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This study examines an ontological reading of theology: in Trinity, in the believer and in Church. It is based on biblical exegesis and comparison with traditional theological thinking. The purpose of analysis is to discover the theological and practical implications of an ontological understanding to traditional historical theology of how God in Trinity, in the believer and in the Church are comprehended and experienced. This question is important to uncovering the dimensions of ‘being.’ The rationale is to formulate the unique contribution that ontological thinking brings to understanding God in Trinity: in substance, in relationship and in function; the consequences for the believer through redefined relationship with the Trinity in the Person of Christ; and rediscovery of ontological principles to be restored, in renewal of the Church of Jesus Christ. It is believed that recovery of ontological truths in a cohesive theology may redefine aspects of historical Christianity on the grounds of the interrelationship and interaction of Trinity. The significance of how God produces existentially and ontologically His life within the believer will define humanity in being, through relationship to Godhead. Likewise, these truths mediate relationship among believers, distinguishing them from all other religions. The ontological significance will redefine church according to the nature and Person of Godhead, thereby widely forming structures and functions according to ontological truths and practices.
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Chapter One: INTRODUCTION

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This research paper analyzes the religious construct of Christianity, identifying the core principles: historical, philosophical and theological, that are expressed. Definition is given to the ontological premise for comprehending Trinity, the believer, and the church. The examination of biblical texts will redefine integrally and cohesively Christian experience in order to restore the primary importance of the ontological meaning of Godhead, of humanity and of church as an existential reality before any functional consideration; to reconnect the ontology of the Trinitarian existence as defining the nature of man and his relationship to the Godhead.
IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

This study restores the primacy of the existential and ontological to Christianity, whereas since the 6th century, the understanding has been religious and institutional, functional and positional, as this thesis will develop further. The uniqueness of the person of Jesus Christ restores every believer to God’s original intentions. This research paper redresses the imbalance of functional institutionalism whereby adherence and ascent to credence of dogma replaces encounter with a Person in an ontological and existential way.

This study will be a resource for those desiring to explore biblical apostolic Christianity and will provide a theological foundation for those pursuing a profound ontological reform both theologically and practically.

There has been a renewed interest in the Trinity in recent years. Certain ecclesiastical movements have been looking for fresh expressions of church. This study seeks to move beyond a ‘form’ in reform to a theological renewal that connects the Trinitarian reality directly to a renewed understanding of humankind in Christ; revitalizing church through a restoration of ontology and being to their rightful place. This reorders function to flow out of ontology, and works to flow out of being in Christ in Trinity. This study connects three critical elements from this renewal: the Trinity, the believer and the church, in a coherent theological progression.
METHODOLOGY

Primary and secondary sources used, identify major historical figures, and events that influenced and shaped considerably the understanding of God, and are examined in ontological terms. It is not exhaustive but representative. The primary text is the Bible, followed by writings of the early Church fathers, key reformers, and contemporary theologians, specific to the subject. The referenced texts provide historical and theological background and are developed in each of the three chapters of the thesis. Furthermore, an exegesis of the biblical texts is given primary importance in the thesis proposal. Conclusions are drawn to support and develop the ontological construct.
DELIMITATIONS

Throughout this paper, historical analysis is not exhaustive, it is specific and synthetic as it relates to the development of an ontological narrative. The existence of God is not proven, rather assumed, as the focal point is upon how the Godhead exists ontologically and operationally in Tri-Unity.

This paper does not engage with literary criticism or critical theories of the biblical texts in respect of the historicity of the persons and works of the Father, Jesus Christ or the Spirit. The purpose is to understand and perceive the consequences of the three divine Persons to whom the Scriptures bear witness. This testimony is accepted as is, subject to thorough exegetical analysis. No one system of belief is given preference in exposition and explanation, favouring the primacy of the biblical texts within the framework and limits of an ontological understanding. The veracity and reliability of the Holy Bible in nature and authority in the development of this thesis are assumed.

