33), and perhaps even be prepared to give a reason for the hope they have (1 Pet. 3:15), but there is no biblical reason to suggest that every Christian should be an evangelist.

¹⁴¹ Cf. North, *The Second Isaiah*, 241.

¹⁴² See G. von Rad, TDNT, 2:848; 5:508; W. Grundmann, TDNT, 7:780; Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*, 158, 360; Kirkpatrick, *Psalms*, 77, 273-74, 437-38.

¹⁴³ Cf. H.H. Rowley, *Job*, Revised Edition (Greenwood, S.C.: Attic, 1978) 139-40.

¹⁴⁴ See John 5:28-29; J. Jermaias, TDNT, 6:536-7, 541.

¹⁴⁵ Kelly, *Peter and Jude*, 310

¹⁴⁶ We have omitted reference to the question of a millennial reign of Christ following the present age and preceding the time of the new heaven and the new earth. If there is such a period, it is an intermediate stage between the present stage of the kingdom and the eternal stage thereof.

¹⁴⁷ The judgment of individuals is taught in 2 Cor 5:10; Matth. 16:25-27

¹⁴⁸ According to Cranfield, *Romans*, 206, “The use of the past tense here is significant and suggestive. In a real sense, of course, their glory is still in the future...But their glorification has already been foreordained by God...Moreover, Christ, in whose destiny their destiny is included, has already been glorified, so that in Him their glorification has already been accomplished.”

¹⁴⁹ In our view Kelly, *Peter and Jude*, 89, does not do justice to “stones,” when he says in this connection, “His (the author of 1 Peter) conception of the Christian life is through and through corporate, not individualistic.” In my view his conception is both, though corporateness is emphasized.

Biblical Ethics

The late John V. Dahms

Professor Emeritus in New Testament, Canadian Theological Seminary

Published in Global Missiology, Trinitarian Studies, October 2004, www.globalmissiology.net

Chapter V

A study of biblical ethics involves consideration of:

- (1) Ethical prescriptions in the Scriptures.
- (2) Violations of ethical prescriptions which are condoned and/or commended.
- (3) The basis of ethical judgments according to the Scriptures.

Ethical Prescriptions

From the very beginning of the Scriptures as they have come down to us, ethical prescriptions play a prominent part. In the earliest chapters (Gen 1-Exod 19) such prescriptions are largely presupposed (e.g., Gen 4:10-11; 6:5-11; 18:25; 39:7-12), and the articulation of specific injunctions is rare (see Gen 1 :28 [?]; 9:5; cf. 26:25).¹

Beginning with Exod 20, however, the situation changes. In the legislation attributed to Moses there is a great deal of specific instruction concerning ethics, together with prescriptions concerning the religious life and civic responsibilities. The Decalogue (Exod 20:2-17; Deut 5:6-21), which in its latter portion is concerned with ethics, is pre-eminent in this Mosaic law. Not only is this evident in the pride of place accorded it both in the Sinaitic and in the Deuteronomic prescriptions, but also in the references to the "Ten Commandments" in Exod 34:28; Deut 4:13; 10:4 (cf. Exod 24:12; 31:18; 32:15; 34:1-4; Deut 9:9-10:3). But ethical injunctions are also prominent in the Covenant Code (Exod 20:22- 23:33), in the Holiness Code (Lev 17-26 or 18-26)², and in the regulations of Deut 12-28.

In the rest of the Old Testament there are sections in which the Law is not specifically mentioned, or only rarely so. This is especially true of the Wisdom literature.³ Nevertheless it has been affirmed that "often the Wisdom writers merely cast into an aphoristic or poetic form what had been part of the apodictic or case laws of the Pentateuch."⁴ And in none of the literature is there any intimation that the law has been abrogated or replaced either in whole or in part. Indeed, there is emphasis from time to time on doing what Moses commanded.⁵ And even when Jeremiah prophesies a new covenant, he does not think of it as implying a change in the law, but rather, "I [the Lord] will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts" (Jer 31 :33; cf. 24:7; 32:39). Likewise Ezekiel represents God as promising Israel a future when "I will give them on heart, and put a new spirit within them. ...so that they may follow my statutes and keep my ordinances and obey them" (11:19-20; cf. 36:27; 37:24).

Old Testament ethics emphasizes the law and conformity thereto.

With respect to New Testament ethics there is much debate. There are those who hold that the law has been abrogated or superseded, at least in the thought of Paul. We submit that such a view is untenable, at least insofar as the ethical prescriptions of the Decalogue are concerned. There are two passages in which the issue, or a closely related one, is specifically addressed, and in both of them the continuing validity of the law is insisted upon.

The first of these passages is Matt 5: 17 -19:

Do not think that I have come to abolish the law or the prophets: I have come not to abolish but to fulfill. For truly I tell you, until heaven and earth pass away, not one letter, not one stroke of a letter, will pass from the law until all is accomplished. ..Whoever breaks one of the least of these commandments, and teaches others to do the same, will be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whoever does them and teaches them shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.⁶

The abiding validity of the law, at least insofar as the ethical prescriptions of the Decalogue are concerned, is clearly a Matthaean emphasis. Nor do the "but I say unto you" statements of Matt 5:21-48 mean that the respective commandments are abrogated. ..In none of these passages is there an intention to annul the demands of the Law, but only to carry them to their ultimate meaning, to intensify them, or to interpret them in a higher key. This is the true fulfillment of Law, not its destruction."⁷ Indeed, if Matt 5:21-48 means the annulment of any of the respective demands of the law, either it or the preceding passage (5:17- 20) teaches false doctrine.

The other New Testament passage which has direct implications for our study is in Rom 7:7 ff., which begins with, "What then should we say? That the law is sin? By no means!" and concludes with, "So the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good."⁸ Moreover, in the immediately succeeding material Paul says, "The law is spiritual" (7:14); it is "the law of God" (7:22, 25); "The just requirement of the law (is to be) fulfilled in us" (8:4; cf. 13:8-10); and, "The mind that is set on the flesh. ..does not submit to God's law" (8:7). It is to be emphasized that what Paul states in this section of Romans is because he is aware that what he has said (in 5:20 perhaps; in 7:4-6 certainly) may be construed as an attack on the law, and he wants to ensure that no such conclusion is drawn. He wants it known that the law continues to be in force and is to be heeded by Christians.⁹

It may be argued that this is not all that Paul has to say about the continuing validity of the law. Agreed. Indeed, at a later point the Epistle to the Galatians will be considered with respect to this Question. At this point it is only noted that in Rom 7-8 it is insisted that at least the moral injunctions of the Mosaic legislation have not been abrogated for Christians, whether Jew or Gentile.¹⁰

But quite apart from the continuing validity of the law's prescriptions concerning moral conduct, there is considerable evidence that rules concerning such conduct were imposed in the New Testament church.

First of all, there are the list of vices against which Christians are warned. Moreover, many of the prohibitions in respect thereto are reminiscent of prohibitions in the Mosaic law. We quote only two of these lists:

Evil intentions. ..fornication, theft, murder, adultery, avarice, wickedness, deceit, licentiousness, envy, slander, pride, folly (Mark 7:21-22; cf. Matt 15:19).

Fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, male prostitutes, sodomites, thieves, the greedy, drunkards, revilers, robbers—none of these will inherit the kingdom of God (1 Cor 6:9-10). That conduct in clear violation of such standards was taken in full seriousness is evident from the directive that the immoral man of 1 Cor 5 be excommunicated (1 Cor 5:13).

In addition to such lists we have instructions concerning relationships within the household (Eph 5:22-6:9; Col 3:18-4:1; 1 Pet 2:18-3:7), and toward the governing authorities (Mark 12:17; Rom 13:1-7; 1 Pet 2:13-17), as well as with respect to a variety of other matters having to do with moral conduct.

Rules, regulations, commandments and prescriptions concerning moral life and conduct are to be found in every part of the Scriptures, at least by implication. It is not surprising, therefore, that W. D. Davies has stated, "Here is the peculiarity of Christian moral teaching: that it places us ..under the judgment of absolute demands."¹ And if rules, regulations, commandments, and such like, exhausted the evidence concerning biblical ethics, no more would need to be said. But, as Davies points out, more does need to be said, and what follows indicates why.

Violations of the Prescribed Rules

Violation of the prescriptions concerning moral life and conduct articulated or implied in the Scriptures is sometimes condoned, even approved, in those same Scriptures. Some examples follow: .Genesis 22:1-2

"God tested Abraham. ..He said, 'Take your son, your only son Isaac. ..and offer him. ..as a burnt offering. ..'" With a view to testing him God leads Abraham to believe that He desires the sacrifice of his son. Did God really desire the sacrifice of Isaac? The sequel indicates that He did not. But did God lead Abraham to believe that He desired such a sacrifice? Of course He did. In fact He would not have been able to thoroughly test Abraham otherwise. Hence the deception! God is neither an idealist nor a rationalist! Exodus 3:t8

"You and the elders of Israel shall go to the king of Egypt, and say to him, 'The Lord, the God of the Hebrews, has met with us;, let us now go a three days' journey into the wilderness, so that we may sacrifice to the Lord our God'" (Cf. 5:1-3; 8:25-26; 10:9-10). God is represented as instructing Moses to give another reason than the real one for desiring permission for his people to leave Egypt.

Another deception is involved. In fact God also said, "I know. .. that the king of Egypt will not let you go unless compelled by a mighty hand. So I will stretch out my hand and strike Egypt with all my wonders that I will perform in it; after that he will let you go"(19-20)

To Pharaoh and the Egyptians the deception was important, because they would have to learn that Yahweh was the Lord (Exod 7:5; 14:4, 17 -18). As such He has control of the universe, and of what takes place within it, including what would happen if Pharaoh rejected the opportunity to let the Israelites depart from Egypt. (Human freedom does not affect His control of human events, whatever some philosophers may think and teach.)

1 Samuel 16:1:2.

"The Lord said to Samuel'. ..Fill your horn with oil, and set out, I will send you to Jesse the Bethlehemite, for I have provided for myself a king among his sons.' Samuel said, 'How can I go? If Saul hears of it, he will kill me.' And the Lord said, 'Take a heifer with you, and say, 'I have come to sacrifice to the Lord.'""

Some have argued that Samuel did offer sacrifice at Bethlehem, so that no lie was involved. But a lie is not merely a formal statement of the truth. It is anything that involves the intent to deceive. But was it so urgent that Saul's successor be named and anointed at this early date that a deception was justified? That "the spirit of the Lord came mightily upon David from that day forward" (1 Sam 16:13) may indicate that it should not be delayed and that the deceiving of Saul was there- fore warranted.

1 Kings 22:20-23 (2 Chronicles 18: 19-22)

"The Lord said, 'Who will entice Ahab, so that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-Gilead?' ...A spirit came forward and stood before the Lord, saying, 'I will entice him. ...I will go out and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets.' Then the Lord said, 'You are to entice him, and you shall succeed; go out and do it.' So you see, the Lord has put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these, your prophets. ..."2

The Lord led Ahab to judgment by means of the lying spirit in the mouths of Ahab's prophets. God's judgments are not in accord with idealist ethics. Cf. Rom 3:5-6, "What should we say? That God is unjust to inflict wrath on us? ...By no means! For then how could God judge the world?"

Imprecatory Psalms and Prophecies (Ps 35,59, 109,137, 140, etc.; cf. Jer 7:16; 11 ;14; 14:11-12; 18:21-23; 20:12)

The most startling of these imprecations include Ps 137:8-9 "Happy shall they be who pay you back what you have done to us! Happy shall they be who take your little ones and dash them against the rock!"; and Ps 140:9-10. "Those who surround me lift up their heads: let the mischief of their lips overwhelm them! Let burning coals fall on them! Let them be flung into pits no more to rise" Cf. Jer 18:21, 23, "Give their children over to famine; hurl them out to the power of the sword. ...Do not forgive their iniquity, do not blot out their sin from your sight. ...Deal with them while you are angry."

Can such expressions be harmonized with Prov 24:17, "Do not rejoice when your enemies fall, and do not let your heart be glad when they stumble"; Prov 25:21, "If your enemies are hungry, give them bread to eat, and if they are thirsty, give them water to drink"; and Matt 5:44-45, "Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be children of your Father in heaven. ..." (Luke 6:27-28; Rom 12:20). Cf. Jesus' lament over Jerusalem because of its impending destruction (Matt 23:37-38; Luke 13:34-35).

Consider the following comments:

- (1) Most of the imprecatory Psalms are credited to David. If they are by David, they simply show that he was not always free from a spirit of vindictiveness and a desire to get even.
- (2) Imprecatory material is not absent from the New Testament, e.g. Gal 5:12; 2 Tim 4:14; Rev 6:10.
- (3) The harshness of some of the expressions cited are indicative of the great plight in which God's people sometimes find themselves, and of their longing for retribution to be visited on those who are the cause of it.
- (4) Can it be that we must recognize that entire sanctification must await the establishment of God's kingdom in all its fullness? Jeremiah 4:10

"Then I said, 'Ah, Lord God, how utterly you have deceived this people and Jerusalem, saying, 'It shall be well with you,' even while the sword is at the throat."

One wonders whether we do not have here reported a situation similar to that of Deut 13, where we are told that God may test people through false prophets who encourage them to trust in what is false, to see whether they would still be loyal to the God who had proved Himself in times past. (cf. Deut 13:5).

Matthew 12:3-5 (cf. Mark 2:25-26; Luke 6:3-4).

"Have you not read what David did, when he and his companions were hungry? He entered the house of God and ate the bread of the Presence, which it was not lawful for him or his companions to eat, but only for the priests. Or have you not read in the law that on the Sabbath the priests in the temple break the Sabbath and yet are guiltless?"

The point Jesus is making is that David violated the only relevant prescription there was, but was guiltless. Moreover He is making the point that the disciples might be justified in profaning the Sabbath, even though what they had done was not in accord with what had been prescribed.

Jesus is saying that it might be possible to disobey what God's word had prescribed and be guiltless. A lesser law may be infringed in order to fulfill a higher law! One is guiltless who does so.

Matthew 23:15. 17:

"You make the new convert twice as much a child of hell as yourselves. . . You blind fools (moroi kai tuphloi)!" (cf. Matt 23:17; Acts 13: 10; Gal 3: 1). Such statements seemingly contradict Matt 5:22, "If you insult a brother or sister, you will be liable to the council, and if you say, 'You fool (more)!' you will be liable to the hell of fire."

If it be suggested that Matt 5:22 only relates to conduct towards fellow disciples, the exhortation to love our enemies (Matt 5:44) seems to suggest otherwise, to say nothing of Luke 6:28, "Bless those who curse you"; and Rom 12:14, "Bless those who persecute you; bless and do not curse them." According to J. L. Houlden, "He [Jesus] hardly maintains this attitude when he confronts the scribes and Pharisees in ch. xxiii; nor, in his picture of final judgment does he show God acting in accord with this principle. . ."³

Galatians 1:20 (cf. Matt 26:63-64; Rom 1:9; 2 Cor 1:23; Heb 6:13-17)

"Before God, I do not lie."

The significance of this statement, and of others like it, is because of Matt 5:34-37, "I say to you. Do not swear at all. . .Let your word be 'Yes, Yes' or 'No, No'; anything more than this comes from the evil one" (cf. Jas 5:12).

The absoluteness of this statement, and of Jas 5: 12, is notable. But evidently neither Paul nor Jesus is an absolutist as the scriptures cited indicate. Both of them recognize that absolute statements may have relative meanings and need to be understood accordingly.
Romans 3:24-25

"Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as a sacrifice of atonement by blood." This statement is important for us in view of such passages as John 5:20, "The Father loves the Son."

Many writers discuss Christ's sacrificial death in relation to God's love for us and His justice in relation to us, but there is little discussion of Christ's death in relation to God's love for Him and His justice to Him. The plain fact is that sending His Son to die for us was contrary to His love for His Son. Who would justify a human father's sacrifice of his son to rescue a butterfly? How much more difficult to justify the Father's sacrifice of His Son so that He might be the Saviour of the world! It is surely thoughtlessness, if not overweening pride, which keeps us from being aware of the problem. In comparison with the life of His Son the universe, and all that has ever

been in it plus all that will ever be in it, is of infinitesimal value. In view of the centrality of the cross in Christian conviction, the implications for ethics are important, even if rarely explored.¹⁴

Such passages as those we have considered require the conclusion that exceptions to what appear to be absolute rules of conduct are sometimes permitted, even commanded. The rules appear to be absolute, but are not. They express only what is generally and ordinarily required.

The apostle Paul did not consider commandments concerning ethics to be absolute, at least for Christians. According to Rom 7:6, he states, "Now we are discharged from the law, dead to that which held us captive, so that we are slaves not under the old written code (lit. 'not in [the] oldness of [the] letter') but in the new life (lit. 'newness') of the Spirit." On this verse C. E. B. Cranfield comments:

The believer's service is characterized, not by the lifeless effectness of the mere letter, which is what the legalist is left with by his misunderstanding and misuse of the law. ..That Paul is not opposing the law itself to the Spirit is clear, since only a few verses later he affirms that the law is spiritual (v. 14). He does not use 'letter' as equivalent to 'law' ...[The] presence [of the Spirit] is the true establishment of the law. ..¹⁵

We understand Cranfield to be arguing that Rom 7:6 means that the law continues to be of import for Christians, but that its requirements are not absolutes. We submit that only such an interpretation makes it possible to harmonize Rom 7:6 with what follows in Romans.

With this passage we may compare Gal 3:23-4:7:

Now before faith came, we were imprisoned and guarded under the law until faith would be revealed. Therefore the law was our disciplinarian until Christ came. ..But now that faith has come, we are no longer subject to a disciplinarian. ..Heirs, as long as they are minors, are no better than slaves. They remain under guardians and trustees. ..So with us; while we were minors, we were enslaved. ..But. .. God sent His Son. ..to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as children ...So. ..you are no longer a slave but a child. (Cf. Gal 5:1, "For freedom Christ has set us free; stand firm, therefore, and do not submit again to a yoke of slavery.") Gal 3:23-4:7, if taken by itself, seems to imply that the law has no significance for the conduct of Christians. And in his discussion of this passage R. N. Longenecker states, "In Christ the Christian finds. ..the Law as a system of conduct set aside in favor of guidance by reference to his [Christ's] teachings and example and through the direct action of his Spirit."¹⁶ But such an interpretation seems to be untenable in view of the statement a bit later, in Gal 5:14, "The whole law is summed up in a single commandment, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself'" (cf. Gal 5:23; 1 Cor 7:19). The law is to be fulfilled (cf. Rom 13:8-10)! Surely this means that Gal 3:23-4:7 is not to be understood as implying the abrogation, supersession, setting aside, or replacement of the law? Rather, the relationship to the law is to be like the worthy relationship of a freed slave or a matured son to the fine standard previously imposed by a good slave- master or guardian. He does not disregard it, but applies its precepts perceptively and sensitively to practical situations, which means, of course, that he is aware that a rigid application thereof is sometimes inappropriate. The law is respected but the legalistic fulfillment of its commandments is no longer necessary.¹⁷

These passages-Rom 7 and Gal 3-5-seem to suggest that prior to the coming of Christ the legalistic observance of the law was right and proper. But, if so, the Old Testament exceptions we have considered are a problem. Is it possible that in the practical situation he is addressing Paul - in Semitic fashion - uses absolutist language when a relative meaning is intended? Might he not agree that the Old Testament does not require a completely legalistic observance of the law? (A child may have a measure of freedom from doing precisely what he/she is told, but later

be entirely free from such precision.) At any rate, in Paul's mind Christians are free from a legalistic observance of the law.

Before concluding this section we add two considerations which, strictly speaking, may be irrelevant to a study of biblical ethics:

(a) The view that a set of ethical prescriptions has been, or can be devised, which must be adhered to without exception, implies that circumstances have nothing to do with one's decision concerning right and wrong, and this means that history is really meaningless. In this connection it is to be noted that it was precisely because He foresaw the circumstances of human fallenness and lostness that it was right for the Father to include in His plan for His Son that He should become an atoning sacrifice. As we have seen, this was not in accord with His love for His Son.

(b) There can be only one absolute in any given universe of discourse. If there are two so-called absolutes, there is really no absolute, because the "absolutes" condition each other, and that which is conditioned is not a absolute. This means that there can be only one ethical absolute, or else that there is ultimately no difference between the various "absolutes. "If, for the sake of argument, we grant that, "You shall not commit adultery" (Exod 20:14), and, "Let all of us speak the truth to our neighbors" (Eph 4:25), are both absolutes, we must also say that ultimately there is no difference between adultery and lying. But such a conclusion will be acceptable to few.

It is because ethical prescriptions, with only one possible exception, do not give expression to absolute requirements, that we can accommodate such Scriptures as we have considered in this section of the paper. And not only can they be accommodated, they are to be expected. "Perfection" not only allows deviation from almost all prescriptions; it positively requires it in some circumstances. God Himself exhibits His perfection, not by functioning according to a formal rule with absolute consistency, but by deviation therefrom in certain situations. As far as the biblical record goes, circumstances due to sin and its curse appear to provide the chief occasion for deviation from ethical rules. Indeed, it was human sin and its curse which occasioned the sending of God's Son to be a sacrifice, which, as we have seen, does not logically fit either His love for His Son or His justice to Him. However, it is not only sin, and/or its curse, which occasioned deviation from what is logical. That God sometimes functions illogically, even when the circumstances of sin, and/or its effects, are not in view, accords with the fact that, though He is essentially infinite, He exists as ~ persons, a finite number! Both logic and that which deviates therefrom characterize Him from all eternity. Conduct in accord with what is logical would have implied that He beget only one Son, or that He beget an infinite number of sons

The Unity of Prescriptions and Exceptions Thereto

Implicit in what we have stated is the understanding that God-given prescriptions with respect to ethics should ordinarily determine conduct. But how does one determine when deviation therefrom is not only permissible, but even required? In other words, when is deviation sin, and when is it commendable?

As already indicated, logic does not help us here. Logic would simply require that what has been prescribed must be adhered to always and absolutely. There is no logic by which one can get from God's love for His Son to the sacrifice of His Son. There is no logic by which one can get from the rule against lying to the divine instruction to Samuel to deceive Saul concerning his travel to Bethlehem. There is no logic by which one can get from the prohibition against the swearing of oaths to Paul's use of an oath in Gal 1:20, or to God's swearing with an oath. Logic

requires the condemnation of Samuel, of Paul, and, yes, of God. (If it is always wrong for a human being to swear an oath, it is always wrong for God to do so. A God who would require of us the kind of moral conduct which He did not abide by might be feared, perhaps even loved, but He could not be respected by a thinking person.)

A hierarchical view may help us sometimes. It would be commonly agreed that the saving of a child from a burning building must have priority over the saving of a pet dog. This accords with Jesus' principle that a person is "of more value than many sparrows" (Matt 10:31; Luke 12:7). But there is no hierarchical principle which justifies the sacrifice of Christ. Indeed, by the principle of hierarchy the Father's sending of the Son to become a sacrifice for us must be condemned as preferring that which is of lesser value to that which is of vastly greater value (the life of the Son of God). Moreover, there is no hierarchical principle to justify David's eating of the bread of the Presence. The attempt to do so would be similar to an attempt to compare apples and oranges. (There is no evidence that the lives of David and his men were in jeopardy, but, even if they were, there is no hierarchical principle by which to judge that human life is more important than the worship of God in the way He has prescribed.) Furthermore, there is no hierarchical principle by which Paul's oath in Gal 1:20 can be justified.¹⁸

It is sometimes affirmed that the "fallenness and degeneration of human society" means that we may have to choose between evils. In such cases it is proper to choose the lesser evil. P. E. Hughes argues for such a view, finding biblical warrant for it in Jos 2; Matt 12:3-4; 14:1-12; 19:3-9.¹⁹ The problems of such a view are the same as those of the hierarchical view. In addition it is assumed that it is only because of the fallenness of man that there are logical problems with respect to ethics. But, as we have shown, the very nature of God includes what is illogical. Moreover, the scandal of particularity is not solely due to the fallenness of human society. The ethical implications, if we are to be like God (Matt 5:45, 48; Eph 5:1; 1 Pet 1:15; etc.) are significant.

The Bible indicates, however, that there is a way by which certain deviations from biblical standards and prescriptions are justified. (No doubt we shall not see how every biblical deviation is justified, but, being finite, let alone being incompletely sanctified, we can hardly expect otherwise.) The following passages are significant in this respect:
Matthew 22:48

"On (en) these two commandments (love to God and love to neighbor) hang (krematai) all the law and the prophets" (cf. Matt 7:12).²⁰

It is to be noted first of all with respect to this verse that love is basically an aesthetic matter. There are those who hold that love is primarily a matter of the will rather than a matter of feeling,²¹ but this view is not based on a careful study of biblical usage.

G. Quell asserts, "Love ('hb) in the OT is basically a spontaneous feeling."²² And with respect to agapē in the Septuagint, V. P. Furnish notes, "lit usually refers to the conjugal love between man and women,"²³ And whatever may be said about the concept being invested with new meaning in the New Testament,²⁴ the connotation is still fundamentally that of "affection." John 3:16 represents God's gift of His Son, not as love, but as the result of love. Likewise Rom 5:8 represents Christ's death for us, not as the love of God, but as the manifestation of that love. Love is not primarily a matter of will or act. As Bauer's Lexicon, Second Edition Revised and Augmented by F. W. Gingrich and F. W. Danker, states, "the primary New Testament meaning is that of 'affection for person.'" Indeed, V. P. Furnish argues that even love (agapate) for enemies (Matt 5:44) may include "something like 'friendship' or 'affection.'"²⁵

The next point to be made is that Matt 22:40 does not imply that the many commandments in the law and the prophets are reduced to, or superseded by, or included in, or can be derived from, the two great commandments.²⁶ The Septuagint occurrences of Kremamai en (2 Sam 18:9; Lam 5:12; Ezek 17:22-23; 27:10) do not permit such a meaning.²⁷ 2 Sam 18:9; LXX, which describes Absalom's head as hanging in an oak tree, suggests some such meaning as that the many commandments are held fast by the two.²⁸ In accord with such a meaning various scholars affirm that "the dual love commandment is viewed. ..as the primary hermeneutical principle for interpreting and applying the law."²⁹ Note concerning this view: (a) The priority of the law if maintained; it is not superseded; it is not replaced; it is not subordinated to love (b) Love is described as a principle of interpretation and application. If this understanding is correct, we have here specified an aesthetic basis for determining how the respective commandment or commandments is (are) to be applied to the particular situation(s) in which one finds oneself.

Romans 13:8-10

Rom 13:8-10 (cf. Gal 5:14) provides support for our contention concerning Matt 22:40:

One who loves another has fulfilled (pepl?rōken) the law. The commandments, "You shall not commit adultery; You shall not murder; You shall not steal; You shall not covet"; and any other commandment, are summed up in (en. ..anakephalaioutai) this word, "Love your neighbor as yourself. Love does no wrong to a neighbor; therefore, love is the fulfilling of the law. In this passage we not only have it stated that love is the fulfilling of the law,³⁰ but the reason why this is so is indicated in vv. 9 (gar) and 10a

V. 9. states that the various commandments of (the) law are anakephalaioutai in the one command, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself." What is being said turns on the meaning of anakephalaioutai. Is it being stated that the prescriptions of the law are "summarized" or "epitomized" in the command to love the neighbor, as the above rendering may indicate?³¹ It appears that this interpretation cannot be accepted for the following reasons: (a) How can a feeling summarize or epitomize commandments which are largely injunctions concerning conduct? Indeed, as E. W. Lutzer has pointed out, "There is widespread disagreement as to what actions are loving or unloving."³² (b) In his writings Paul repeatedly includes particular prescriptions concerning conduct. As much as he emphasizes love, he does not think it sufficient to enjoin it.³³ In 1 Cor 7:19 Paul thinks it necessary to say, "Neither circumcision counts for anything, nor uncircumcision, but obeying the commandments of God is everything." Apparently Paul never thought of love for neighbor as summarizing or epitomizing the commandments of (the) law.

Anakephalaioomai is a rare word, and even then has more than one connotation in secular Greek.³⁴ Its only other New Testament occurrence is in Eph 1 :10, where we are informed that it is the divine will to anakephalaioomai all things en him" (En is also used with this verb in Rom 13:9). Here it cannot mean that Christ is to become the sum total or epitome of all things, since just a few verses later, in 1 :22, He is spoken of as "head over (kephal?n huper) all things. .." (cf. Eph 4:15-16). What it seems to mean is well stated in NIV, "to bring. ..together under one head," if it is understood that "head" means control and rule, as in Eph 1 :22; 5:22-23.³⁵

If this is more or less the meaning of anakephalaioomai in Rom 13:9, Paul is to be understood as saying therein: Love for the persons involved is to prevail in each situation and is to control the way in which the respective commandments are applied in that situation, mediating between commandments where that may be necessary.³⁶ And, since love of neighbor eventuates in action of this kind, it fulfills the law, whose purpose is to prevent evil being done to others.³⁷ (Paul

perceives that it is the love of neighbor which so interprets and applies the various commandments that this purpose of the law is fulfilled.)

But if this is so, the aesthetic sensitivity which enables those who know the commandments to distinguish right from wrong in particular situations is sensitivity informed by love for the persons involved.³⁸

Philippians 1:9-10

This is my prayer, that your love may overflow more and more, with knowledge and full insight (en epignōsei kai pas? aisth?sei), to help you to determine what is best, so that in the day of Christ you may be pure and blameless, having produced the harvest of righteousness. .. In these verses "love," "knowledge" and "full insight" are set forth as pre-requisites "so that you may determine what is best." Loh and Nida agree that the meaning is, "so that you will be able to choose what is best to do, (or) ...how you should best behave."³⁹

The meaning of love (agap?) has been considered above. Passing over "knowledge" for the moment, the meaning of aisthesis is perhaps best illuminated by what W. Jaeger has to say about its occurrence in a medical text of the Hippocratic school:

The real doctor is recognized by his power to estimate what is appropriate for each individual case. He is the man who has the sure judgment to pick the right quantity for everyone. There is no standard of weight or measure by which one could fix quantities on a general basis. That must be done wholly by feeling (aisth?sis), which is the only thing that can compensate for the lack of such a rational standard.⁴⁰

Note that what makes up for lack of "a rational standard" is "feeling." Moreover, this "is the only thing that can compensate for the lack of such a rational standard."⁴¹

According to G. Delling, the original meaning of aisth?sis is that of "sensual perception," as opposed to intellectual perception, and "in Philo's use of the term. ..in general it is regarded. ..as the cause of passions. ..It is often opposed to nous (mind)."⁴² W. Hendriksen has apparently caught its significance in Phil 1:9 as well as anyone, when he describes it as "the taste and feeling for that which in any concrete situation is spiritually beautiful, the aesthetic sense in the sphere of Christian duty and doctrine."⁴³

With respect to "knowledge," according to R. Bultmann, "We must insist on the difference between aisth?sis as sensual perception and gnōsis which is acquired through ginōskein as knowledge deriving from the nous or logos."⁴⁴ Moreover, Bultmann affirms that "epignōsis in Phil. 1:9 has exactly the same meaning as gnōsis in 1 C. 1:5; R. 15:14."⁴⁵

Having considered the key terms, the relationship of knowledge and aesthetic judgment to love, as indicated by the preposition en in Phil 1:9, must be examined. The relationship seems to be as follows.⁴⁶ Knowledge and all aisth?sis are to accompany love. What leads to this judgment is the occurrence of "All (pas? [i])" before aisth?sei. This adjective does not occur with epignōsei. If love were something other than a matter of aisth?sis, one would not expect this adjective. It appears that the adjective occurs because love is a matter of aisth?sis, but does not exhaust it, and Paul wants to indicate the significance of feeling(s) other than love in making judgments, while maintaining (a) the supremacy of I love, and (b) the unity of the aesthetic sense(s) (hence we do not have aisth?sis in the plural). Finally, it may be that the occurrence of aisth?t?ria (plural!) in Heb 5: 14, which we shall be considering shortly, may be evidence that aesthetic sensitivity cannot be reduced to one simple feeling. It may also be significant that in Gal 5:22 the fruit (karpos) [singular!] of the Spirit is "love, joy, peace" (three!, with love in first place⁴⁷). If

so, Phil 1:9-10 is more comprehensive with respect to the significance of aesthetics in relation to ethics than is the case in Matt 22:40 or Rom 13:8-10.

If this exegesis is sound, both information (of scriptural commandments?) and the aesthetic faculty (or aesthetic faculties) in which love is of supreme moment, are important if one is to "determine what is best," and "be pure and blameless." And we shall see reason to believe that both are in view in Heb 5:14, though without mention of love. It will have been noted, of course, that the importance of aesthetic judgment is always in connection with practical and concrete situations, no doubt because of the particularity which often (always?) characterizes them.⁴⁸ Heb 5:14

According to this verse, "mature" Christians are those "whose faculties (aisthētia) have been trained by practice to distinguish good from evil."

According to the context those for whom Hebrews was written in the first place had been informed concerning "the basic elements of the oracles of God" (though they needed to be taught them again), and that those elementary truths included "repentance from acts that lead to death" (6:1 NIV, so that they must have been more or less familiar with moral prescriptions. (Of course, being converted Jews they would have had some familiarity with the prescriptions of the Mosaic law.)

It is indicated, however, that their aisthētia needed training by practice, if they were to distinguish between good and evil (apparently in practical situations). As we have seen, aisthēsis, a cognate of aisthētion, refers to aesthetic sensibility. Accordingly, the aistheteria constitute the aesthetic faculty (or faculties?).⁴⁹ In this connection, and supportive thereof, is the information that these aisthētia are trained (gegumnasmena) by practice (hexin) to distinguish good from evil." Aesthetic judgment is improved in this way.⁵⁰

That aisthētia is plural accords with the plurality with respect to aesthetics which was noted in the discussion of Phil 1:9. On the other hand, there is no specific reference to love, which is prominent with respect to ethics elsewhere in the New Testament.⁵¹ Apart from this omission, the same two essentials as we saw in Phil 1:9 are necessary if one is to discern what one ought to do (in particular circumstances?).⁵²

Wisdom

Both Old and New Testaments emphasize that God's people need wisdom so that their conduct in practical situations and circumstances may accord with His will and be fully pleasing to him" (cf. Col 1:9-10).

To have this wisdom one must have the knowledge of His word. Indeed, it sometimes appears as if "the wisdom of God" and "the word of God" are used synonymously (e.g., Wisd 9:1; Philo, Leg. Alleg., 1.65; Sir 24:3 compared with Is 55:11). But to be wise requires more than knowledge. G. Fohrer says that wisdom as represented in the Old Testament "can arise out of a feeling for the right thing which is fostered by traditional knowledge, education and personal experience."⁵³

That it "can arise out of a feeling for the right thing" accords with Phil 1:9 and Heb 5:14, where we are informed that aisthēsis and aisthētia enable one to "approve what is excellent" and "distinguish good from evil." That wisdom is fostered by "traditional knowledge" and "education" accords with the emphasis on "knowledge" in Phil 1:9, and on "the first principles of God's word" in Heb 5:12. The emphasis on "experience" accords with the importance of being "trained by practice to distinguish good from evil" (Heb 5:14). And it is to be noted that Phil 1:9-10 is more or less parallel to Col 1:9-10, which speaks of the need to be "filled with the

knowledge of his will in (Gr.: en.; NIV: through) all spiritual wisdom and understanding, to lead a life worthy of the Lord, fully pleasing to him." "Wisdom" here appears to be the counterpart of *aisthēsei* in Phil 1:9. Fohrer's statement concerning the meaning of wisdom in the Old Testament could also be said of the understanding thereof in Phil 1:9

This means that, when Colossians emphasizes wisdom as necessary for commendable Christian conduct (cf. Rom 16:19; Eph 5:15; Col 1:28; 4:5; Jas 1:5), it is implied that aesthetic sensitivity is one of the necessary components in worthy moral decision-making.

In this section attention has been drawn to New Testament evidence which has made it clear that aesthetic judgment (in which love plays the most important part) is important if one is to perceive how the commandments of God ought to be applied in the practical situations of life.⁵⁴ B. S. Childs has asserted:

At no point within the Bible is there ever spelled out a system or a technique by which one could move from the general imperatives of the law of God, such as [are] found in the Decalogue, to the specific application with- in the concrete situation.⁵⁵

If he had understood the biblical evidence we have examined in this section, Childs would have had to radically modify his statement. A "system" or "technique" is not provided, but what is required to make the move is clearly set forth.

Before concluding this section, we consider the objection that the aesthetic judgments of different people often do not agree. This is not surprising, since the aesthetic sense(s) does (do) not function well as a result of the Fall, as is the case with every other component of man's being. There are, however, the following considerations to be kept in mind:

(a) There is no other way to justify the sacrifice of Christ. Every attempt to justify it otherwise either overlooks an important consideration, or proves inadequate when carefully scrutinized.

(b) To a considerable degree there is agreement as to what is aesthetically pleasing. Almost everyone agrees that a rose is beautiful. Almost everyone also agrees that roadside garbage, or a suppurating ulcer, is repulsive.

(c) Being aware that our aesthetic judgments may be distorted means that we must often (always?) make ethical decisions with fear and trembling, lest we fail to abide by the respective commandment when we ought to do so, or fail to deviate from it when we ought to do that. (According to Phil 2:12, we are to work out our salvation with fear and trembling. Moreover, this is said in relation to willing and doing, therefore in a context which includes ethical decisions and actions.)⁵⁶

(d) The view presented makes prayer and the Holy Spirit important, not only so that we may have the moral fibre we need in order to do what we ought to do, but also so that we may know what we ought to do. So we need to pray for wisdom (Jas 1:5), and to have our minds "set on the Spirit" (Rom 8:6). That the fruit of the Spirit is first of all "love, joy peace" (Gal 5:22) seems to imply that a mind set on the Spirit is a mind informed by the Spirit-inspired aesthetic sense(s). (In the light of Heb 5:14, is it not to be added that, as we walk in the Spirit, our aesthetic sensitivities become more and more reliable?)

In conclusion it may be noted that there are three components involved in worthy decision-making:

(a) Knowledge of the ethical prescriptions of the Holy Scriptures, and of their logical implications.

(b) Familiarity with the peculiarities of the particular circumstances in which one must make moral decisions.

(c) Aesthetic sensitivity whereby one may distinguish those occasions when there should be deviation from the ethical prescriptions set forth in the Bible, love being foremost in informing that sensitivity.