This is not a complete work of typical systematic theology. The three fields of inquiry lay a comprehensive foundation for an ontological theology. There are other aspects, such as a new pedagogical approach to qualitative growth principles and processes for the ontological Christian, which would merit fuller treatment through the ontological prism.
DEFINITION OF TERMS

“Ontology” is a philosophical term concerning “the study of the nature of being.”¹
“…treated independently from any particular determinations.”² It is often integrated into
the wider discipline of metaphysics:

“Metaphysics considers very general questions about the nature of reality. It
includes the study of the basic categories of things (ontology). Questions such as
whether there are universals, events, substances, individuals, necessary beings,
possible worlds, numbers, ideal objects, abstract objects, and the like arise here.
Meta-physics also includes questions about space, time, identity and change, mind
and body, personal identity, causation, determinism, freedom, and the structure
of action.”³

The present study develops an ontological view of the Trinity, of the believer and of the
Church and examines the repercussions for theology and practice.

ABBREVIATIONS

ASV American Standard Version
DBY The Holy Scriptures, A New Translation from the Original Languages
ESV ESV® Bible. The Holy Bible, English Standard Version®
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Accessed 13th June 2018.
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Chapter Two: ONTOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN TRINITY

In this chapter an overview of the key historical and orthodox developments in Trinitarian understanding enables comprehension of the points of tension, the resolved and unresolved issues relating to a finite perception of an infinite Godhead. The core principles are further developed in ontological terms to demonstrate the primacy and integration of ontology in the Trinity, singularly and particularly. Current trends examined undergo a critique in the light of assertions made and the ontological reading of Scripture. Ontological values are clarified and affirmed throughout, while the chapter concludes by explicating six cohesive principles that define the operational inter-Trinitarian relationship ontologically, thereby establishing the grounds for renewed consideration of the believer and the church.
A BRIEF SUMMARY OF TRINITY IN TRADITIONAL AND CONTEMPORARY THEOLOGY

The centrality of the Trinity is of primordial importance to the Christian faith. The ontological and operational identity of Godhead is the origin of the Christian conception of God, of the believer and of Church. The wealth of written material from philosophical, historical, cultural and theological perspectives on the subject is vast, diverse and complex. This section delineates the general development until the Council of Constantinople (381) at which creedal Trinitarian statements found conclusive agreement in the Patristic period, “The Nicene Creed is the first which obtained universal authority” (Schaff, History of the Creeds 24). It could be said that Trinitarian Orthodoxy was established at this point in history. A reading of subsequent creeds rarely varies significantly from that Trinitarian formulation and declaration.

The primitive simplicity of the Apostles Creed, “I believe in God the Father Almighty, [Maker of heaven and earth] And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord; And in the Holy Ghost” develops in the intervening years through the first Nicene Oecumenical Council (325) to fuller expression in the Creed of Constantinople (381),

We-[I]-believe in one God the Father Almighty. Maker of heaven and earth, And of all things visible and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, Begotten of the Father before all worlds [God of God]. Light of Light, Very God of very God, Begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father by whom all things were made.

And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified, who spake by the prophets (Schaff 27, 29).

This latter Creed reflects the histo-theological challenges to a biblical understanding of God in Trinity. The ‘oneness’ or unity of God the Father, thereby maintaining the monotheism from which Christianity emerged as distinct, is encapsulated in the term ‘monarchism’ among the Church fathers. The ‘unbegotten’ Father is related to the only-begotten’ eternal, equal and divine Son of the Father. The text reflects the definition of the Son as of one ‘οὐσία’, essence or substance, with the Father. Implicit in the creedal
statement is the ‘ὑπόστασις’ of the generate Son as a distinct Person.\(^1\) The ‘ὑπόστασις’ of Jesus Christ, the God-Man is not treated in this creed, finding fuller treatment in the Councils of Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451). These creeds addressed the incarnation of Christ as one person both divine and human [in permanent union] “... without confusion or conversion ... without division or separation ... the two have continually one common life and interpenetrate each other ... The self-consciousness of Christ is never divided...” (Schaff *History of the Creeds* 30, 32). This conception is added to the existing divine attribute of Christ, Son of God.