Finally, it is to be noted that the ethical prescriptions of the Holy Scriptures correspond to the Father; the existential considerations to be taken into account correspond to the Son; and aesthetic sensitivity corresponds to the Holy Spirit. Biblical ethics, like biblical apologetics and the biblical conception of truth, may be described as Trinitarian!

ADDENDUM: "FIRST AND GREATEST" COMMANDMENTS

In view of the thesis which has been advanced, what did Jesus mean by calling the love commandments the first and greatest of the commandments (Matt 22:38; Mark 12:29-31)?

Worthy response to this question requires that the relationship between love and justice be considered. There are four possibilities:

(a) Love and justice are ultimately one and the same.⁵⁷ But only pantheism (or some other kind of monism) can accommodate such a view.

(b) Love and justice have equal standing, neither is more basic than the other. But only an ultimate dualism can accommodate such a view, to say nothing of the fact that such a view leaves men nothing but their prejudices to help them decide between love and justice in many practical situations.

(c) Love is more basic than justice.⁵⁸ But this means that rank injustice may be motivated by love. At least some of those responsible for the Inquisition may have been motivated by love.

(d) Justice is more basic than love.⁵⁹ This is the view of such New Testament writers as have made their position clear. As R. Mohrlang has asserted, "Matthew's formulation of the golden rule and the two great commandments roots love in law (7:12; 22:34-40; cf. 19:19b): here the expression of charity and compassion is both shaped by and interpreted within the framework of the law and the most basic demand for *dikaion*?."⁶⁰ In this connection he states,

The essence of the Sermon [on the Mount] is not love but *dikaion*? (Matt 5:6, 10, 20; 6:1, 33; cf. 3:15; 21:32) of which love is but one aspect (albeit a very important one) ...Submission and radical obedience to the will of God (as expressed in the law and the teachings of Jesus) ...lie at the real heart of the Sermon, not love.⁶¹

Moreover, as various authors have pointed out, there are sayings of Jesus, especially in Matt 23 and 25, which are not consistent with the idea that love is supreme over every other consideration in the field of ethics.⁶² Unless Jesus was radically inconsistent, or Matthew misrepresented Him, love is conditioned. Indeed, Matt 25, with its consignment of certain people to eternal punishment, suggests that love is conditioned by justice.

Paul apparently thinks likewise. In Rom 3:26 we are told that what God did with respect to justifying the ungodly was so done that "He might justify righteously, without compromising His own righteousness."⁶³ C. E. B. Cranfield argues, "The Greek is very awkward, if it is meant to express the double purpose that God might be righteous and that He might justify. ...; but it is a quite natural way of expressing the meaning 'that God might be righteous even in justifying.'"⁶⁴ In other words, God's righteousness is more fundamental than His love. Likewise, Paul holds

that, because agap? "does no wrong to a neighbor," i.e., it is not unjust to a neighbor, it can be the fulfilling of the law (Rom 13:10). Again Paul implies that justice is more basic than love, as important as love is. And R. Mohrlang has drawn attention to a good deal of evidence, particularly in Gal and 2 Cor, that "in Paul's own life . . .the expression of love is conditioned by certain theological and moral considerations of even greater importance than love itself."⁶⁵

But if love is not unconditioned, what did Jesus mean when He stated that the love commandments were the first and greatest of the commandments? It may be thought, of course, that He is simply inconsistent, or was using hyperbole. But, if our interpretation of Matt 22:40 is correct, Jesus described the love commandments as He did because they provide guidance needed for the worthy application of those commandments which prescribe the way in which God's people are to conduct themselves. As Rom 13: 10 states, love ensures that the purpose of the law ("no wrong to a neighbor") is fulfilled. And 1 Cor 13:1-3 emphasizes that the finest activities and achievements are ultimately worthless without love.

1. Cf. Rom 5:13-14; 2:14-15
2. See G. J. Wehham, *The Book of Leviticus*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 7, 240-41, with respect to the question whether Lev 17 is to be included in the Holiness Code.
3. But see Prov 28:4, 7, 9; 29: 18; cf. 30:6.
4. W. C. Kaiser, Jr., *Toward Old Testament Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983) 43. W. D. Davies, *Jewish and Pauline Studies* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984) 332 n 22, points out that "the influence of the covenant tradition with its Law on the prophets has become clear." Cf. W. Gutbrod. TDN7;- 4,.1040
5. See, for example, Deut 4:1-2; 12:32,. Jos 1:7; Ps 119:166; Neh 9:13-29. Note also A. Alt, *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*. trans. R. A. Wilson (Garden City; N. Y: Doubleday 1967) 103
6. According to R. Mohrlang, *Matthew and Paul*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984) 9, "The point of (this) passage. . .can only be that the entire law remains valid and demands strict obedience from the Christian community. " Emphasis his. With Matt 5;17-19. compare Luke 16:17; Matt 19:1Z-19 (Mark 10:17- 19; Luke 18:18-20). Unless otherwise specified, biblical quotations are according to the Revised Standard Version.
7. D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972) 120; cf. B. S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus* (Philadelphia: Westminster; 1974) 29. According to J. T Sanders, *Ethics in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975) 41, "Matthew does not present Jesus as the giver of a new law, but as the true interpreter of the already existent law." Emphases his. Per contra, T F. Glasson, *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*, (London, SCM, 1963), 92. "In the Sermon on the Mount the contrast with the law of Moses is brought out repeatedly"; cf. J. P. Meier; *Law and History of Matthew's Gospel* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1976) 157-61; M. D. Goulder; *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (London: S. P. C. K., 1974) 261-62.
8. Is it significant that in this connection Paul quotes from the second table of the Decalogue?
9. According to Davies, *Jewish and Pauline Studies*, 94, "So far from being an attack on the law, Rom. 7 may be even a defense of it"; cf. J. W. Drane, *Paul: Libertine or leGalist?* (London: S. P. C. K., 1975) 65, "In 1 Cor 7:19 Paul takes an ethical position. . .not much different from the legalism he had so much depreciated in Galatians" (Drane holds that with respect to the law Paul's writings are not consistent with one another). Cf. J. L. Houlden, *Ethics and the New Testament* (London: Mowbrays, 1975) 27- 28. On pp. 106-7 Houlden declares that it is only "for Matthew, and probably James, that the whole law

remains binding for Christians." For Mark, Luke, John and Paul, "the law is not merely interpreted but rivaled and supplanted." We contend that the evidence indicates otherwise. Concerning Luke see S. D. Wilson, *Luke and the Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1983); for John see R. Schnackenburg, *Ib.e: Gospel according to St. John* (New York: Crossroad, 1982) 217; B. Lindars, *The GosDel of John* (London: Oliphants, 1972) 97-98; J. Jeremias, *TDN7*; 4:872-73.

10. See the preceding note for evidence of the conviction that for various New Testament authors the Old Testament law is no longer in force.
11. *Jewish and Pauline Studies*, 298.
12. Cf. 1 Sam 16:14; 18:10., Ezek 14:9.
13. *Ethics and the New Testament*, 118; Cf. R. Mohrlang, *Matthew and Paul*, 100, "When all is said and done, there remains a basic inconsistency in Matthew's presentation between 5:43ff. and the attitude shown in the Gospel to the Pharisees. "
14. According to G. L. Bahnsen, *Theonomy in Christian Ethics* (Nutley, N. J.: Craig, 1977) 306, God determines "Good and evil. " If so, God cannot be responsibly described as good or evil, and the good things He does are not because He is good.
15. *Romans: A Shorter Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985) 152. On the "oldness of the letter'M. Black, *Romans* (London: Oliphants, 1973) 100, comments "Not, of course, the written torah, but the 'letter of the Law; i.e., its strait-laced interpretation':. ct: C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (New York: Halper & Row; 1957) 138. Per contra, W Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, Second Edition (New York: Scribner's, n.d.) 176.
16. "The Pedagogical Nature of the Law in Galatians 3: 19-4: 7. " *JETS* 25 (Mar. 1982) 61. He says the Christian also finds "God's law as standard preeminently expressed." How these statements, both of them in the same sentence, are to be harmonized, I do not know. If it is a standard, how can it be set aside? Moreover; on the preceding page he speaks of the "Law as having reached its zenith in the teachings and example of Jesus Christ. " But, if so, how can the Law be set aside in favour of Christ's teachings and example? Supplemented and interpreted, perhaps, but not set aside. It is of interest to note that Longenecker never considers Gal 5: 13 or Rom 13:8-10 in this article.
17. Lutzer; *The Morality Gap*, 106, insists, "If exceptions are made to moral laws, these exceptions must have scriptural authority." His ethics is an ethics for children and slaves.
18. Lutzer; *The Morality Gap*, 102, rightly states, "Heirarchicalism cannot answer the question of how the hierarchy of values is to be determined" (cf. p. 99).
19. *Christian Ethics in Secular Society* (Grand Rapids: Baker; 1983) 196ff.; cf. Lutzer; *The Morality Gap*, 108.
20. In the Old testament, and, indeed in Matt 19:18-19 (cf. Matt 5:21-48), love of neighbor is represented as simply one among other ethical prescriptions. In Mark 12:30-31 (cf. Luke 10:27) it and the commandment to love God are said to be the greatest of the commandments. To the parallel in Matt 17:37-39, however; the statement of v. 40 is added, a significant addition indeed.
21. According to E. Stauffer; *TDN7*; 1:38, "The love of God for Israel (Dr. 11:13) is not impulse but will; the love for God and neighbour demanded of the Israelites (Dr. 6:5; Lv; 19:18) is not intoxication but act." But love can be a feeling without impulse or intoxication being involved.

22. TDN7; 1 :22, cf. G. Wallis, TDO7; 1: 102; A. A. Anderson, *The Book of Psalms* (Greenwood, S.C.: Attic, 1972) 1:822. Gen 29:30; Song of Sol Passim: etc., make this clear.
23. *The Love Command in the New Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon 1972) 221. See Song of Sol. Passim. Religious usage occurs, however; in Wisd 3;9; Ps Sol. 18:3; ct: Wisd 6:18.
24. Furnish, Love command, 221.
25. Ibid., 49-50; see also pp. 219-31.
26. R. Schnackenburg, *The Moral Teaching of the New Testament* trans. J. Holland-Smith and W J. O'Hara (New York: Seabury, 1971) 93, says that it means that they can be "derived" from the two great commandments.
27. Matt 22:40 is the only New Testament occurrence of the phrase.
28. The other Septuagintal occurrences do not appear to be relevant.
29. R. Mohrloang, *Matthew and Paul*, 95, Cf. B. Gerhardsson, "The Hermeneutic Program in Matthew 22:37-40," in *Jews, Greeks and Christians*, ed. R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs (Leiden: Brill, 1976) 134, "in these verses is nothingness than the...principles for interpretation and application of the inherited holy scriptures. ...an instrument for evaluation, selection, and radical interpretation. "See also Furnish, Love Command. 34; J. T. Sanders, *Ethics in the New Testament*, 42; J. Pipet; *Love your enemies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979) 152. Per contra. C. E. Carlson, "The Things that Defile (Mark VII. 14) and the Law in Matthew and Mark," *NTS* 15 (1968) 82 n 2; C. Spicq, *Agap? in the New Testament*, trans. M. A. MacNamara and M. A. Richter (St. Louis: Herdel; 1963-66) 1:30-31; Schnackenburg, *Moral Teaching*, 93.
30. In view of v. 10b, the perfect tense of $\text{pl}^{\text{?}}\text{ro}\ddot{\text{o}}$ in v. 8 must be the perfect "of a general truth" (M. Black, *Romans* [London: Oliphants, 1973] 162), or a present perfect. i.e. having "wholly the sense of a present" as in Luke 4:21 (cf. F. Blass and A. Debrunner; *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Trans, & Rev. R. W. Funk [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961] #341, p. 176).
31. Cf. Furnish, Love Command, 97; E. Käsemann, *New Testament Questions of Today* (London: SCM, 1969) 199. According to G. L. Bahnsen, *Theonomy in Christian Ethics* (Nutley, N. J.: Craig, 1977) 243, Rom 13:9 means that God's law is summarized in love," and "Love enforces the full details of God's law " (Emphasis his.) According to Sanders, *EIbiQ§.*, 42, Rom 13:9 means that "the Torah may be dispensed with in view of the all-inclusive command to love."
32. *The Morality Gap*, 23.
33. Cf. Käsemann, *Questions*, 199, "Rom 13:1-7....cannot be directly associated. ..with the epitomizing demand for love in 13:8-10. "
34. See H. Schlier; TDN7; 3:681-82.
35. See the discussions in Schlier; TDN7; 3:681-82; and in M. Barth, *Ephesians* (Garden City, N. J.: Doubleday, 1974) 1:89-92. In *ibid.*, 2:446, Barth speaks of Christ's headship as his "monarchy. "
36. It cannot mean rule or control in the sense of having priority over; or superiority to. Rom. 13:8, 10, make this clear.

37. Apparently the idea that the law was intended to prevent evil being done to others was a common understanding, at least in Jewish circles. Hillel is credited with saying, "What is hateful to you, do not to your neighbor: that is the whole Torah, while the rest is the commentary thereof" (bSchab. 31a; cf. Tobit 4:15).
38. According to H. D. Betz, Galatians (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979) 275, Gal 5: 14 implies that Christians are not required to observe each of the law's "individual prescriptions and prohibitions," but that fulfilling of the law is required of them. Cf. J. W. Drane, "Paul: Libertine or Legalist? (London: S.P.C.K., 1975) 134, As he expounds the principle of love fulfilling the Law, Paul enunciates an ethical system which is not free from moral rules and directives, but which manages to combine these with the freedom of the Christian to act in accordance with the directives of the Holy Spirit in his own life"
39. A Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Philippians (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1977) 17.
40. Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture, trans. G. Highet (New York: Oxford University Press, 1939-44) 3:18.
41. In commenting on this statement, V. P. Furnish, Theology and Ethics in Paul (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968) 236-37, asserts that Paul does not have any "rational standard" to propose by which the demands of love (God's will) can be ascertained in particular instances. That is finally a matter for the Christian himself to discern and decide, a matter of 'insight' into the given situation." In his view, however; the translation of *aisth?sis* in Phil 1:9 as "feeling" 'perhaps subjectivizes the concept to a greater degree than Paul would have himself allowed" (ibid., 237 n 66). He prefers the rendering "insight". But, beyond emphasizing the help of the Christian community; to say nothing of the fallibility of that community; one must often rely on feeling. Of course as Phil 1:9 may intimate, knowledge of the respective biblical prescriptions should be given full consideration in making a moral decision. However; as we shall see, Heb 5:14 makes it clear that one's sensitivities need to be "trained by practice to distinguish good from evil."
42. TDNT 1:187; cf. H. Conzelmann, TDN7; 7:888.
43. New Testament Commentary: Exposition of Philippians (Grand Rapids: Baker 1962) 60. Emphasis his. Käsemann, Questions, 214, speaks of *aisth?sis* as "the feeling for the actual situation at the time."

Aisthanomai, *aisth?sis*, and *aisth?t?rion* are rare in the New Testament (only three occurrences), but are found some 42 times in the Septuagint, more than half of which are in Proverbs. An aesthetic connotation is required in Ep.Jer. 23; Sir 22:19; 4 Macc 8:4; etc.. Moreover; the usage is often in a wisdom context, which is not surprising, since wisdom requires more than information and what may be logically deduced therefrom; it also requires sensitivity to the respective situation, i.e., aesthetic judgment in relation thereto.

When they occur in the Septuagint, *aisthanomai* and its cognates commonly; if not always, translates *yādah* or one of its derivatives. R. Bultmann, TDN7; 1:697, states that in some of the cases when *yādah* is rendered by *ginōskein* in LXX, e.g., 1 Sam 14:12; Isa 47:8; 53:3; Jer 16:21; Ezek 25: 14, "aisthanesthai would be better Greek. " He also states that in the Old Testament "knowledge is not thought of in terms of information ...Knowledge has an element of acknowledgment. But it also has an element of emotion, or better of movement of will, so that ignorance means guilt as well as error" (ibid.,) 1:698). His introduction of "movement of will, " and what he says about it, is due to existentialist influence. There is no guilt without the exercise of the will, but guilty exercise of the will is due, at least in part, to unworthy feeling.

44. TDNT 1 :690. He does warn, however; against too sharp a distinction.

45. Ibid., 1:707.
46. The other elements of the fruit of the Spirit listed in Gal 5:22-23 are not a matter of feeling but of will and conduct. They are motivated by the aesthetic elements (cf. Neh 8:10; John 3:16; etc.)
47. See Loh and Nida, *Philippians*, 16, for other suggestions.
48. In Col 1:9-10 we have a similar emphasis, as we shall see.
49. Our reference to the meaning of *aisth?sis* in the writings of Philo may be especially significant for the meaning of *aisth?t?ria* in Heb 5:14, since many scholars are convinced that the author of Hebrews was influenced by the thought of Philo, if not by his writings.
50. In spite of what is commonly believed, experience can only prove that some propositions are untrue, or are partly untrue. It may lend support to some propositions, but cannot prove that they are true. There is really no such thing as inductive reasoning.
51. *Agap?* and its cognates occur only five times in Hebrews, two of which are in Old Testament quotations, and one when the author addresses his readers as "beloved." *Philadelphia* occurs in 13:1, and *philoxenia* in 13:2. It is intimated that love is, or ought to be, the supreme characteristic of Christians, but there is no indication that it is significant either for the interpretation of moral injunctions, or for the perception of what one ought to do in practical situations.
52. *Apeiros logou dikaiosun?s* (Heb 5:13) is to be understood in the light of Heb 5:14b because of the contrast of the two verses. TEV catches the import: "without any experience in the matter of right and wrong."
53. TDNT; 7:476-77; cf. B. S. Easton in ISBE, 5:3089, "Predominantly the 'wisdom' thought of is that which comes through experience."
54. The Old Testament emphasis on the need for wisdom in practical decision-making implies that the importance of aesthetic judgment was recognized under the old covenant.
55. *Biblical Theology in Crisis* (Philadelphia: Westminster; 1970) 129.
56. If one merely had to follow rules, he would have no reason for fear and trembling. All he would need to do would be to follow the rules, and where there were no rules that he could find, he would not be responsible for his actions, so that, again there would be no need for fear and trembling.
57. S. C. Mott, *Biblical Ethics and Social Change* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982) 62, opposes "the idea that love and justice are distinct in principle."
58. Cf. J. L. Houlden, *Ethics and the New Testament*, 17-19; Sanders, *Ethics*, 45. 59. Kaiser, *OT Ethics*, 147.
60. *Matthew and Paul*, 99; cf, 108.
61. Ibid., 98-99; cf. Sanders, *Ethics*, 44-45; Furnish, *Love Command*, 30-34.
62. Cf. Houlden, *Ethics*, 118.

63. C. E. B. Crantfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Edinburgh; T. & T. Clark, 1975, 1979) 1:213; cf G. Schrenk, *TDNT*, 2:188, "R. 3:26 expresses the fact that the justice of the One who is absolutely righteous is demonstrated in the atoning sacrifice of Jesus." Some scholars interpret otherwise, eg Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 90.91
64. *Romans*, 1:213
65. *Matthew and Paul* 105-6

Biblical Feelings And Emotions

The late John V. Dahms

Professor Emeritus in New Testament, Canadian Theological Seminary

Published in Global Missiology, Trinitarian Studies, January 2005, www.globalmissiology.net

Chapter VI

The scriptures contain a wealth of material pertaining to feelings and emotions. We seek to summarize and illustrate what is said therein.

An analysis of biblical teaching in respect to our theme suggests the following topics:

1. Basic and Eternal Feeling(s) and Emotion(s).
2. Feeling(s) and Emotion(s) related to Sin and Evil.
3. Feeling(s) as a Result of Salvation.

1. Basic Feelings and Emotions

The Scriptures imply that there are certain feelings and emotions which exist eternally, and are therefore basic. It appears that these are love, joy and peace.¹

There are those who hold that these terms do not denote feelings and/or emotions, at least when predicated of God. Love is said to be "for Jesus...a matter of will and action."² According to V. Furnish, "Love is an act of the will. ..not just some. ..feeling. .."³ Bultman argues, "Only if love is thought of as an emotion is it meaningless to command love; the *command of* love shows that love is understood as an attitude of the will."⁴ According to I. H. Marshall, "Christian love is first and foremost *giving* love, although it does not lack other elements such as affection."⁵ In our judgment, however, it is first and foremost a feeling. But it is a feeling which always eventuates in appropriate giving. Just as faith without works is dead (Jas 2:26), so love without works is also dead.

There are various reasons for holding that love in the Old Testament is primarily a feeling. Some of the reasons include:

- (1) "Love" (MT: ahab; LXX: agapē) is commonly used of erotic feelings between the sexes. e.g., Gen 24:67; 29:20; 2 Sam 13:15; Prov 5:19 (MT only); Song of Sol 2:5; 8:6; Hos 3:1;⁶ etc.
- (2) Love and hate are frequently contrasted, e.g., Jud 14:16; 2 Sam 19:6; Ps 45:7; 97:10; 109:5; Eccl 9:1; Mal 1:2-3; cf. Gen 29:30-31; Deut 21:15-17. It is not possible to hold that hate is a matter of will and/or action in all of these verses.
- (3) According to Hos 3:1, "The Lord loves the people of Israel; though they turn to other gods and love cakes of raisins." That love is a matter of strong feeling is evident in 11:8, "How can I give you up Ephraim! How can I hand you over, O Israel! ...My heart recoils within me, my compassion grows warm and tender."⁷ As G. Quell has observed, "Love in the OT is basically a spontaneous feeling."⁸

Essentially the same judgment must be made with regard to love in the New Testament. Some of the reasons are:

(1) The Septuagint version of the Old Testament was apparently the Bible of Greek-speaking churches in New Testament times. The Old Testament meaning of *agapaō* and *agapē* would prevail in those churches unless they were specifically instructed otherwise. There is no evidence of such instruction. (This is not to say that the meaning was not enriched by the New Testament message. It does mean that it was not fundamentally altered, so far as we know.)

(2) As in the Old Testament, love and hate can be contrasted, e.g., Matt 5:43; Rom 9:13; Heb 1:9; 1 John 4:20-21.

(3) The love of the best seats in the synagogues (Luke 11 :43), of darkness (John 3:19), of the praise of men (John 12:43), of gain from wrongdoing (2 Pet 2:15), of the world or the things in the world (1 John 2:15; cf. 2 Tim 4:10),⁹ of life (Rev 12:11), is fundamentally a matter of feeling, however much decision and conduct may eventuate therefrom.

Certainly such love is different from love for God and for humanity, but, if love for God and for humanity were not fundamentally a feeling, not all of these could be called love.

(4) Though "love" may sometimes denote both a subjective feeling and/or the manifestation thereof (e.g., John 15:13; 2 Cor 8:8), it is often distinguished from its manifestation, e.g., John 3:16, "God so loved the world that (*hōste* introducing a result clause) he gave his only Son"; John 17:24 NIV, "The glory you have given me because (*hoti*) you loved me. ..."; Rom 5:8, "God shows his love for us in that (*hoti*) while we were yet sinners Christ died for us"; Gal 5:6, "Faith working through (*di'*) love";¹⁰ Gal 5:13, "Through (*dia*) love be servants of one another"; 1 John 4:9, "In this the love of God was made manifest among us, that (*hoti*) God sent his only Son into the world. ..."; cf. John 3:35; 14:23, 28; 2 Cor. 8:24 Eph 5:25; 1 Thess 1:3; 1 John 3:16; Rev 1:5.

(5) *Phileō*, which clearly implies affection, is used as a synonym for *agapaō* from time to time: (a) Matt 6:5; 23:6; cf. Luke 11 :43; 20:46 (b) John 5:20; cf. 3:35; (c) John 20:2; cf. 13:23; 19:26; 21:7, 20; (d) John 11:3; cf. 11:5; (e) John 12:25; cf. Rev. 12:11; (f) John 16:27; cf. 14:21; (g) 1 Cor 16:22; Tit 3:15; cf. 1 Cor 2:9; 8:3; Rom 8:28; Eph 6:24; (h) Rev 3:19; cf. 1 :5; 3:9. In this connection also compare Jas 4:4 with 1 John 2: 15; 1 Thess 4:9a with 4:9b; 1 Pet 1 :22a with 1 :22b; and 1 Pet 3:8 with 1 John 3:11; 4:7.¹¹

(6) In 2 Cor 2:4 Paul states that his love for the Corinthians meant "anguish of heart and ..tears" (cf. Hos 11 :8). According to 1 Thess 2:8 that the Thessalonians have become "beloved (*agapētos*)" to Paul meant that he was "affectionately desirous (*homeiromenoi*)" of them.

As in the Old Testament, love in the New Testament is "basically a ...feeling." E. Stauffer has stated in commenting on Matt 24:12, "The character of love for God. ..is a glowing passion for God."¹² And R. Mohrlang has pointed out that for Paul love for others "include(s) a sense of genuine care and compassion and brotherly affection."¹³ Bultmann's assertion quoted above fails to give due consideration to the paradoxical nature of love. John put it this way, "Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God, and he who loves is born of God and knows God" (1 John 4:7-8; cf. Phil 2:12-13). He exhorts Christians (beloved!) to love one another, yet states that one "cannot come into a real relationship with a loving God without being transformed into a loving person."¹⁴

There is little disagreement that joy is a feeling, though E. Käsemann, in commenting on Rom 14:17, states, "Joy is standing under an open heaven," and goes on to assert that not feeling but reality is in view.¹⁵ But surely a feeling is in view in such a text as Isa 9:3, "They rejoice before thee as with joy at the harvest, as men rejoice when they divide the spoil."¹⁶ Likewise, the New Testament speaks of joy at good news (Luke 2:10; 2 Cor 7:7); at finding what is lost (Luke 15:5,

6, 9); at a glorious prospect (Matt 5:12; John 8:56; 1 Pet 1:6-8; Heb 10:34); etc. Moreover, joy is contrasted with grief (John 16:20-23; 2 Cor 2:3; cf. John 14:27 -28). Except for the passages in which *chairein* may be only a gracious greeting (Acts 15:23; 23:26; Jas 1:1; cf. 2 John 10-11, and *chaire(te)* likewise (Matt 26:49; 27:29; 28:9 [?]; Mark 15:18; Luke 1:28 [?]; John 19:3), the terminology we are considering does represent a feeling.

As for peace, *shalom* commonly denotes "well-being" and "wholeness,"¹⁷ except for those occasions when it denotes cessation of, or freedom from, war and strife. (Whether a mere greeting is in view in Luke 10:5; 24:36 v.1.; John 20:19, 21, 26, is debatable.) But well-being and wholeness include tranquility and confidence, and there are occasions when these are prominent in the meaning, for example, in Ps 4 where peace is contrasted with "distress": "In peace I will both lie down and sleep; for thou alone, O Lord, makest me dwell in safety" (v. 8; cf. v. 1).¹⁸ And in the New Testament *eirēnē* is contrasted with anxiety in John 14:27; Phil 4:6-7; cf. Luke 7:38-50. As with love and joy, a feeling is commonly included, if not foremost, in the meaning of "peace."

If, as we have stated, the feelings of love, joy and peace are eternal and fundamental, they must characterize deity, quite apart from His relation to what He has created. Since Trinitarian doctrine arose largely as a result of New Testament revelation, it is not surprising that there is little Old Testament evidence that such feelings are an eternal characteristic of God. The divine Wisdom is represented as saying, "I was daily his (the Lord's) delight" (Prov 8:30),¹⁹ but even here the context is that of Wisdom's relationship to creation.

In the New Testament it is stated, however, that the Father loved the Son "before the foundation of the world" (John 17:24). As C. K. Barrett has said, expression is thus given to "the eternal relationship of love which is...of the essence of the Holy Trinity."²⁰ In the light of John 17:24, "The Father loves the Son" (John 3:35; 10:17; 15:9; 17:24; cf. 5:20), and "I (Christ) love the Father" (John 14:31), need not be understood as referring only to the incarnate Son. Though there is no comparable mention of love for, or by, the Spirit, that the foremost grace of the Spirit is "love" (Gal 5:22) may invite the judgment that the Father and the Son eternally love the Spirit and that He reciprocates their love.²¹

Since love is so integral to the Godhead, it is not surprising that God's love should extend to all that He has created. This is implied in such passages as Ps 145:9, "His compassion is over all that he has made" (cf. vv. 13-20); Jonah 4:11, "Should I not pity Nineveh...in which there are more than a hundred and twenty thousand persons...and also much cattle?";²² and Matt 6:26-30, "Your heavenly Father feeds them (the birds of the air)...God...clothes the grass of the field" (cf. Ps 104:10-31; 147:9). His love for people not only extends to "all who fear him...(and) love him" (Ps 145:19-20), but includes sinners (Rom 5:9). He "desires all men to be saved" (1 Tim 2:4).

God's love, however, is not only a universal love. It is also love for (love of a particular quality for?) a particular people, and for select individuals.²³ When Moses declares, "The Lord set his love upon you and chose you" (Deut 7:7; cf. Amos 3:2; Rom 11 :28), the context indicates that God's love is a particular love for Israel as a corporate entity. Likewise, when Paul asserts, "Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her" (Eph 5:25), he implies a particular love for the true commonwealth of Israel, a commonwealth into which Gentile Christians are incorporated (see Eph 2:12-19; cf. 1 Pet 2:7-10). On the other hand, God's particular love is also for select individuals. Paul could say, "The Son of God...loved me and gave himself for me" (Gal 2:20; cf. Rom 8:35; Eph 3:19). Indeed, God is represented as saying, "I have loved Jacob, but I have hated Esau" (Mal 1:2-3; Rom 9:13).²⁴

God's love is so significant that John asserts, "God is love" (1 John 4:8, 16), i.e., "love" is an exceedingly important attribute of God.²⁵ And, of course, that love characterizes the relationship

between the members of the Godhead, to say nothing of the fact that it characterizes His relationship to all of creation, means that love is of ultimate significance, and can never be considered dispensable.

Though the fact that it needs to be commanded is due to the Fall, it is in accord with love as an essential characteristic of God's being, that we should read, "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your might" (Deut 6:5; cf. 30: 16); and "You shall love your neighbor as yourself" (Lev 19: 18; cf. 19:34).²⁶ And it was appropriate for Jesus to affirm that these two commandments are the greatest commandments of the law, even declaring, "On these two commandments depend all the law and the prophets" (Matt 22:35-40). John asserted accordingly, "He who does not love does not know God" (1 John 4:8), and, "He who abides in love abides in God, and God abides in him" (1 John 4:16).

Besides being eternally characterized by love, God is eternally characterized by joy. Though it is difficult to find biblical passages which specifically state this,²⁷ one can hardly conceive of the Son with whom the Father is well pleased (Matt 3:17) as not being well pleasing to Him, and a joy to Him, throughout all eternity (cf. John 8:29). Indeed, according to Philo, "rejoicing is most closely associated with God alone" (*de Abr.*, 202). And, when Jesus speaks of "my joy," and desires that their joy may be "complete" (John 15: 11; cf. 17:13), it is probable that His joy is a concomitant of His unity with the Father, a unity suggested in the immediate context when He calls God "my Father."²⁸ And God's rejoicing in His works and in His people is reported in Isa 62:5; 65:19; Zeph 3:17; cf. Deut 28:63; 30:9; Ps 104:31; Jer 33:9; to say nothing of His provision of "good news of a great joy" (Luke 2:10), and of His rejoicing over sinners who repent (Luke 15:7, 10, 22-24, 32; cf. Matt 18:13-14).

Since God is joyful, it is appropriate that there should be expressions of joy and exhortations to be joyful. The poet can say, "The hills gird themselves with joy, the meadows. ..(and) the valleys. ..shout and sing together for joy" (Ps 65:12-13; cf. Job 39:21; Ps. 19:5).

Another (?) Psalmist can say, "I rejoice in the Lord" (Ps. 104:34). And Paul not only speaks of his own joy and rejoicing (Phil 1 :3-5, 18, 19; 2:2; 4:10; etc.), but exhorts, "Rejoice in the Lord always; again I will say, Rejoice" (Phil 4:4; cf. 3:1).

We may also ascribe eternal peace to God, i.e., "peace as a feeling of peace and rest."²⁹ As G. F. Hawthorne says concerning "the peace of God" (Phil 4:7), "Paul seems to be here referring to the tranquility of God's own eternal being. ... the peace which God himself has ... the calm serenity which characterizes his very nature. ..."³⁰ And, when Jesus says, "My peace I give to you" (John 14:27), He seems to imply - in light of the Johannine Christology - that His peace is an eternal possession.³¹

God is eager to bestow His peace. That this peace includes a subjective feeling, at least at times, is implied in the passages quoted above (Ps 4:8; John 14:27; Phil 4:7), when taken in context. To these may be added John 16:33; Rom 15:13.³² Exhortation with respect to the subjective experience of His peace is implicit in John 14:27, "Peace I leave with you; my peace I give to you. ..Let not your hearts be troubled, neither let them be afraid."³³

Feelings of love, joy and peace are eternally characteristic of God's being and of His activity in relation to creation. They are also characteristic of what God wants persons to be. It may be that there are other feelings and emotions, equally basic and eternal, but we doubt it. It seems significant that not only are love, joy and peace the three kinds of feeling mentioned in the Supper Discourse and High Priestly Prayer of Jesus (John 13-17), but with respect to each one there is reason to believe that what is in view at least includes a particular kind of feeling. There is also, of course, the Pauline statement that the fruit of the Spirit is first of all love, joy, peace

(Gal 5:22), though, that each of these denotes a feeling, or even includes a feeling, may be questioned.³⁴

2. Feelings and Emotions related to Sin and Evil

There are a number of feelings and emotions which are not basic and eternal, but are occasioned by sin and evil. They may be set forth in three general categories, which are the counterpart of the eternal feelings we have already considered: (1) Selfishness, hatred, lust, wrath, jealousy; (2) Fear, distress, grief, depression, sadness, loneliness, sorrow, guilt, shame; (3) Inner conflict.

Some of these feelings occasioned by sin characterize God; some do not.

With respect to God, sin and evil occasion divine hatred and wrath. "Thou hates all evildoers. The Lord abhors bloodthirsty and deceitful men" (Ps 5:5, 6). "His (the Lord's) soul hates him that loves violence" (Ps 11 :5). "God. ..expresses his wrath every day" (Ps 7:11 NIV). Romans repeatedly refers to God's wrath against the ungodly and unrighteous (1:18; 2:5,8; 5:9; 9:22; cf. 4:15; 12:19; 13:4). That God is a jealous God, demanding exclusive devotion, is emphasized in Ex 20:5; Deut 4:24; 5:9; 6:15; etc., and is noted in 2 Cor 11:2 (zeros). That sin and evil are the occasion of divine grief and sorrow is vividly set forth in Gen 6:6, "The Lord was sorry that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him to his heart"; cf. Ps 78:40, "How often they rebelled against him (God) in the wilderness and grieved him in the desert"; Eph 4:30, "Do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God" (cf. Isa 53:3, 4; Matt 26:38). The waywardness of Israel is even said to lead to "conflict raging within the heart of God,"³⁵ to "God. ..in conflict with himself over Israel"³⁶: "How can I give you up, O Ephraim! How can I hand you over, O Israel! How can I make you like Admah! How can I treat you like Zeboiim! My heart recoils within me. ..." (Hos 11:8; cf. Jer 31:20; Jas 2:13).

There is biblical evidence that God has feelings occasioned by sin in all three categories I have set forth, though, of course, He does not have, and cannot have, all of them. For example, He cannot feel lust, or guilt, or shame. Even so, there is a highly paradoxical relationship between His eternal feelings and the feelings He has which are occasioned by sin and evil. How can God, of which John can say that He is love, ever be characterized by anger and hatred? How can the God of eternal joy ever "experience" sorrow and grief? How can the God of peace ever have "conflict raging within (his) heart"? Rationalistic theology has no sound explanation(s). Biblical theology may be consistent-we are convinced that it is-but consistency is not always of a logical nature.

Sin is due to, and results from, all the unworthy and undesirable feelings we have listed above, and possibly some which we have over- looked. In the first place there are the evil feelings which are integral to the character of the sinner. In this connection we draw attention to some of the New testament lists which include the feelings which characterize sinful persons, though it is not to be thought that all such feelings are characteristic of each and every sinner; Mark 7:21-22 (cf. Matt 15:19); Rom 1:24-31; 13:13; 1 Cor 5:11; 6:9-10; 2 Cor 12:20-21; Gal 5:19-21; Eph 4:25-5:6; Col 3:5-8; 1 Tim 1:9-10; 2 Tim 3:2-4; Rev 21:8. In these passages the following feelings are included: covetousness, pride, lust, malice, envy, jealousy, wrath, anger, arrogance, selfishness, bitterness, enmity, hatred of good, hatred of God, love of self, love of money, love of pleasure.³⁷ In addition sinners may lack certain important feelings. They may be heartless, ruthless, inhuman. Such feelings are in place of the agapē they ought to have toward God and toward men.³⁸

Besides the feelings integral to the character of the sinner, there are feelings which result from their evil actions, the second category of feelings listed above. In this case the biblical witness is not nearly so extensive. It begins, however, with Gen 3:7-8 (cf. 2:25), and the sense of shame,

and perhaps of fear, credited to Adam and Eve.³⁹ When Cain realizes what he is to suffer because of his sin, he cries out, "My punishment is greater than I can bear" (Gen 4:13). Jacob, when about to meet Esau whom he had wronged, "was greatly afraid and distressed" (Gen 32:7), as were Joseph's brothers as a result of their treatment of him (Gen 37:29; 42:21; 45:3, 5; 50:15-21). As a result of his disobedience "an evil spirit from the Lord tormented (Saul)" (1 Sam 16:14), and he was "afraid of David" (1 Sam 18:12; cf. 28:5, 20). The Psalmist (David?) describes the "consequence of living with guilt and a stifled conscience:⁴⁰ 'When I declared not my sin, my body wasted away through my groaning all day long. For day and night thy hand was heavy upon me; my strength was dried up as by the heat of summer'" (Ps 32:3-4; cf. 38:1-8; 51:3). Judas Iscariot suffered such remorse⁴¹ that "he went and hanged himself" (Matt 27:3-5). In 2 Cor 7:10 Paul mentions "worldly grief (which) produces death," probably referring to "sorrow because of the painful and unwelcome consequences of sin,"⁴² i.e., self-pity and/or remorse (?). Heb 10:27 warns of the possibility of "a fearful expectation of judgment and of raging fire that will consume the enemies of God" (N IV) and Heb 12:17 states that Esau "could bring about no change of mind, though he sought the blessing with tears" (NIV), and may imply that certain sinners could have a similar experience.⁴³ Other biblical evidence could be adduced. As we have seen, feelings as a result of sin include shame, fear, distress, guilt, remorse, grief, perhaps also self-pity and despair. Nor is this list necessarily exhaustive.