Only in this creed does the Holy Spirit find further definition particularly through the contribution of Eastern Church fathers such as St Basil, St Gregory Nazianzen and St John Damascus. The filioque relationship of single procession from God the Father as unique source or origin is clearly from the Eastern rather than the Western ‘filioque’ double procession understanding that would emerge with Augustine,

> The Greek fathers always maintained that the principle of unity in the Trinity is the person of the Father … Principle of the other two persons … Source of the relations whence the hypostases receive their distinctive characteristics … He lays down their relations of origin - generation and procession – in regard to the unique principle of Godhead (Lossky 58).

St John Damascus attests, “all then that the Son and the Spirit have is from the Father, even their very being; and unless the Father is, neither the Son nor the Spirit is...” (60). This disagreement as to the relationship of the Spirit with the Persons of the Trinity was to form the principal, albeit not the only, reason for the schism between the Eastern and Western church. The double procession or ‘filioque’ of the Spirit from the Father and the Son first appears in the Nicene Creed of the Council of Toledo (587) (Bettenson 25).\(^2\) Augustine is the foremost proponent of the principle in “*De Trinitate*” which found wide acceptance in the Western churches,

---

\(^1\) The genius of the fathers made use of the two synonyms to distinguish in God that which is common-`ousia`, substance or essence- from that which is particular-*hypostasis* or person (Lossky 51).

\(^2\) See footnote no.6 ‘from the Father and the Son’ employed first in the council of Toledo in 447, was integrated into the creed in 587.
… it must be admitted that the Father and the Son are a Beginning of the Holy Spirit, not two Beginnings; but as the Father and Son are one God, and one Creator, and one Lord relatively to the creature, so are they one Beginning relatively to the Holy Spirit … let him, I say, understand, that as the Father has in Himself that the Holy Spirit should proceed from Him, so has He given to the Son that the same Holy Spirit should proceed from Him, and be both apart from time: and that the Holy Spirit is so said to proceed from the Father as that it be understood that His proceeding also from the Son, is a property derived by the Son from the Father (Schaff Augustine 598, 507).

The creed, bearing in mind this divergent cause of schism, stands as an orthodox Trinitarian reference to modern times. Schaff comments,

The Reformers inherited the veneration for this Symbol. It was formally adopted by the Lutheran and several of the Reformed Churches, and is approvingly mentioned in the Augsburg Confession, the Form of Concord, the Thirty-nine Articles, the Second Helvetic, the Belgic, and the Bohemian Confessions (History of the Creeds 40).

Similarly, Berkhof remarks that the confession of the Creed has not altered and the errors since expressed are not developments, rather repetition of the same old speculations (83).

The Westminster Confession of Faith expresses this doctrine of the Creed,

There is but one only living and true God, who is infinite in being and perfection, a most pure spirit, invisible, without body, parts, or passions, immutable, immense, eternal, incomprehensible, almighty, most wise, most holy, most free, most absolute (Ch.2.1, 10)

In the unity of the Godhead there be three Persons of one substance, power, and eternity: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son. (Ch.2.3, 10).

The Son of God, the second Person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance, and equal with the Father, did, when the fullness of time was come, take upon him man's nature, with all the essential properties and common infirmities
thereof; yet without sin… So that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the Godhead and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion. Which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only Mediator between God and man (Ch.8.2, 19).