Of course the ill feelings of the sinner are neither constant nor unalloyed. One may "enjoy the pleasures of sin for a short time" (Heb 11:25). Indeed, the Psalmist may describe the wicked as "have(in) no pangs," "not (being) in trouble," "having pride (as) their necklace," being "always at ease" (Ps 73:4, 5, 6, 12). At least this appears to be the case for the time being. Whether it is ever entirely true, or is true for their life-time, is doubtful.⁴⁴

There is, however, a third kind of feeling which is frequently experienced by the sinner with more or less intensity, a feeling of inner tension due to the fact that the image of God is never really obliterated in this life. It is most clearly set forth 7:22-24, "I delight in the law of God in my inmost self but I see in my members another law at war with the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin. .. Wretched man that I am! ..." Many scholars are of the opinion that the experience of at least some Christians is being described, but such an interpretation implies that a Christian is not necessarily a regenerate person. A slave of sin is not really a Christian (cf. 1 Cor 6:9-11; 1 John 3:9; 5:18). And, though a Christian may experience periods of wretchedness, he is not a wretched man. Because his redemption is not complete in this life, a Christian may experience a tension somewhat similar to that of Rom 7, "The desires of the flesh are against the Spirit, and the desires of the Spirit are against the flesh; for these 'are opposed to each other, to prevent you from doing what you would'" (Gal 5:17). But the Christian is not enslaved by the desires of the flesh. He can "walk by the Spirit" and need not "gratify the desires of the flesh" (Gal 5:16, 25; cf. Rom 8:9). And, if he does walk by the Spirit, he has "peace" in his "inmost self" (Gal 5:22).⁴⁵

3. Feelings as a Result of Salvation

In one sense there are no new feelings related to salvation, only a particular quality of feelings which have existed from all eternity.

Salvation begins with God's love for the sinner. "God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, so that everyone who believes in him may not perish. .." (John 3:16). However, love for the unfortunate and the sinner has the form of sympathy and compassion.⁴⁶ "Because of the Lord's great love we are not consumed, for his compassions never fail" (Lam. 3:22 NIV). "He (Jesus) saw a great throng, and he had compassion for them, because they were like sheep without a shepherd" (Mark 6:34). "We have not a high priest who is unable to sympathize with our weaknesses" (Heb 4:15).

What God does for human salvation brings Him joy. There is heavenly joy over the national restoration of His people. "The Lord has taken away the judgments against you, he has turned away your enemies... He will rejoice over you with gladness. ..., He will exult over you with loud singing" (Zeph. 3:15-17 NIV). There is also heavenly joy over spiritual restoration. There is "more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents" (Luke 15:7). "For the sake of the joy that was set before him (Jesus) endured the cross" (Heb. 12:2). Of course this divine joy over national restoration and spiritual restoration is of a quality to be distinguished from the joy the members of the Godhead have in each other, and from the divine joy in creation as "very good." This joy is joy over what redemption secures and will secure.

It is more difficult to find divine peace represented as a feeling resulting from redemption. In light of the New Testament, which implies the deity of the Suffering Servant, it may be intimated, perhaps in Isa. 53:11, "He shall see the fruit of the travail of his soul and be satisfied."⁴⁷ In Ps. 85: 10 ("Righteousness and peace will kiss each other") it is probable that divine attributes are in view, and, though the emphasis is on the peace which the land will enjoy, as an attribute of God, peace will surely include a divine feeling of satisfaction.⁴⁸ The Palm Sunday ejaculation, "Peace in heaven" (Luke 19:38), certainly relates to redemption and its accomplishment, but surely implies divine satisfaction, and so divine peace. In this connection one may note the conception of conflict in heaven which is brought to an end by Satan's expulsion from heaven (Rev 12:7-9; cf. Luke 10:18). We may also note that Col 1:20 speaks of God "reconcil(ing) to himself all things," including things "in heaven." Though Rev 12 does not specifically mention peace in connection with Satan's expulsion from heaven, it is perhaps to be assumed in the light of v. 12, "Rejoice then, O heaven and you that dwell therein." The reconciliation of Col 1:20 is said to have been a matter of "making peace by the blood of his cross." We find it difficult to believe that this peace did not include a divine feeling of satisfaction.⁴⁹

Though there is not a great deal of biblical evidence concerning divine feelings related to salvation, there is a great deal about the human feelings of the redeemed.

Again we believe that the feelings of the redeemed may be subsumed under love, joy and peace. We give but a few examples of such feelings:

- (1) With respect to love: "I love the Lord, because he has heard my voice and my supplications. ..When I was brought low, he saved me ...You have delivered my soul from death" (Ps 116:1, 6, 8); "She loved much; but he who is forgiven little, loves little" (Luke 7:47); "YOU love him" (1 Pet 1 :8); "We love, because he first loved us" (1 John 4:19; cf. 4:9-10).
- (2) With respect to joy and rejoicing due to divine salvation (and the praise which gives expression to that joy), we note such passages as Ps 13:5; 27:6; 51:8, 12; Acts 8:8; 13:52; 1 Thess 1:6; 1 Pet 1:8.
- (3) Peace as a result of salvation is to be seen in Ps 85:8 (cf. vv. 3- 5); Isa 26:1 ,3 (MT only); 48:18; Luke 1 :79 (cf. v. 77); 2:14, 29-30;50 7:50;51 Eph 4:3; 6: 15.52

It is to be noted, of course, that God's people are exhorted to inner love, joy and peace in both Testaments, e.g., Deut 6:5; Ps 32:11; 55:22 LXX; Matt 5:44; 22:37-39; Phi 13:1; 4:4, 6-7; 1 Thess 5:16 (cf. Matt 6:25-34; 1 Pet 5:7). That such exhortation is necessary is apparently due to: (1) Grace is not granted apart from the exercise of the will. Grace enables us to will effectually, as Phil 2:12-13 teaches. Though the will alone is not sufficient for any significant change in our feelings, it does have a part to play therein.⁵³ (2) Our salvation is not complete in this life (cf. Rom 8:23; 13:11). This means that the lusts of the flesh still assail us, their blandishments being

exacerbated by the pressures of "the world." (The devil tempts us through our fleshly lusts, using environmental circumstances as a means thereto [1 Cor 7:5].⁵⁴

It is for the same reasons that God's people are exhorted to fear God (Deut 6:13-15; 1 Sam 12:24-25; Ps 34:11-16; Matt 10:28; Heb 12:28-29; cf. 1 John 2:28). Paul implies as much when he says to Christians, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling" (Phil 2:12).⁵⁵ In 1 John 4:17-18 it is apparently taught that God's people may have love so perfected in them that they no longer have any fear of the day of judgment. Since other Scriptures seem to imply that fear of the divine wrath ought always to be a motivating factor in the life of God's people, we suggest that the mature Christian experience is paradoxically one in which there is both fear of judgment, and the lack of such fear. Is it not a fact that many sons both fear, and do not fear, their earthly fathers?⁵⁶

We do not claim to have exhausted the feelings of Christians. For example, we have not mentioned gratitude. But we have considered the important ones, and suspect that all the other feelings may be subsumed under love, joy and peace. In fact, there is a dynamic relationship between gratitude and love; cf. Ps 116:1, "I love the Lord, because he has heard my voice and my supplications"; 1 John 4:19, "We love, because he first loved us"; 2 Cor 8:8-9.

It may be briefly noted that both Old and New Testaments anticipate an eschatological future in which unalloyed feelings of love, joy (expressed in praise) and peace will prevail. For love, see Deut 30:6, "The Lord your God will circumcise your heart and the heart of your offspring, so that you will love the Lord your God with all your heart and all your soul" (cf. Jer 27:7; 32:38-40; Ezek 36:26-27). For joy, see Isa 35:10, "The ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with singing; everlasting joy shall be upon their heads. . ."; Jude 24, "Him who is able. . .to present you. . .before the presence of his glory with rejoicing" (cf. Isa 9:3; 55:12; 65:18; 1 Cor 13:13; Rev. 19:7; etc.). For peace, see Isa 66:13, "As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you"; Rev 21:4, "He shall wipe away every tear from their eyes, and death shall be no more, neither shall there be mourning nor crying nor pain any more" (cf. Isa 9:7; Ezek 34:25, 28; etc.) It should be noted, however, that love, joy and peace are richer in the eschatological age than they were "originally," and that this is because of the redemption effected by Christ.

It seems that we can say that the Trinitarian pattern can be seen in love, joy and peace, with love corresponding to the Father, joy to the Son, and peace to the Holy Spirit, though, of course, each member of the Trinity has all three "feelings." Again the pattern is seen in that (1) in eternity unalloyed love, joy and peace prevailed; (2) the incursion of sin brought in conflicting feelings; and (3) love, joy and peace will again prevail unalloyed, but will be enriched by the redemption that has been fully applied. We make bold to say that not only will they be enriched in human experience ("He who is forgiven little, loves little" [Luke 7:47]), but also in the divine "experience" ("There will be more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents than over ninety-nine persons who need no repentance" [Luke 15:7]).

1. Gr.: agapaō, chara, eirēnē.
2. E. Stauffet; TDNT; 1:44-45.
3. The Love Command in the New Testament (Nashville: Abingdon, 1972) 202.
4. Jesus and the Word (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1958) 118.
5. The Epistles of John (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 61.
6. In this verse God's love for Israel is compared with sexual love.

7. Cf. p C. Craigie, Twelve Prophets (Philadelphia: Westminster; 1984) 73-74.
8. TDNT; 1:22.
9. TDNT; 1:45.
10. Matthew and Paul (Cambridge: University Press, 1984) 104.
11. Marshall. Epistles of John, 212. According to G. Quell, TDN7, 1:25. "To fulfill the command of love can only consist in not hindering the feeling of love, the rise of which is not connected with any act of will. "
12. TDN7; 1:45.
13. H. Conzelmann, TDNT; 9:362, speaks of "the experience of joy in the Old Testament
14. Cf. G. L. Cart; TWOT; 2:931.
15. Cf. P C. Craigie, Psalms 1-50 (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1983) 82.
16. Cf. Wisd 8:3, "The Lord of all loves her (Wisdom)." Prov 8:3 "can be taken to mean that wisdom experienced pleasure without alloy or that she gave delight to Yahweh" (W. McKane, Proverbs (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970) 357.
17. The Gospel according to John S Second Edition (Philadelphia: Westminster; 1978) 514; cf. A. M. Hunter; The Gospel according to John (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1965) 165.
18. Various theologians both ancient and modern, have held that the Holy Spirit is the "mutual love of both" the Father and the Sonll. "The love of both is a Third Person, who makes them one" (S. B. Swete, The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church [Grand Rapids: Baker; 1966] 372).

"The love of the Spirit" (Rom 15:30) probably means, "the love inspired by the Spirit" (C. E.B. Cranfield, Romans: A Shorter Commentary [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985] 373). J. Murray The Epistle to the Romans (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968) 2:221, prefers the interpretation, "The love which the Spirit bears to believers."
19. Cf. Deut 25:4. Surely 1 Cor 9:9-10 is to be understood as having some such meaning as that in Deut 25:4 "God had in mind not oxen, but Christian preachers and their needs" (C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (New York: Harper & Row; 1968) 205.
20. It is not to be assumed that God's particular love is only due to the Fall. The quality of love is conditioned by the quality of the object, and by one's relationship to the object. Filial love is qualitatively different from fraternal love, and love for one's brother is qualitatively different from love for another brother. If there were to be no qualitative difference in God's love for different people and different individuals, He would have had to create them all absolutely identical in every respect. On the other hand, the quality of His love is also due to the Fall and to human sin.

21. Rationalism cannot accommodate the idea of God's love being essentially universal, but existentially restricted to one people, and to certain individuals. God is personal, which means that He has a specific nature, but is also free.
22. Cf. Marshall, Epistles of John, 212-13.
23. Lev. 19:18 is not given prominence in the Old Testament, nor is it made clear there that enemies are to be loved, though Exod 23:4-5 and Prov 25:21-22 (cf. Gen 50:15-21) point in that direction. Craigie, Psalms 1-50, 41, asserts, "The Psalmists in ancient times were bound to the same commitment of love for enemies as is the modern Christian or Jew (cf. Lev 19:17-18; Exod23:4-5) ..."
24. Does 1 Chron 16:27 assume it?
25. Cf. R. E. Brown, The Gospel according to John (Garden City, N. Y: Doubleday, 1970) 2:68; E. Haenchen, John 2 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984) 154; Barrett, John 476, 509.
26. Cf. W. Foerster. TDNT: 2:412.
27. Philippians (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1983) 184; cf. F. W. Beare, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians (London: Black, 1959) 147.
28. If His peace were only due to His thoroughgoing and unremitting conformity to the will of God, what significance could it have in John 14:27, beyond that of a farewell wish that His disciples might have peace?
29. Others hold that peace includes a subjective feeling in such passages as Rom 8:6; 14:17; Gal 5:22; Eph 6:23; 2 Thess 3:16; 2 Pet 3:14. See C. H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932) 122; J. Murray. The Epistle to the Romans (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968 repr. 1971) 1:286; 2:194. A. E. Barnett, 18, 12:204; F. Foulkes, The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963) 181.
30. Such exhortations as occur in CoI 3:15; 2 Pet 3:14; etc., may not have subjective peace in view.
31. In our opinion these three graces, and especially the first of the three, represent the dynamic of the Spirit, whereby He ministers the other graces listed.
32. Craigie, Twelve Prophets, 1:74.
33. H. W. Wolff, Hosea (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1965)201; cf J. L. Mays Hosea (Philadelphia: Westminster; 1969) 157.

34. We have made some effort to put the feelings most frequently mentioned consideration has affected the order. No attempt has been made to examine what other scriptures may have had to contribute.
35. We do not imply that sinners are necessarily devoid of all good feelings. Those who are evil may love certain people (Matt 5:46-47; Luke 11:13). The image of God was not obliterated by the Fall.
36. G. von Rad, Genesis, Revised Edition (Philadelphia: Westminster; 1972) 101, holds that both shame and fear are ascribed to human sin in Gen 3.
37. Craigie, Psalms 1-50, 267.
38. Cf. D. Hill, The Gospel of Matthew (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981) 348.
39. P. E. Hughes, Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids; Eerdmans, 1962) 272-73; R. Bultmann, TDNT; 4:320. For a different interpretation, see C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (New York: Harper & Row, 1973) 211.
40. Cf. D. A. Hagner; Hebrews (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983) 150, 151; 7: H. Robinson, The Epistle to the Hebrews (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1933) 147, holds that the expectation of Heb 10:27 involves "despair."
41. That God's people suffer some of the same ill feelings from time to time is due to the following: (a) Our redemption is not completely effected in this life; (b) We suffer from the sins of others, either because of our proximity to them, or of our solidarity with them; (c) Sinners frequently hate and harm God's people.
- Are "double-minded" people (Jas 4:8) to be compared with those spoken of in Rom 7? They are sinners who need to repent. However; nothing is said concerning the feelings directly related to their double-mindedness.
42. Cf. J. Moffatt, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews (Edinburgh: 7: & 7: Clark, 1924) 196-97.
43. Cf. C. R. North, The Second Isaiah (Oxford: Clarendon, 1964) 244.
44. Cf. A. A. Anderson, The Book of Psalms (Greenwood, S.C.: Attic, 1972) 612.
45. God is not an insensitive machine.
46. H. Marshall, The Gospel of Luke (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 120. speaks of Simeon being "serene."

47. "Peace" here is in contrast to "weeping" (Luke 7:38). More may be implied than feeling, but feeling is prominent. Cf. "peace" vs. "trembling" in Luke 8:47-48.
48. This means that the lusts of the flesh still assail us (Gal 5:16-17). The devil tempts us through these lusts, using environmental circumstances as a means thereto (cf. 1 Cor 7:5). How unfallen man could be tempted is an enigma.
49. Cf. J. D. W. Watts, Isaiah 34-66 (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1987) 263- 64; J. L. McKenzie, Second Isaiah (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1968) 162.
50. North, The Second Isaiah, 232-3.
51. F.F. Bruce, "Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians," Simpson and Bruce, Ephesians and Colossians, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957 repr.1973) 207-8.
52. Marshall, Luke, 66.
53. Ibid., 314.
54. E. K. Simpson, "Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians," Simpson and Bruce, Ephesians and Colossians, 148.
55. J. J. Millet; The Epistles of Paul to the Philippians and to Philemon, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955 repr 1980), 90-92.
56. On the other hand, it appears that lack of feeling may not be significant as to one's true condition spiritually; cf. 1 Cor. 4:3-4; Eph. 4:19.

Biblical Ecclesiology

The late John V. Dahms

Professor Emeritus in New Testament, Canadian Theological Seminary

Published in Global Missiology, Trinitarian Studies, January 2005, www.globalmissiology.net

Chapter VII

Biblical Ecclesiology may be studied under the following rubrics:

I.	The Origin of the Church	
	1. God.....	1
	2. Christ.....	2
	3. The Holy Spirit.....	3
II.	The Human Persons Involved in the Church.	
	1 .The Apostles.....	6
	2. Continuing Human Leadership.....	8
	3. The Laity.....	10
III.	The Activities of the Church.	
	1. Worship.....	10
	2. Edification of God's People.....	11
	3. Ministry to Others.....	13

I. The Origin of the Church

GOD

The Scriptures trace the origin of the Christian Church to God's words and deeds reported in the Old Testament, and especially to His words and deeds to Israel and in relation to her.

The Church's roots may be traced to God's words and deeds in relation to the Fall recorded in Gen. 3, and to human response to those words and deeds of His. However, God's creative activity and His words reported in Gen. 1 and 2, provided the backdrop to the Fall and to what occurred thereafter, so that, though the Church's origins are not in creation, the nature of creation is of relevance to the nature and activity of the Church.

Though God responded to the Fall with works and deeds (Gen. 3:8- 24), there is no clear biblical witness that Adam and Eve had a positive relationship to God thereafter.¹ However, thereafter various individuals are credited with a positive relationship with Him (Abel, Seth, Enosh [?], Enoch, Lamech [?], Noah, Shem [?]), but there is little, if any, indication of an unbroken continuity of devotion to the Lord prior to the time of Abram (Abraham). With God's call of Abram and His promise to him (Gen. 12:1-3) we have the founding of a blood line which constituted God's people together with those "adopted" into that family, which became the nation

of Israel. Though God had messages for other nations (see Jonah 1:1-2; 3:1-3; cf. Amos 1:3-2:3; Isa. 13-23; Jer. 46-51; Ezek. 25-32, etc.), and visited judgment on them for their iniquities. Israel was "His people" (Luke 1:68), of whom He said, "You only have I known of all the families of the earth" (Amos 3:1-2).²

"The Christians believed themselves to be the true continuation of the elect people."³ To Gentile Christians at Rome Paul said, "Remember that it is not you that support the root (the forefathers of Israel), but the root that supports you" (Rom. 11:18; cf. 11:28): "You have been. .. grafted. ..into a cultivated olive tree" (Rom. 11:24). And to Gentile Christians at Ephesus he stated, "At one time. ..you were aliens from the commonwealth (*12oliteias*) of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise. ..You are no longer strangers. .., but you are fellow citizens (*sum1political*) with the saints and also members of the household of God (Eph. 2:11, 12, 19).⁴ And Peter could affirm (apparently to Gentile Christians), "Once you were not a people but now you are God's people (*laos theou*)" (1 Pet. 2:10).⁵

The Church is rooted in God's revelation of Himself to ancient Israel, and in its relationship to Him. Indeed, though the interpretation is disputed, Paul could apparently speak of the Church as "the Israel of God" (Gal. 6:16).