The Holy Spirit, the third Person in the Trinity, proceeding from the Father and the Son, of the same substance and equal in power and glory, is, together with the Father and the Son, to be believed in, loved, obeyed, and worshipped throughout all ages…He is the Lord and Giver of life, everywhere present, and is the source of all good thoughts, pure desires, and holy counsels in men. By him the prophets were moved to speak the Word of God, and all the writers of the Holy Scriptures inspired to record infallibly the mind and will of God. The dispensation of the Gospel is especially committed to him (Ch.9 (34).1, 2, 21).

The first statement affirms the ingenerate Father, the generate begotten Son, and the proceeding Holy Spirit, as a conceptual summary rooted in the Cappadocian fathers, Basil of Caesarea and especially Gregory Nazianzen (Kelly 275). The Augustinian appendix of dual procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son, attests to the distinctive Western tradition. The statements concerning the Person of Jesus Christ incorporate the co-eternal, co-equal divinity of the Nicene, and the incarnate God-Man of the Chalcedonian creeds. It substantially completes the orthodox Christology of the ancient Church (Schaff History of the Creeds 29). Recognition of co-eternity and co-equality in essence and in personhood of the Spirit is reaffirmed; the final phrase of the citation is implicitly suggestive of Tertullian’s economy in the Godhead: OT age of the Father; Gospel-age of the Son; Post-Pentecost-age of the Spirit, which historically paved the way for Modalism³ (Ferguson and Wright 691-694).

**Pivotal Developments**

The Didache, a reference for the early Christian community and fathers in the post NT or Patristic period, reflects the strong Jewish monotheistic understanding of God, “Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is One …” (ESV Dt.6:4), “The Two Ways⁴ and the


⁴ J.B. Lightfoot comments in his version of the Didache, “The "Teaching of the Two Ways" has roots in Jewish tradition, which is not remarkable because most early Christians had Jewish backgrounds.
First Commandment. There are two ways, one of life and one of death, but a great
difference between the two ways. The way of life, then, is this: First, you shall love God
who made you…” (Ch.1). There is no reference to the eternity of Christ nor the Spirit,
but the Trinitarian reference is evident throughout, exemplified in the baptismal rite,
“…baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in living
water” (Ch.7). Jesus is perceived in Hebrew thought as the Father’s servant,

We thank thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David Thy servant, which You
madest known to us through Jesus Thy Servant; to Thee be the glory for ever …
We thank Thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which You madest known
to us through Jesus Thy Servant; to Thee be the glory for ever …” (Ch.9)
The Spirit is understood as active in the call to God, “to them whom the Spirit has
prepared …” (Ch.4 of bondservants master not creating bitterness (treatment): God over
both), and in the prophet’s ministry in the Church, “Yet not everyone that speaks in the
Spirit is a prophet, but only if he have the ways of the Lord” (Ch.11).

It is the baptismal liturgy that explicitly comprehends a Trinitarian reality that was
assumed and asserted rather than explained and developed.

It is Justin the apologist (c.150) who describes God, “… everlasting, ineffable and without
names, changeless and impassible, and 'ingenerate'. He is also 'the creator of the
universe', the maker and Father of all things; Himself above being, He is the cause of all
existence…” (Kelly 97). Likewise, he associates the ‘λόγος’ with Christ, “we are taught
that Christ is the first-born of God, … He is the reason (Word) of whom the whole human
race partake … next to God, we worship and love the reason (Word which is from the
unbegotten and ineffable God…” (Bettenson 5). The ingenerate or unbegotten nature of
the person of God the Father is already established and accepted among the Patristic
fathers, as simple continuity from Judaism. Christ the ‘λόγος’ is viewed in two ways: the

Parallels to this "Teaching of the Two Ways" are found in the General Epistle of Barnabas and The
Shepherd of Hermas, but are believed to have developed independently of one another -- that is, none is
quoting the others, but each reflects a common tradition.”