Jesus Christ

"The Christians preserved their continuity with Israel, and yet there was. ..something altogether new in their concept of being God's people. This new factor. ..was Jesus Christ."⁶

In this connection it is to be noted that, though the Church is often called "the church of God" (e.g., 1 Cor. 1 :2; 11 :22; Gal. 1 :13; 1 Tim. 3.5), Jesus declared, "I will build my church," and even spoke of the "rock" on which He would build it (Matt. 16:18). Moreover, on the day of Pentecost Peter declared on the basis of the resurrection and ascension of Christ, "God has made him both Lord and Messiah, this Jesus whom you crucified" (Acts 2:36), and went on to counsel those who had been "cut to the heart." "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ so that your sins may be forgiven. .." (Acts 2:38). Here was something significantly new. John the Baptist had preached "a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins," but to be baptized "in the name of Jesus Christ so that your sins may be forgiven" was a new departure, justified by the proclamation of His Lordship, which was justified, in turn, by His resurrection and ascension. And shortly thereafter, again on the basis of His resurrection, Peter declares that "Jesus Christ of Nazareth" has "become the cornerstone. There is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among mortals by which we must be saved" (Acts 4:10-12). Likewise Paul can write, "No one can lay any foundation other than the one that has been laid; that foundation is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. 3:11).

Would a devout Jew not have thought that Abraham and/or Moses provided a sufficient foundation? John 8:31-39 represents Jesus as saying to "the Jews who had believed in him," "If you continue in my word, you are truly my disciples, and you will know the truth, and the truth will make you free." Rejecting such doctrine, they insisted, "Abraham is our father" (cf. Matt. 3:9), and concluded therefrom, "We have one father, God himself." In other words, "their spiritual, as their physical, descent is impeccable."⁷ They could not believe that Jesus might be "greater than our father Abraham" (cf. John 8:53-59). Likewise, we have the man whose eyes Jesus opened accused, "You are his (Jesus') disciple, but we are disciples of Moses. We know

that God has spoken to Moses, but as for this man, we do not know where he comes from" (John 9:28-29). They could not imagine that Jesus' spiritual authority might be superior to that of Abraham and/or Moses.

The New Testament clearly states that in His person and in His words, Jesus went beyond what we have in Judaism. "Long ago God spoke to our ancestors in many and various ways by the prophets, but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son' (Heb. 1:1-2). "The law. . . was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ" (John 1 :17; cf. John 14:6). Such statements do not necessarily imply that there is false doctrine in the Old Testament. They do imply that in Christ we have the mediator of a new covenant (Heb. 8:6-13; 1 Cor. 11 :25).

In 2 Cor. 3:6-11 Paul affirms that "God. . .has made us competent to be ministers (plural!) of a new covenant," a covenant whose ministry far exceeds the Mosaic ministry of the Sinaitic covenant in splendour. "Ministers (*diakonous*)" evidently refers to ministers of the Church.⁸ As such they have a ministry far exceeding in glory the ministry of the old covenant. Though the Church is in continuity with Israel, it exceeds Israel because of Christ..

The Holy Spirit

The exceeding weight of glory which characterizes the ministry entrusted to the Church is due basically to Christ's person, His ministry, His sacrifice, His resurrection, and His ascension, but is also due to the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

Several Old Testament prophets anticipated an eschatological dispensation of the Spirit which would surpass any filling with the Spirit experienced in their own times. Joel represented the Lord as promising, "It shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit on all flesh; your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions. Even upon the menservants and maidservants in those days, I will pour out my spirit" (2:28-29 [3:1-2]; cf. Isa. 44:1-5; Ezek. 36:26-30; 37:14; 39:29).

John the Baptist prophesied likewise, "Coming after me (is) ...one (who) will baptize you with the Holy Spirit" (Mark 1 :7-8; cf. Matt. 3:11 ; Luke 3:16; John 1 :33). And Jesus is credited with speaking "about the Spirit, which believers in him were to receive; for as yet there was no Spirit, because Jesus was not yet glorified" (John 7:39). Moreover, at the Last Supper He is said to have promised, "I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Counselor. ." (John 14:16); "The Counselor, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name. ." (John 14:26); "When the Counselor comes, whom I will send to you from the Father. ." (John 15:26); "If I do not go away, the Counselor will not come to you, but if I go, I will send him to you" (John 16:7); "When the Spirit of truth comes. ." (John 16: 13). And prior to His accession He said (referring to the coming of the Spirit), "I am sending upon you what my Father promised; so stay herein the city (Jerusalem) until you have been clothed with power from on high" (Luke 24:49). "He ordered them not to leave Jerusalem, but to wait there for the promise of the Father. 'This', he said, 'is what you have heard from me, ...you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days from now.'" (Acts 1:4-5).

According to John 20:22, on the evening of the day when He arose from the dead He 'breathed on' the gathered disciples, and said, "Receive the Holy Spirit." Some have held that this is John's version of the Pentecostal gift of the Spirit. "Breathed on" in Greek is a verb which does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, but which occurs in Gen. 2:7 LXX of God "breathing into" Adam the breath of life so that he became 'a living soul' (cf. the same verb in Ezek. 37:9 LXX of breath being breathed into dry bones).⁹ This suggests the idea of the creation of new life, and supports the view that the Spirit is being offered for immediate reception. However, John 7:39 states that the descent of the Spirit awaited Christ's glorification, and in John 16:7 Jesus says that He must "go away. ..but, if I go, I will send him to you" (cf. 15:26). Moreover, earlier on the

same day as He said, "Receive the Holy Spirit," He had said, "I have not yet ascended to the Father" (John 20:17). It seems, therefore, that Jesus is simply reiterating the promise of the Spirit as a gift to be given very soon.¹⁰

Certainly the descent of the Spirit is represented in Acts 2 as occurring on the day of Pentecost. Moreover, Peter is represented as declaring that Joel's prophecy was being fulfilled (Acts 2:16-21), and as going on to state, "Being exalted at the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has poured out this that you both see and hear" (Acts 2:33). The conformity to John 15:26 is striking. Furthermore, it is significant that Peter immediately informs those "cut to the heart" that repentance and baptism "in the name of Jesus for the forgiveness of your sins," will result in reception of "the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:38). The Pentecostal gift of the Spirit is henceforth available to everyone.

That Peter describes the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost as "the beginning" (Acts 11:15), suggests that the Church really came into being at that time, which is not to deny the importance of the disciples Jesus had made during His ministry, His choice of the Twelve (Luke 6:12-16), or the witness of those sent out two by two, as reported in Luke 9 and 10.

It is significant in this connection that we first hear of baptism "in the name of Jesus Christ," or in the triune name, on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:38; cf. 19:5), or in what may be described as preparatory there-to.¹¹ Moreover, it is only following Pentecost that the Holy Spirit is sometimes called the Spirit of Jesus, the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of Jesus Christ, or the Spirit of his (God's) Son (Acts 16:7; Rom. 8:9; Gal. 4:6; Phil. 1:19; 1 Pet. 1:11).¹² In this connection, furthermore, it is to be noted that "anyone who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him" (Rom. 8:9; cf. Gal. 4:6).

In this connection it is also noteworthy that the gift of the Spirit is closely connected with Christian baptism. As we have seen, Acts 2:38 is evidence of this. Further evidence is provided in Acts 19:5-6, "On hearing this, they (the Ephesians who had previously had John the Baptist's baptism) were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And, when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them; ..." And, if we may put together the reports of Paul's own conversion, according to Acts 9:17 Ananias of Damascus said to him, "The Lord Jesus...has sent me that you may regain your sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit," and according to Acts 22:16 Ananias also said to him, "Now why do you delay? Get up, be baptized, and have your sins washed away, calling on his (Christ's) name." the instruction in the latter passage is reminiscent of Acts 2:38.¹³ In accord therewith, and also in accord with the urgency of the instruction in 22:16, the filling with the Spirit mentioned in Acts 9 was contingent upon baptism in Christ's name.

That the Samaritans of Acts 8 only received the Spirit subsequent to baptism, is an exception to Acts 2:38 (cf. Rom. 8:9). The explanations offered lack Biblical warrant, unless, being Samaritans, they needed to embrace the Jewish faith (cf. John 4:22-24), besides accepting: the good news about the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus, the Messiah, and baptism in his name (Acts 8:5, 12, 16). (That Cornelius and his friends received the Holy Spirit prior to baptism (Acts 10:44-48), is another exception to the rule though these Gentiles would not have received baptism, but for the evidence that they had received the Holy Spirit, who fell upon them as Peter told of reason for faith in Christ, and made the point of the prophets' testimony that "everyone who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name.") Only baptism is lacking from the prescription set forth in Acts 2:38.) There may be exceptions to external and temporal elements of the prescription. God is not a legalist. But exceptions do not nullify the prescription.¹⁴

Power for witness to Christ is said to be characteristic of endowment with the Spirit. "You will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the ends of the earth" (Acts 1:8). But, was Power, presumably the power of the Spirit, not available for ministry prior to Pentecost, at least on occasion? Was Jonah's witness to Nineveh not a powerful witness (Jonah 3:4-9)?¹⁵ Did John the Baptist not have a powerful ministry (Mark 1:5)? (According to Luke 1:15 "Even before his birth he will be filled with the Holy Spirit,"). Did those Jesus sent out two by two not have a powerful ministry (Mark 6:1,2,-13; Luke 9:6; 10:17-18)? Why the special need for power? In my opinion the special need for power was because they were to be witnesses to Christ. Effective witness to God, and to the Old Testament revelation concerning Him, could be difficult enough (e.g., 1 Kgs. 22:26-27; 2 Chron. 24:20-22; Isa. 6:9-10; Jer. 32:2-3; Amos 7:10-13). But to "proclaim Christ crucified" was to preach what was "a stumbling block to Jews and foolishness to Gentiles" (I Cor. 1:23). And to this day the idea of salvation freely provided by an event at a particular place and time in history is a common stumbling block and foolishness. It goes against our legalistic and/or rationalistic tendencies to a degree far greater than anything taught prior to Pentecost. For the preaching thereof to be effective requires an endowment with power far exceeding that required by the prophets. Nothing less than endowment with the Spirit of God who is also the Spirit of Jesus Christ Himself is sufficient. Though the Holy Spirit comes from the Father (John 15:26), and is the gift of the Father (John 14:16), He was sent "in (Jesus') name" (John 14:26), and was sent at Pentecost by Jesus Himself (John 15:26; 16:7; Acts 2:33). This being the case, those endowed with the Spirit are empowered to bear effective witness to Christ in accord with the particular gifts they enjoy.

The Spirit, however, not only empowers for witness, He also enables moral integrity. Though "the desires of the flesh" still assail us (Gal.5:16-17), we can "live by the Spirit," and so have victory over those desires, and abstain from "the works of the flesh" enumerated, though not exhaustively, in Gal. 5:19-21 (cf. Mark 7:21-22; Rom. 1:26-31; Col. 3:5; 1 Tim. 1:9-10; Rev. 21:8; etc..). Of course the Spirit of God endowed Old Testament saints with moral capability. Samuel prophesied that "the spirit of the Lord (would) come mightily upon (Saul)" and he would be "turned into another man," and soon thereafter "God gave him another heart" (1 Sam. 10:6, 9). David prayed, "Take not they holy spirit from me," in the midst of a petition for "a clean heart," and restoration of the "joy of thy salvation" (Ps. 51:10-12). However, there is reason to believe that following Pentecost the moral capability of God's people was enhanced. It seems to be significant that Paul calls the Spirit of God the Spirit of Christ in the midst of a passage affirming that "the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set you free from the law of sin and death," and exhorting His hearers, "If by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body you will live" (Rom. 8:2, 13). The Spirit of Christ enhanced moral ability because Christ had lived an exemplary life in the midst of this present evil age (Gal 1:4). Even more important was the manifestation of a love which suffered an undeserved death, a death in which the sins of the world were so borne that He cried out, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" (Mark 15:34). It was a death for us "while we still were sinners" (Rom 5:8) so that we might be "reconciled to God" Rom. 5:10). Such a one, risen from the dead, and with us always by His Spirit (Matt. 28:19-20) has a moral significance beyond what was known prior to Pentecost.

But besides providing power to witness to Christ, and power to live a pure life, beginning with Pentecost the Holy Spirit provided a subjective experience superior to what had been experienced prior thereto. In the Old Testament, particularly in the Psalms, we have expression given to great inner beatitude. Nehemiah can say "to all the people," "The joy of the Lord is your strength" (Neh. 8:10). The Psalmist can say, "Oh, how I love your law! It is my meditation all day long," and can add, "Great peace have those who love your law" (119:97, 165; cf. Prov. 3:13-18; Isa. 48:18; Mal. 2:6). From time to time God manifested His love for His own (cf. Hos. 11:1), eliciting from them the confession, "I love the Lord" (Ps. 116:1). But the angelic message to Bethlehem shepherds, a message of "peace" and "a great joy" (Luke 2:10, 14) suggests that the coming of Christ presaged peace and joy beyond any previously experienced. And at the Last Supper Jesus indicated that He was leaving a legacy of love, joy and peace such as had not been known previously (John 14:21,27; 15:9-10; cf. 17:13). When Paul declares, "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace" (Gal. 5:22), was he not declaring that by the Spirit with which He endows His own Christ's legacy is being enjoyed? It may be significant in this connection that in the preceding chapter Paul spoke of God sending "the Spirit of his Son into our hearts" (Gal. 4:6).

Indeed, Paul had said, "Because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying 'Abba! Father!'" (Gal 4:6) And, when he later wrote to the Christians in Rome, He expanded this doctrine, asserting, "You have received a spirit of adoption. When we cry, 'Abba! Father!' it is that very Spirit himself bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God" (Rom. 8:15-16). "We cry," in context, suggests that "Abba! Father!," or some equivalent, was common usage in the New Testament church. Jesus is credited with the usage (Mark 14:36), but what is particularly notable is that such language apparently implied an intimacy with God which was considered inappropriate in approaching the Most High.¹⁶ Indeed, in my opinion it would have implied an intimacy which was not previously experienced. The Spirit of Jesus, however, made it appropriate to follow Jesus' example by providing the kind of subjective experience which corresponded there with.¹⁷

II. The Ministers of the Church

]

The ministers of the church may be conveniently divided into (1) The Apostles, (2) The Continuing Leadership, and (3) The Laity. As we proceed it will become clear why we distinguish the apostles from the continuing leadership, and also why we include the laity as ministers of the church.

1. The Apostles

It may be thought that we should have included Christ as the foremost "minister" of the church. He is represented as having called Himself "the shepherd of the sheep" (John 10:2, cf. 14), and to have said that the sheep "listen to" Him and "follow" Him (John 10:8, 16, 27). That He speaks of "one flock" (John 10:16; cf. Luke 12:32) suggests that He has the church in view. At the Last Supper He declared, "If you keep my commandments, you will abide in my love" (John 15:10), and, "You are my friends if you do what I command you" (John 15:14; cf. Matt. 28:20). That He made these statements in the context of the vine and the branches suggests that the church is in view here too. Paul says that the church is the body of Christ (Eph. 1:22-23; Col. 1:24); describes

"Christ (as) the head of the church, his body" (Eph. 5:23); speaks of "the church (as) subject to Christ" (Eph. 5:24); and implies the necessity of "holding fast to the Head, from whom the whole body. ..grows with a growth that is from God" (Col. 2:19). In the Book of Revelation the ascended Christ is represented as communicating to the seven churches of Asia, and emphasizing the importance of keeping His "word" throughout (cf. 3:3, 10; 22:18-19).

Jesus Christ is the Head of the church. As such, however, He is not only the object of her worship, and the one with whom she has an intimate relationship. He is also the one whose will is to be done, a will expressed as commandments.¹⁸

However, since Christ has ascended the question of authority is paramount, because He left behind no written document or documents. Who may be trusted to pass on faithfully what Christ taught? Who can be trusted to articulate the "many things" which His people need to know, but which His disciples could not "bear" while He was among them (John 16:12)?

Jesus is represented as addressing that question at the Last Supper. He told the eleven with Him in the Upper Room, "The Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you everything, and remind you of all that I have said to you" (John 14:26); "You. ..are to testify, because you have been with me from the beginning" (John 15:27); "When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into (or 'in') all the truth. ..., and he will declare to you the things that are to come. ..He will take what is mine and declare it to you" (John 16:13-15).

In accord with this provision Paul asserts that "members of the household of God (are) built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the cornerstone" (Eph. 2:19-20); and that "the mystery of Christ...in former generation was not made known to humankind, as it has now been revealed to his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit. ..." (Eph. 3:4-5). ("Prophets" is anarthrous in both of these passages. Is it not probable, therefore, that individuals who are both apostles and prophets are in view?¹⁹ It is also in accord therewith that Jude 17 exhorts, "You, beloved, must remember the pre- dictions of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ"; and that Rev. 21:14 states the "the wall of the city (New Jerusalem) has twelve foundations, and on them are the twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb."

The reference to the twelve apostles of the Lamb leads to several comments: (1) Acts 1:15-26 reports that Matthias "was added to the eleven apostles," to fill the vacancy caused by the defection of Judas Iscariot. (2) "Apostle" in a non-technical sense could be used of persons who were delegates of local congregations (2 Cor. 8:23; Phil. 2:25). (3) A few others, not of the Twelve, qualified as apostles in the same sense as the Twelve, though they had not accompanied Jesus throughout His ministry (cf. John 15:27; Acts 1:21-22; Acts 13:31). They were individuals who had (a) seen the risen Lord, and (b) been commissioned by Him, e.g., Paul (Gal. 1:16; 1 Cor. 9:1-2; 15:8-10; cf. Acts 22:14-15; 26:16-18; 1 Tim 2:7): probably James the Lord's brother (1 Cor. 15:7; Gal. 1:19; cf. Gal. 2:9; Acts 15:19): and possibly Barnabas (cf. Acts 14:14).²⁰

The importance of eyewitness testimony is evident, and is emphasized in various Scriptures: (1) Luke testifies to the dependence of his gospel (and Acts?) on those "who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and servants of the word (or 'eyewitnesses who were also servants of the word!)" (Luke 1 :2); John says, "We have seen his (the Word's) glory" (John 1:14); and, "What we have seen with our eyes, what we have looked at and touched with our hands, concerning the word of life. ..we declare to you" (1 John 1: 1, 3). Peter claims to have been "a witness of the sufferings of Christ" (1 Pet. 5:1), and to have been an eyewitness "of his majesty" at His

transfiguration (2 Pet. 1:16- 18). And the author of Hebrews claims that the message of salvation "was attested to us by those who heard him (the Lord)" (Heb. 2:3):

It is in accord with the apostolic authority conferred upon them that the apostles were aware of carrying on a ministry faithful to the truth of God. Their conduct may not always have been impeccable. Peter could act "hypocritically" not acting consistently with the truth of the gospel" (Gal. 2:11-14). Perhaps Paul admitted 'wrongdoing' in that he had cried out in the Jewish council, "It is about the resurrection of the dead that I am on trial" (Acts 23:6; cf. 24:20-21). But in their ministry the apostles were conscious of being faithful witnesses to the truth. The clearest expression thereof is in 1 Thess. 2:13. "When you received the word of God that you heard from us, you accepted it not as a human word but as what it really is, God's word." Paul seems to imply that same consciousness in Gal. 1:11-12, "The gospel that was proclaimed by me is not of human origin. ..I received it through a revelation of Jesus Christ" (cf. 1:8-9); in 1 Cor. 2:16, "We have the mind of Christ"; and in Acts 20:27, "I did not shrink from declaring to you the whole purpose of God." According to 2 Pet. 1:16 Peter seems to have had like confidence: "We did not follow cleverly devised myths when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." The apostle John is credited likewise, "He knows that he tells the truth" (John 19:35; cf. 21:24).