5 J.N.D. Kelly notes Justin’s use of “αγεννητός”: a technical term stressing His unique ‘unoriginateness’
in contrast to creatures"
biblical writers’ mechanisms of personifying the ‘λόγος’;\(^6\) Christ being the active principle of reason or rationality, “the solution they proposed, reduced to essentials, was that, as pre-existent, Christ was the Father's thought or mind, and that, as manifested in creation and revelation. He was its extrapolation or expression. In expounding this doctrine, they had recourse to the imagery of the divine Logos, or Word” (Kelly 108-109). The second perspective is philosophical. From this period it is Heraclitus, (567-480), who first conceptualizes the ‘λόγος’ from within his worldview where, “... each force needs the force antagonist [or contrary] to exist ... it is opposites that constitutes the motor for becoming ...; from this is born harmony ... or arrangement, or even adjustment ...” (Patrick 58). It describes the perpetual motion of change or transitional motion from being to pure non-being, applied to spatial motion in nature, qualitative change in humans, and periodicity which brings everything under its dominion,

...there is no fixed or unmoved being above or outside the shifting world, no divine heavenly existence that does not change... In Heraclitus' system there was nothing transcendent or immovable, but all was pursuing the endless way upward and downward. His God was ceaselessly taking new forms. Gods become men, and men gods (Patrick 31-32, 45).

The identity that Heraclitus (567-480) attributes to the ‘λόγος’ is not clear: the revelatory audible Voice of nature, Reason ruling or immanent in the world, or distinct but immanent Wisdom, (30, 133); “everywhere he attributes to his God, wisdom (‘σοφία’), intelligent will (‘γνώμη’), reason (‘φρόνιμος’ and ‘φρήν’), and recognized truth (‘λόγος’)” (47). This Wisdom he deifies as god. Zeller and Jerphagnon perceive the ‘λόγος’ as Heraclitus’ own discourse of the theory of the world (Patrick 133; Jerphagnon 59). His ‘λόγος’ was found in the natural order as law, truth, wisdom, and reason (Patrick 46). While it is recognized that remaining fragment sources of Heraclitus’ are not comprehended simply, it is clear that the ‘λόγος’ of John’s Gospel prologue requires further interpretation and exegesis in order to establish any clear connection with Heraclitus’ conceptualisation which is a quantum leap to the biblical reading of Christ as ‘λόγος’. However, a philosophical seed
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\(^6\) Personification foresees “ḥokmāh” as pre-existent Christ: Pr.8:12, 14, 17, 20-21, 22-31; the right hand or arm: Ps.18:35; 44:3; 45:3-4 see Rev.19:11-16; 48:10; 80:17;98:1; 118:15-16; Is.41:10; 48:13; 62:8; Mt.22:44; 26:64; 1Pe.3:21-22; Ps.89:13; Is.40:13; 53:1 see Jn.12:38; 59:16; 63:5. Further discussed in the following chapter.
has been sown by which Christ is perceived in this way and medially, as the immanence of God, while He Himself cannot transgress transcendency.

Irenaeus' (c.130-200) catechetical instruction is explicitly Trinitarian,

God the Father, not made, not material, invisible; one God, the creator of all things: this is the first point of our faith ... The Word of God, Son of God, Christ Jesus our Lord ... through Whom (i.e. the Word) all things were made; Who also, at the end of the age, to complete and gather up all things ... And the third point is: the Holy Spirit who at the end of the age was poured out in a new way upon mankind in all the earth, renewing man to God (Kelly 101-102).

The mediation of Christ as the agency of all created things is attributed to the triple identification of ‘λόγος’ of God, Son of God and Christ Lord. The Jewish difficulty recognizing the Messiah Christ as Son of God does not appear to be problematic. The 'new way' recognizes the indwelling or incarnation of the Spirit in believers, although he does not develop further ontology of the Son nor the Spirit.

It is Ignatius, (c.112), who explicitly attributes the appellation as ‘God’ to Christ the ‘λόγος’. He states “... He is 'our God', describing Him as 'God incarnate' and 'God made manifest as man'. He was 'in spirit united with the Father'. In His pre-existent being 'ingenerate' He was the timeless, invisible, impalpable, impassible one Who for our sakes entered time and became visible, palpable and passible” (105).

The emphasis on unity between God and God incarnate Jesus Christ is prominent in Ignatius. The relationship of ‘λόγος’ to God incarnate is explained in the former being related to the rational in God, therefore the eternal generation of the Son is the generation of the ‘λόγος’ of God or God’s thoughts or mind. Justin Martyr also articulately reflects this view. He admits that according to the creational order all men have some ‘λόγος’ or reason. However, his affirmation of the deification of ‘λόγος’ is explicated,

The Logos, however, had now 'assumed shape and become a man' in Jesus Christ; He had become incarnate in His entirety in Him. The Logos is here conceived of as the Father's intelligence or rational thought; but Justin argues that He was not only in name distinct from the Father, ... but was 'numerically distinct too …' (Kelly 110).
Justin interprets the plural of mankind in the creation texts, “let us make man in our image,” as the personified Wisdom texts, and the three men with Abraham,⁷ to demonstrate the numerical distinctiveness of the ‘λόγος’ as Christ, Son of God. His eternity is expressed in that He is the thought or mind in God manifest out of Him as a unique Son, “to be the Father's agent in creating and ordering the universe and to reveal truth to men” (Ibid.). In distinguishing the Word-Son-God, he also affirms this inseparability and indivisibility through the analogy of being unable to distinguish the light of the sun from its source, in reference to the essence of both, being perfect. Tatian and Theophilus of Antioch reinforce the generation of the Word from the Father as the full and perfect essence, nothing being deprived nor emptied in either, defining the relationship of the Father with the Son (111-112); likewise, in Athenagoras, “… dwelling on the unity and fellowship which exist between Father and Son” (113). J.N.D Kelly succinctly identifies two principles on which the early apologists concurred:

(a) that for all of them the description 'God the Father' connoted, not the first Person of the Holy Trinity, but the one Godhead considered as author of whatever exists; and (b) that they all, Athenagoras included, dated the generation of the Logos, and so His eligibility for the title 'Son', not from His origination within the being of the Godhead, but from His emission or putting forth for the purposes of creation, revelation and redemption (113).

The nature of the Father-Son relationship established, is perceived as one in essence within the Divine Being, before and after generation (114). The Spirit moreover, shared the divine nature and ‘effluence’ from the Deity (116). At this early stage in the Patristic development of Trinity both union and distinctiveness of Godhead were not referenced to any notion of intra-Trinitarian subordination (117). The eternity of the Son as distinct from the function of the Son and the personhood of the ‘λόγος’ in relationship to the begetting of the Father are two particular highlights at this stage of development.

When Irenaeus (c.130-200), Tertullian (c.196-212), and Hippolytus (c.170-236), contribute their teaching on the Trinity, they have in common a dual approach: the first being ‘ontological’ and the second ‘economical’ (117-118, 122-123). The former concerns the eternal relationship between the Father, the Word-Son-God and the Holy
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⁷ Ge.1:26; see also 11:7; Ge.18:1-2, 10, 16-17, 22-23; Pr.8:12, 14, 17, 20-21, 22-31.
Spirit, the latter pertains to the “process of self-revelation” (122), how God: Father, Son and Spirit operate functionally in the framework revealed in creation and in redemption. Contextually, ‘monarchism’ emphasizing ‘oneness’ of the Father, was to be preserved, in that any manifestation of the Word-Son or Spirit in ‘Triad’ was perceived ontologically as out of the Father, thereby preserving monotheism. The nature of the Word-Son-God and the Holy Spirit, in divinity and in relationship to the Father were becoming more clearly established. However, the nature of the distinct Persons of Christ and of the Spirit relationship in or to the Father was to be one principal preoccupation of these theological figures. For Irenaeus, the co-existence of the Word with the Father from eternity was now accepted. It was in the functional economy that identifying the ‘λόγος’ was the means of revealing or knowing the Father, he enjoins the Spirit,

… for 'without the Spirit it is impossible to behold the Word of God ... since the knowledge of the Father is the Son, and the knowledge of the Son of God can only be obtained through the Spirit; and according to the Father's good pleasure the Son ministers and dispenses the Spirit to whomsoever the Father wills, and as He wills' (120).