Due to the passage of time the apostles passed from the scene of history. Paul instructed Timothy, "What you have heard from me through many witnesses entrust to faithful people who will be able to teach others as well" (2 Tim 2:2). However, there is no indication that the Holy Spirit would teach any of them "all things," and/or accurately bring to their remembrance part or all that the apostles had taught them, let alone that He would guide them "into (or'in') all the truth" (cf. John 14:26; 16:13). Only what the apostles, or their close associates, had written could be considered reliable. And it may be noted that the official correspondence of the apostles was considered to be as reliable as their oral ministry. Paul can instruct, "Those who do not obey what we say in this letter; have nothing to do with them, so that they may be ashamed" (2 Thess. 3:14). We read concerning John, "This is the disciple who is testifying to these things. ...; and we know that his testimony is true" (John 21:24). And the author of Revelation warns against adding to, or taking away from, "the words of the book of this prophecy" (Rev. 22:18-19).

Through their writings and the writings of their close associates the apostles remain a permanent gift of Christ to the church (Eph. 4:11).²¹ They provide all that we can trust as a guide to doctrine and practice in the church.²² In the days following Pentecost the believers "devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching" (Acts 2:42). The first concern of a faithful church is to do likewise.

2. Living Leadership

Though the apostolic testimony provides continuing authority with respect to doctrine and practice, living leaders are necessary for the ongoing life of the church in the world.

In the earliest days of the church in Jerusalem the apostles apparently exercised all the leadership functions required. They were even responsible for the distribution of relief (Acts 4:35; 5:2). However, they soon found that their responsibilities were more than they could properly handle. First of all, the distribution of relief had to be entrusted to others who could give the task the attention it deserved (Acts 6:1-6). Circumstances apparently led quite soon to further development with respect to organization.

From an organizational standpoint, the foremost leaders next to the apostles were commonly called elders. Indeed, the apostles were apparently considered to be elders along with the elders who were not apostles. According to 1 Pet. 5:1 Peter could call himself an elder. And, if the Epistles of John were written by John the apostle, he too could call himself an elder (2 John 1; 3

John 1).²³ On the other hand, it was considered necessary for each local church to have its own elders (Acts 14:23; Tit. 1:5; cf. Acts 11:30; Jas. 5:14).²⁴

In some churches, apparently those which were predominantly Gentile, the term *episcopos* ("bishop" or "overseer") was used instead of "elder" (cf. Phil. 1 :1). That the terms were interchangeable is evident in that Paul could call "the elders of the church" in Ephesus *episcopoi* (Acts 20:17, 28), and could use the two terms indiscriminately in instructing Titus concerning the organization of the churches in Crete (Tit. 1 :5, 7). "Pastor (*poimēn*)" was possibly used as another alternative to the term "elder" (Eph. 4:11; cf. Acts 20:28; 1 Pet. 5:2-4).²⁵ It appears that those who functioned as elders are in view in 1 Thess. 5:12, "those who. . .have charge of (*proΐstameoous*) you";²⁶ in Heb. 13:7, 17, 24, "your leaders (*hēgoumenoi*)"; and perhaps in 1 Cor. 12:28, "administrators (*kubernēseis*).",

Paul and Barnabas "appointed elders for them in every church" they had recently founded in Asia Minor (Acts 14:23), and Paul instructed Titus to "appoint elders in every town" in Crete (Tit. 1:5). However, though he is much concerned about the qualifications of elders (over-seers) in Ephesus, he says nothing about the method of their appointment (see 1 Tim. 3:1-7; 5:17-22). Was this because Ephesus was an older congregation in which the appointment of elders (overseers) was no longer the responsibility of an apostle or his representative? (One of the qualifications listed for the office of elder [overseer] in Ephesus was that one "must not be a recent convert" [1 Tim. 3:6]. But no such qualification is mentioned in the instructions to Titus [Tit. 1 :5-9]. Was this because the churches in Crete had been founded so recently that all their members were recent converts?) However, it is to be noted that Paul says to the elders of the church in Ephesus, "The Holy Spirit has made you *episcopous*" (Acts 20:28). I. H. Marshall comments thereon that in Acts 14:23 "we read how (elders) were appointed by Paul in some of his churches with prayer and fasting, i.e. in dependence on the guidance of the Spirit."²⁷ It is implied, therefore, (1) The choice (or election) of elders is to be a matter of recognizing God's call of persons to the office (cf. Acts 13:2; Heb. 5:1-4). (2) Recognition of God's call is facilitated by (a) consideration of the spiritual life, morals and gifts (abilities) of those who are prospects and/or candidates for the office (cf. Acts 1:21-22; 16:1-3; 1 Tim. 3:1), and (b) engagement in prayer and fasting. (3) The appointment (or election) is apparently to become effective by the laying on of hands (1 Tim. 5:22; cf. 4:14; 2 Tim. 1:6; Acts 13:2-3).

The responsibilities of elders include

(1) Being shepherds of the "flock" (Acts 20:28; Eph. 4:11; 1 Pet. 5:2). This means having oversight of the flock (Acts 20:28; 1 Tim. 3:1-2; 1 Pet 5:2), having charge thereof (1 Thess. 5:12; 1 Tim. 5:17), providing leadership thereto (Heb.13:7, 17), keeping watch over it (Acts 20:28; Heb. 13:17);²⁸ taking care of it (1 Tim. 3:5); helping the weak therein (Acts 20:35); and administering needed discipline (Tit. 1:11).²⁹ In general, the elder is to fulfill a ruling and caring function in the church.

(2) Ordinarily the elder is expected to be active in preaching (1 Tim. 5:17; Heb. 13:7) and teaching (Eph. 4:11; 1 Tim. 3:2; Tit. 1:9), though not all elders fulfilled such a ministry (1 Tim. 5:17).

(3) According to Eph. 4: 11' 12, elders are largely responsible for the "equipment" of "lay" Christians "for the work of ministry."

Apparently deacons soon became officials of local congregations alongside the elders (Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:1-13).³⁰ Though they are not called deacons, the seven of Acts 6 were chosen to "serve (*diakonein*) tables." If they are to be distinguished from the deacons mentioned in Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3, probably they are nevertheless a prototype thereof.

Apparently deacons had responsibilities relating to the "secular" activities of the congregation. Acts 6 is probably indicative of responsibility for the congregational relief program. It may be assumed that other matters of a "secular" nature were also assigned to them. That their qualifications included the ability to "manage their children and their households well" (1 Tim. 3:12) suggests that they needed to have administrative skills, as did the elders. On the other hand, it is probably significant that nothing is said about ability to preach and/or teach, as was ordinarily (?) expected of elders (1 Tim. 3:2; 5:17; Tit. 1 :9).³¹

Christian widows of at least sixty years of age., who had no relatives to support them, were enrolled and cared for by the congregation. In return they evidently participated in the visitation and aid programs of the local church, no doubt insofar as health and strength permitted (1 Tim.5:9-16).³²

Beside elders, deacons (and enrolled widows?) who were the official leaders of the local congregation, certain other individuals exercised leadership functions which were recognized as important, but apparently without official appointment or election thereto. Chief among these were prophets³³ (e.g., Acts 13:1; 15:32; 1 Cor. 12:28; 14:29; Eph. 4:11; Rev. 11:10; 18:20, etc.), evangelists (Eph. 4:11; 2 Tim. 4:5),³⁴ and teachers (Acts 13: 1; 1 Cor 12:28; Jas. 3: 1).³⁵ Perhaps we may also distinguish apostolic representatives such as Timothy and Titus (1 Tim. 1:3ff.; Tit. 1:5ff.; cf. 2 Tim. 4:12).³⁶

3. The Laity

The "laity" of the church, as we have indicated, have a ministry. they are to (1) Exercise a priestly function (1 Pet. 2:5, 9), that is, have "charge of things pertaining to God on their (mortals') behalf" (Heb. 5:1), and "offer spiritual sacrifices" (1 Pet. 2:5), i.e., "acceptable worship" (Heb. 12:28); (2) "Proclaim the mighty acts of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light" (1 Pet. 2:9); and (3) Exercise their particular gifts "for the common good." Each Christian has been endowed by the Spirit with a gift or gifts with this purpose in view (1 Cor. 12:7; cf. Rom. 12:6; 1 Pet.4:10).

III. Activities of the Church

1. Worship

Corporate worship was undoubtedly important in the New Testament church, though clear reference thereto is not frequent, perhaps because it could be taken for granted. Indeed, sometimes it is not clear whether corporate or private worship is in view. For example, when Paul says, "(We) worship God" (Phil. 3:3), it is not clear whether he means that we worship Him individually or corporately, or both.³⁷ And when he urges those he addresses to pray for Him (Eph. 6:18-20), it is not clear whether he is asking for individual prayers, for corporate prayer, or for both, though I suspect that both are in view because both individual and corporate concerns pervade the epistle.

The corporate worship of God is reported in Acts 13:1-2 ("The church at Antioch ...worshipping the Lord"), and is implied in 1 Cor. 14:24-26, which speaks of Christians "com(ing) together," and of the possibility of an "unbeliever or outsider enter(ing)" and responding to what he observes with respect to the "worship (of God)." The corporate worship of Christians is also in view in Eph. 3:21, "To him (God) be glory in the church. ..." Corporate worship is specifically in view in Rev. 4:10; 5:14; 7:11; 11:16; 19:4. Though this is reported as seen in visions of heaven, and of the future, it is clearly assumed that such worship is normal and typical of God's people on earth. Indeed, it may well be that the descriptions of this worship derive from worship practices in New Testament churches.³⁸

Though the term is often used with a wider meaning in English-speaking lands, worship is essentially the glorification of God. Such glorification may be through verbal ascriptions of praise (e.g., Rom. 1:25; 11:33-36; 2 Cor. 9:15; Eph. 3:21; 1 Tim. 1:17; Jude 24-25; etc.), prayers of adoration and thanksgiving (e.g., Acts 4:24-28; Rom. 1:8; 1 Cor. 1:4, 9; Phil. 1:3-5; 1 Pet. 1:3-5); and songs of praise and gratitude (e.g., Eph. 5:19-20; Col. 3:16; Rev. 5:9-10; 15:3-4).³⁹

It is notable that corporate prayer is in view in (1) Acts 1:14, where the Eleven, certain women, Jesus' mother and His brothers, are said to have devoted themselves to prayer together. That the prayer included worship may be assumed, in view of Luke 24:52 which reports that after the risen Christ "withdrew from them (the Eleven and some others) ... They returned to Jerusalem with great joy, and they were continually in the temple blessing God." (2) Acts 2:42 where it is stated that those who responded to Peter's Pentecostal ministry devoted themselves to "the prayers," that is, probably, to the prayers of Christian meetings.⁴⁰ That the prayers must have included worship is indicated in that it is said that they had "glad. .. hearts, praising God" (Acts 2:46-47). (3) Acts 4:24-31 which reports corporate prayer recognizing God's sovereignty following the charge by the Jewish council to Peter and John "not to speak or teach at all in the name of Jesus."

Singing as an element of corporate worship is in view in (1) Eph. 5:19 which speaks of Christians "sing(ing) psalms and hymns and spiritual songs among yourselves, singing and making melody to the Lord in your hearts, giving thanks to God the Father. .."; (2) Col. 3:16, where Paul encourages the Colossian congregation "with gratitude in your hearts sing psalms, hymns and spiritual songs to God"; (3) In the visions of Revelation where corporate singing is replete with praise (e.g., 5:9; 14:3; 15:3; cf. 4:8, 10; 5:12; 11:17; 19:1, 4, 5, 6).

One cannot speak of worship in the early church without including reference to the Lord's Supper. That corporate worship was an essential element thereof is clear from the repeated emphasis on the giving of thanks included therein (Matt. 26:27; Mark 14:23; Luke 22: 17, 19; 1 Cor. 11:24), and is indicated also in the close connection between the statement about the earliest Christians "breaking bread" and the statement about them "praising God" (Acts 2:46-47).⁴¹ Indeed, in my opinion the emphasis on partaking of the Lord's Supper "in remembrance of Christ," and the statement that in so doing people "proclaim the Lord's death" (1 Cor. 11:26), suggest the honoring of Christ, and so the worship of Him.

Acts 2:42, 46, indicate that the Lord's Supper was an important element in the life of the primitive church, and 1 Cor. 11:20 ("When you come together, it is not really to eat the Lord's supper") implies that at Christian assemblies there was commonly, if not always, participation in what was considered to be the Lord's Supper. Much disagreement prevails concerning the meaning of the Supper, but its significance as a major element of worship, is hardly debatable.⁴²

2. The Edification of God's People

The Apostle Paul admonishes, "When you come together. ..Let all things be done for building up" (1 Cor. 14:26; cf. 14:5, 12; Acts 20:32; Rom. 14:19; 2 Cor. 12:19; Eph. 4:12, 16, 29; 1 Tim. 1:4). Worship and edification cannot be divorced. We have seen how Paul could speak of "sing(ing) psalms and hymns and spiritual songs," but describes that activity as "singing and making melody to the Lord. .." (Eph. 5:19)! As M. Barth observes, "Only the praise of God is to be sung. That praise will serve mutual edification."⁴³ Likewise, missionary endeavour and edification cannot be divorced. Repeatedly the Acts tells of joy and the praise of God resulting from the reports of people responding to the proclamation of the gospel (e.g., Acts 11:18; 15:3). Moreover, report of such contributed to the maturity of vision which made possible the decree of the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15:12-29). Indeed verbal communication of every kind may contribute to the edification of God's people. In Eph. 4:11-12 Paul states that apostles, prophets,

evangelists and pastor-teachers perform a ministry important for "building up the body of Christ." And in 1 Cor. 14:26-28 he makes it plain that even those who speak in tongues may edify those who hear them, provided that what they say is interpreted.

And it is not only the spoken word which may contribute to edification. One's conduct may contribute thereto as well. In Rom. 14:17-19 Paul indicates that "righteousness and peace and joy" have a part to play in "mutual up-building"; and in 1 Cor. 8 he implies that conduct which accords with love "builds up." Again, in 1 Cor. 10:23-24 he exhorts to seek the good of the neighbor with a view to his advantage.. In this connection, participation in the Lord's Supper is said to be a means of "proclaim(ing) the Lord's death until he comes" (1 Cor. 11:26). The rites and public services of the church, as well as the good deeds of its members both individually and corporately, contribute significantly to the building up of the body of Christ.

Of major importance for the edification of God's people, however, is fulfillment of Christ's instruction, "Teaching them to obey everything that I have commanded you" (Matt. 28:20). (Indeed, deeds and ceremonial acts of themselves are meaningless. They need to be interpreted.) According to Matthew's gospel, Jesus began His ministry with proclaiming that the kingdom of heaven is at hand, and calling upon people to respond to that good news with repentance (Matt. 4: 17; cf. 4:23-25). Having made disciples, he proceeded to teach them in what we call the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5-7). Though it appears that "the crowds" heard Him (Matt. 7:28-29), He was primarily addressing His disciples, and teaching them. The good news of the kingdom was not the burden of His speech on that occasion, but what it means to be a worthy member of that kingdom. Instruction rather than proclamation was primarily what He was about. Likewise, in the Book of the Acts we have a good deal of proclamation of the good news of what God has done and will do in Christ, and the appeal for response thereto, but the epistles are largely instructive of those who have responded to the gospel call, and of the churches into which they have been incorporated.

Paul recognizes and promotes other functions and activities of the church, but places emphasis on the instruction of God's people. He writes to Timothy, "If you put these instructions before the brothers and sisters, you will be a good servant of Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. 4:6). He states that elders are to be "able to preach with sound doctrine. ..." (Tit. 1:9; cf. 1 Tim. 3:2). Among the last things he says to Timothy in the epistle when he is "already being poured out as a libation and, the time of my departure has come" (2 Tim. 4:6), is the assertion, "All scripture is inspired by God and is useful for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness" (3:16); and the exhortation, "Be persistent ...in teaching. For the time is coming when people will not put up with sound doctrine, but. ..will accumulate for themselves teachers to suit their own desires. ..." (4:2-3).⁴⁴ Moreover, in this valedictory epistle he urges Timothy, "What you have heard from me through many witnesses entrust to faithful people who will be able to teach others as well" (2 Tim. 2:2; cf. 1 Tim. 5:17). Sound instruction must prevail not only in the immediate future but thereafter as well.

As has been indicated, in 2 Timothy sound teaching is derived from two sources: (1) The Scriptures, i.e., the Old Testament; and (2) Paul's own teaching. In 1:13 he exhorts Timothy, "Hold to the standard of sound teaching that you have heard from me. ..." (cf. 2:2; 3:10). In 2 Peter we may note also: (1) The authority of the Old Testament: "No prophecy of Scripture is a matter of one's own interpretation" (1 :20); and (2) Paul's writings are included in the Scriptures (3:15-16); (3) Peter's teachings are reliable (1:12, 15, 16, 19).⁴⁵ In John's Gospel we have comparable material: (1) "Scripture (the Old Testament) cannot be annulled" (10:35; cf. 5:39); (2) "This is the disciple who is testifying to these things, and has written them; and we know that his testimony is true" (21 :24); (3) "The Spirit of truth. ..will guide you (the Eleven) into (or'in') all the truth" (16:13; cf. 14:26). The Old Testament plus the apostolic witness constitute the sources from which sound doctrine is derived.

Fellowship is also important for the building up of God's people. In Acts 2:42 we are informed that the first Christians not only devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching, but also to their fellowship. And Heb. 10:25 exhorts the brethren not to neglect "to meet together, ... but encourag(e) one another."

According to Mark 3:14, Jesus chose the twelve in part that they might "be with him." "Being in the company of Jesus provided the Twelve with the basis for their mission."⁴⁶ But was this the only reason? Is it possible that Jesus wanted the support of a close relationship with other people? Though Mark 3:14 may not imply it, was Jesus fully human, if He did not require it? And in Gethsemane, Jesus rebuked Peter, "Could you not keep awake one hour?" F. V. Filson comments, "The reproach and desire for companionship are evident."⁴⁷

According to 1 John 1:7, "If we walk in the light, as he (God) himself is in the light, we have fellowship with one another" (cf. v.3). It is possible that we should also see a reference to the fellowship of God's people in 2 Cor. 13:13 ("the communion of the Holy Spirit"), and in Phil. 2:1 ("sharing [*koinōnia*] in the Spirit"), though this is much debated.⁴⁸

It is fellowship of a particular kind that is to characterize the church, and be fostered in it. It is affirmed in 1 John 1:3, "We declare to you what we have seen and heard, so that you also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ." The fellowship important in the church is a fellowship which (1) is based on "a common faith in Jesus Christ";⁴⁹ and (2) includes fellowship with "the Father and the Son."⁵⁰ Moreover, according to 1 John 1:7, as we have seen, this fellowship is an abiding matter, "if we walk in the light as he (God) himself is in the light." In this connection it is appropriate to note Jesus' statement to the Eleven, "You are my friends if you do what I command you" (John 15:14). And He proceeds to set forth what it has meant that He has treated them as friends, "I have called you friends, because I have made known to you everything that I have heard from my Father" (John 15:15). Friendship and fellowship imply open sharing, particularly with respect to that on which the relationship is based.

The Lord's Supper is of special significance with respect to communal Christian fellowship. In 1 Cor. 10:16 Paul speaks of the Supper as meaning "sharing (*koinōnia*) in the blood of Christ" and "in the body of Christ." He adds, "Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread." J. Behm comments, "The community which blesses the cup of blessing and breaks the bread is inwardly related to Christ now present. ..But partaking of one bread . . .creates fellowship between the members too. . ."⁵¹

That fellowship is important in the church is implied in Eph. 4:16, "The whole body, joined and knit together by every ligament with which it is equipped, as each part is working properly, promotes the body's growth in building itself up in love." M. Barth comments, "'Love' is denoted as the ground, the sphere, the instrument of the church's existence." This love includes "the mutual love of the saints."⁵² In accord with such an understanding, Paul exhorts, "Above all, clothe yourselves with love, which binds everything together in perfect harmony" (Col. 3:14). In this connection, F. F. Bruce asserts, "Love. . .holds Christians together in fellowship under the strain of all common life."⁵³

3. Ministry to Others

Besides providing opportunities for the worship and edification of its people, the church is to be engaged in ministry to those outside its ranks.

This ministry first and foremost means that the church heeds the mandate of Christ, "Go. . .and make disciples of all nations" (Matt. 28:19), a mandate which, in one form or another, is set forth

at the end, or near the end, of each of the four gospels (Matt. 28:19; Mark 16: 15; Luke 24:47-49; John 20:21), and again in Acts 1:8. Though the Matthaean form of the mandate is addressed to "the eleven disciples," the appended promise ("Remember, I am with you always, to the end of the age") indicates a wider application. "The period indicated-from the Resurrection and enthronement of Christ till the final consummation-is for Matthew the era of the Church's life and mission."⁵⁴ Moreover, though in each form of the mandate the eleven are being addressed, at least primarily, the fact that they provided the founding leadership and abiding authority for the church is suggestive of a permanent responsibility of the church. And Rev. 22:17 indicates that it was so understood: "The Spirit and the Bride (the church) say, 'Come.' And let everyone who hears say, 'Come.' And let him who is thirsty come, let anyone who wishes take the water of life as a gift" (cf. Rom. 10:15).⁵⁵ R. H. Mounce comments, "It is the testimony of the church empowered by the Holy Spirit that constitutes the great evangelizing force of this age."⁵⁶

The New Testament church at Antioch is more or less exemplary in this respect. Those who formed the nucleus of that church "spoke the word to no one except Jews." But some of them "spoke to the Hellenists also, proclaiming the Lord Jesus," with the result that "a great number....turned to the Lord." And when Barnabas came to Antioch and gave leadership, "a great many people were brought to the Lord" (Acts 11:19-24). Then we read of this church sending Barnabas and Saul (Paul) on a missionary tour. And thereafter it continued to be supportive of Paul and his missionary activities (Acts 13:1-3; 14:26-27; 18:22-23).

Evangelization was not the sole concern of the New Testament church for others. There was concern for the corporate welfare of those who responded to the proclamation of the word of the Lord. This is evident in the occasional references to the organization of local bodies of believers. In the earliest days in Jerusalem the apostles provided such organization as was needed (cf. Acts 4:35, 37). Soon further development of the organization was required and effected (Acts 6: 1-6). Paul was not only concerned about the winning of converts. We find him rather quickly appointing elders for new groups of believers, or arranging for their appointment (Acts 14:23; Tit. 1:5). In fact, he implies that the appointment of elders would "put in order what remained to be done" in the various Christian fellowships in Crete. Moreover, in more established churches he not only recognizes the significance of their leadership (e.g., Acts 20:17, 28; 1 Thess. 5:12; 1 Cor. 12:28; Eph. 4:8-12; Phil. 1:1; cf. Heb. 13:7, 17, 24), he is also concerned about improving their organization (1 Tim. 3:1-13; 5:9-22). Following his instructions to Timothy concerning the qualifications of elders and deacons, he says, "I am writing these instructions to you so that. . .you may know how one ought to behave in the household of God, which is the church of the living God." (1 Tim. 3:15)⁵⁷

The New Testament church, however, was not solely concerned about the evangelization of mankind and the organization of Christian communities. It was also concerned with social issues.

The chief concern in this respect was with the social welfare of its own members. We read that members of the Jerusalem church "sold their possessions and goods and distribute(d) the proceeds to all, as any had need" (Acts 2:45; cf. 4:34-37). Needy widows seem to have been a special concern, not only in Jerusalem (Acts 6:1), but also in Ephesus (1 Tim. 5:16). James, Cephas and John exhorted Paul and Barnabas to "remember the poor, which was actually what I was eager to do" (Gal. 2:10). Indeed, prior to this time Paul and Barnabas had conveyed "relief to the believers living in Judea" (Acts 11:27-30), and at a later date Paul devoted much of his own time and energy, as well as enlisting his churches, in gathering and transmitting a large contribution for the relief of poverty-stricken Christians in Judea (Acts 24:17; Rom. 15:25; 1 Cor. 16:1-4; 2 Cor. 8-9).

There are rather frequent exhortations to meet the material needs of those who are "of the family of faith" (Gal. 6:10; cf. Rom. 12:13; Heb. 13:2; Jas. 2:15-17; 1 John 3:17; etc.) Though the

exhortations may be intended for the individuals to whom they apply, the very fact that the epistles in which they occur are read to the congregation as a whole implies that the congregation as a whole is to support them, and, no doubt, that the congregation is to take corporate action where applicable and appropriate.⁵⁸

The economic, social and political circumstances in which most first-century Christians lived explains the paucity of New Testament emphasis on contributing to the material and social needs of those who are not Christians. However, exhortation with respect to such needs is not lacking. Paul urges, "Whenever we have opportunity, let work for the good of all. .." (Gal. 6:10). And, when he instructs Timothy to charge those "who in the present age are rich" to "do, good, to be rich in good works, generous and ready to share" (1 Tim. 6:18), it seems unlikely that they are only being told to conduct themselves in such fashion toward fellow Christians. Indeed, on another occasion Paul exhorts, quoting Prov. 25:21-22 LXX, "If your enemies are hungry, feed them; if they are thirsty, give them something to drink" (Rom. 12:20). C. E. B. Cranfield comments, "By the words food and drink we are to understand kindness of every sort."⁵⁹ Moreover, there would be the memory of Jesus' own words about loving our neighbor, which, as His parable of the Good Samaritan shows, means ministering so far as we are able to the needs of anyone, regardless of his/her nation, class or religion (Luke 10:27-37).⁶⁰

Insofar as the structures of society are concerned, the New Testament church and its members had little possibility of effecting improvement. What they did do was by way of influencing attitudes rather than initiating specific action for reform. For example, Paul did not attack slavery, but did make it clear that a Christian seeks to maintain the kind of relationships which make the legal circumstances essentially insignificant (Eph. 6:9; Col. 4:1; Phil. 15-16; cf. 1 Cor. 11:22, 33-34).

Otherwise, early Christians were given, on the one hand, such instructions as Rom. 13:1-7 and 1 Pet. 2:13, which urged respect and obedience to governing authorities (cf. 1 Sam. 24:6, 10). On the other hand they had the example of Jesus and Paul standing up for their legal rights before authorities (John 18:23; Acts 16:35-39; 22:25-29; 25:11-12). Moreover, they had the example of Jesus driving those who bought and sold from the temple (Matt. 21:12-13; cf. 21:23), and of Peter and the apostles disobeying the charge by the Jewish council not to teach in Jesus' name (Acts 5:27-32). They also had the Old Testament example of Jesus' rebellion against King Joram of Israel in accordance with divine instruction (2 Kings 9:1-26).⁶¹ However, there is no evidence that the church as such, encouraged, or should have encouraged, political action, even by pacific means, with a view to change in social, economic or political structures. Whether this was due simply to the exigencies of their situation, and might have been different under other circumstances, is not indicated.⁶²

Conclusion

We have briefly summarized biblical ecclesiology. We have only to add that our outline, which we believe to be responsible and adequate, reveals a Trinitarian structure, in that there are three major topics, each of which, in turn, has a three-fold division. Moreover, we suggest that the major topics correspond, at least in general, to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and that each of the three subdivisions correspond to the same three persons of the Trinity.

1. Muller, Philippians, 90-1.
2. This seems to be the sense, cf. Craigie, Psalms 1-50, 304.

3. Gen 4:1, 25, may intimate that Eve had a positive relationship with Him, but this is not certain.
4. Unless otherwise indicated, biblical quotations are according to the New Revised Standard Version.
5. J. R. Nelson, The Realm of Redemption, Fifth Edition (London: E.P. Worth, 1962)
6. Some scholars reject the view that Gentile Christians are incorporated into God's ancient people. They interpret Paul's statement that Christ "create(d) in himself one new humanity in place of the two" (Eph 2:15), I. e., in place of Israel and believing Gentiles, in such fashion as, in effect, to nullify the significance of "fellow citizens (sumpolitai) with the saints and also members of the household (oikeioi) of God" (Eph 2: 19).
7. 'The people (laos) is used to refer to Israel as opposed to the Gentiles in Acts 26:17, 23; Rom 15:10. Though laos is anarthrous in 1 Pet 2:10, it occurs of Israel without the article in Wisd 18:13; Sir 16:10; Jude 5. Moreover; the modifier theou, indicates that laos is definite (cf. H. P. V.I: Nunn. A Short Syntax of New Testament Greek (Cambridge: University Press, 1956] 57)
8. Nelson, Realm of Redemotion
9. L. Morris, The Gospel according to John (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971 repr. 1973) 462.
10. Cf. C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (New York: Harper & Row, 1973) 112. P. E. Hughes, ~ Second Epistle to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962) 93, thinks that Paul "is referring. ..to all that took place at the time of his conversion. "He does not give due weight to the occurrence of the plural.
11. Cf. Morris, .John, 846 n 53.
12. Cf. M. C. Tenney in EBC, 9:193.
13. We suggest that Jews and other devoted to the God of Israel only needed baptism in the name of Jesus because they were already recognized as devotees of the true God and of His Spirit. In Matt 28:19 baptism in the triune name is prescribed because making "disciples of all nations" is in view. Amongst Gentiles commitment to the true God, as well as to the Son and the Spirit, needed public representation.
14. In retrospect Peter can say that "the Spirit of Christ within" the Old Testament prophets predicted "the sufferings destined for Christ and the subsequent glory" (1 Pet 1:11). The Spirit was the Spirit of God's Son from all eternity; but was not recognized as such prior to Pentecost.
15. Cf. I. H. Marshall, The Acts of the Apostles (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) 357.

16. In my opinion a healthier individual and congregational life would prevail if churches today conformed more closely to the prescription.
17. If the book of Jonah is not a historical record, as many hold, a powerful ministry; is nevertheless considered a possibility.
18. W. L. Lane, The Gospels according to Mark (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974 repr. 1978) 518.
19. In the Old Testament God is seldom referred to as "Father;" and even then usually as the Father of the nation or of the coming Messiah, and in those cases the context is usually one in which He is thought of as Creator or Redeemer. It never seems to be used because He is one with whom individuals may have a blessed personal relationship.
20. According to D. M. Mathers, The Word and the Way (Toronto: United Church Publishing House, 1962) 94, "When God's word comes to man, God is giving man himself. What He reveals is not something but someone; himself" (cf. pp. 91-95). But revelation without information is just an enigma. God's revelation of himself must include at least the information that it is God who is revealing himself. Mathers also says, "Christian faith doesn't really mean believing the things that you read in the Bible; it means believing in the God that the Bible tells you about, trusting him and obeying him" (p. 96, emphasis his). But to believe in "the God that the Bible tells you about" is to believe at least some of the things that you read in the Bible"!
21. For other views, see M. Barth, Ephesians (Garden City; N.Y.: Doubleday; 1974 repr. 1981) 1:314-17.
22. Some would add Andronicus and Junias (Rom 16.7) to the list.
23. Though Judas Iscariot was replaced by Matthias, there is no evidence that James the son of Zebedee, whose martyrdom is reported in Acts 12:2, was replaced.
24. The Ante-Nicene Fathers recognized that the apostles were the supreme, if not the only authority with respect to doctrine and practice.
25. Judaism had its elders who exercised a "ruling" function and provided the precedent for church elders (cf. Exod 3:16; Deut 19:12; Ezra 6:7; Matt 26:57; Acts 6:12; 24:1; etc.).
26. In his vision of heaven John saw twenty-four "elders" on thrones around the throne of God (Rev 4:4; cf. 19:4). G. E. Ladd, A Commentary on the Revelation of John (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972 repr. 1978) 75, understands "the twenty-four elders (to be) a body of angels who help execute the divine rule in the universe. " If so, they are probably the counterpart of elders in the local church.

27. J. Jeremias, ID1::!L 6:497-98, contends that 'pastor' "is not yet an established title in Eph 4:11."
28. Proĭstēmi is used of elders in 1 Tim 5:17; Rom 12:8 (?).
29. Acts, 333-34.
30. Acts 20:28: prosechō; Heb 13:17: hēgeomai.
31. J. N. D. Kelly, A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles (Grand Rapids: Baker; 1963 repr. 1981) 234.
32. Did Titus get no instructions concerning deacons because the congregations of Crete were of such recent establishment, and were as yet so small, that such a separate office was not needed?
33. According to Acts 6, the apostles, who apparently fulfilled the deacons' function in Jerusalem up to this time, now devoted themselves "to prayer and to serving the word."
34. The enrolled widows are not called deacons or deaconesses. Though they seem to have been involved in some of the activities in which deacons were involved, I suspect that they were not involved in the administration thereof, as deacons seem to have been. Phoebe was probably a deacon (or deaconess) but could hardly have been an enrolled widow (cf. Rom 16:1-2).
35. There seem to have been many who prophesied occasionally, but not with sufficient frequency to be known as prophets. According to 1 Cor 14:37 there were apparently those who functioned as prophets, without general recognition as such.
36. Probably these were, or included, individuals such as Apollos, who was not an apostle, but carried on an itinerant ministry (Acts 18:27; 1 Cor 16:12; cf. 3 John 5-8; Rom 10:15).
37. Elders were official teachers. Jas 3: 1 indicates that there were those who functioned as teachers without official sanction (cf. 1 Tim 1:7).
38. In my opinion workers of miracles, healers, helpers, speakers in various kinds of tongues, interpreters of tongues, etc., (cf. 1 Cor 12:8-10; 28-29) were not included among the leaders as such.
39. The corporate emphasis in Phil 1:27; 2:1-2, may suggest that Paul is thinking of corporate worship, or to both individual and corporate worship.
40. What is seen in a vision derives from what is familiar to the one who has the vision. The material may be reorganized, may be a pastiche of familiar matters, and may be located in a new time and place, but the elements of what one sees are not new.

41. Such worship is often in conjunction with petition, supplication, and inter-cession. And it may be closely joined to instruction, exhortation, admonition, etc. Indeed the very words giving expression to praise and thanksgiving may instruct and provide exhortation and/or admonition (e.g., Rom 8:31-39; 2 Cor 9:15; Eph 3:21; 1 Tim 1:17; etc.).
42. In view of Acts 3:1, the reference may be to "set Jewish hours of prayer" (Marshall, Acts, 83).
43. I hold with those scholars who are of the conviction that "the breaking of bread" was a way of speaking of the Lord's Supper (e.g., Marshall, Acts, 83. Per contra, J. Behm, I).NI, 3:731, 737).
44. The Quakers and the Salvation Army are probably the best-known groups which do not include the Lord's Supper in their practices. Acts 2 and 1 Cor 11 indicate that it was much more prominent in the primitive church than it is in many Protestant denominations today.
- Christian baptism focuses attention on commitment to Christ, dying and rising with Christ, and incorporation into the church. Because Christ is so central therein, honor and glory accrue to Him. Such being the case, worship is implicit, if not explicit, in the rite.
45. Ephesians, 2:583.
46. Instruction within the Christian community is clearly in view. Paul urges Timothy, "Proclaim the message," and "Do the work of an evangelist" (2 Tim 4:2, 5). It seems to me, however, that sound teaching is especially on his mind.
47. J. N. D. Kelly; A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1969 repr. 1981) 320, paraphrases 1:19. "In the apostles' experience of the Transfiguration we... have confirmation of the message of prophecy."
48. R. A. Guelich, Mark 1-8:26 (Dallas: Word Books, 1989) 159.
49. A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew (London: Black, 1967) 279; cf. S. E. Johnson, ill, 7:579. Lane, Mark, 518-19, argues, however; that Jesus' Gethsemane rebuke of Peter was not because He needed or desired, "comfort and companionship." He urged the apostles to watch and pray; not for Him but for themselves.
50. See Barrett, Second Corinthians, 344; G. F. Hawthorne, Philippians (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1983) 66.
51. Paul speaks of "the faith we share" (Tit 1:4; cf. Rom 15:27; 1 Cor 1:9; Phil 1:7), and Jude of "the salvation we share" (Jude 3). Fellowship is implied in both instances.
52. Marshall, Epistles of John, 104.

53. TDNT; 3:739; cf. F. Hauck, TDNT, 3:806.
54. Ephesians, 2:451.
55. F. F. Bruce, "Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians, " E. K. Simpson and F. F. Bruce, Commentary on the Epistles to the Eoheians and the Colossians (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957 repr. 1973) 281 n 106.
56. Hill, Matthew, 362.
57. It is possible to take the invitation in the first part of the verse as addressed to Christ, calling on Him to return from heaven, but this is not likely (cf. Mounce, Revelation, 395).
58. Revelation, 395.
59. The instructions referred to surely include what is stated in 1 Tim 2 concerning church practice. Indeed, Kelly, Pastoral Epistles, 86, holds, "The instructions cover the entire charge contained in the letter. " We are inclined to agree, but they cannot refer to less than what is stated in chapters 2 and 3.
60. Note the special emphasis on showing hospitality: Rom 12:13; 1 Tim 3:2; 5:10; Tit 1:8; Heb 13:2; 1 Pet 4:9. The conditions prevailing in inns and hostels, to say nothing of the meager resources of the average Christian, explain such exhortation.
61. Romans. 2:648; cf. Murray, Romans, 2:142.
62. In Rom 13:10 ("Love does no wrong to a neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law") Paul's quotation of Lev 19:18 serves a somewhat different purpose from Jesus' quotation thereof.