The Holy Spirit remains blurred; however implicitly Irenaeus does state, “… whatever is begotten of God is God,” (Ibid.) which could apply to the Son as to the Spirit at this stage in the development of Trinitarian thought. Contextually, the ‘economy’ of the Trinity according to the original meaning, was identifying function through creation and redemption as a means of establishing the Persons of the ‘λόγος’ and the Spirit as ‘Tri-Unity’ - a significant progressive development from ‘monarchism’.

Ontologically, it is Tertullian who describes the ‘λόγος’- Son as a Person - a second and a third, in the Person of the Spirit, “so that the Godhead is a ‘trinity’” (125). The ‘economy’ serves this ontological purpose. He clarifies ‘distinction’ as neither division nor separation (126). Hippolytus implicitly suggests hierarchy in Trinity, “but if there are Three revealed in the economy, there is in fact only one God, since it is the Father Who commands, the Son Who obeys and the Spirit Who makes us understand” (Ibid.). Kelly observes through the potential misinterpretation of the language employed, “…his intention is not to subordinate Him [the Word] to the Father (judged by post-Nicene standards, his language has a subordinationist ring), but to emphasize the absolute unity of the Godhead, since that will of the Father is in fact none other than the Word Himself”
Hippolytus expresses his difficulty in admitting that the Person of the Son is begotten of God Himself rather than His will. The former being necessary to personhood and a critical development in understanding the ‘λόγος’.

The focus is to remain on a positive construct of the Trinity, but in doing so it is necessary to recognize the alternate theories that were classified as heretical by the principal fathers: Monarchism has for its basic doctrinal tenet, “God is one, the sole principle of all existence… an accepted truth of the ethical monotheism of the OT of which Christianity was an heir”8 (Sinclair and Ferguson 440). Contextually, the argument confronts Greek philosophers and polytheism erected upon Judaic monotheism, which reflect the limitations imposed upon Christ as purely human, inspired, Spirit - anointed or assisted.

Modalism perceives Christ as a mere man, albeit of high dignity upon whom the Holy Spirit came in inspiration until the cross when the latter left him. The confusion is described as poles of attraction and opposition: the Father abandoned the Son on the cross, yet because they are ‘one,’ the Father also died with the Son. The idea goes further to suggest that the Holy Spirit was sent, “... as a kind of glue, to weld the Son back to Him” (691-694). The logic is, if the Father is God and Christ is God too, then there are two Gods in two persons (Kelly 128-129). The argument does affirm the Personhood and divinity of Christ, even if the conclusion is erroneous.

Modalistic Monarchism denied the three persons in Godhead, preferring three modes of manifestation of the one God the Father (Berkhof 82), such as Creator-Father, Redeemer-Son and Sanctifier-Spirit9 (Sinclair and Ferguson 691-694). They did perceive the divinity of the Son as distinct from the Father, but then as Hippolytus reports, “they believed in one identical Godhead which could be designated indifferently Father or Son; the terms did not stand for real distinctions” (Kelly 133). In the final outcome the distinction of ontological persons is ill-defined, deformed, even through the constraints of defined modes or functions.

Sabellianism, according to J.N.D Kelly, concurs with the initial premise of Modalistic Monarchism, describing temporary ‘projections’ or ‘masks’ of the Father as Son and then


as Spirit, as “modes of self-expression” (Kelly 135).\textsuperscript{10} Athanasius, in his letter to Dionysius bishop of Rome, defines this position, “… he … says that the Son is the Father and the Father the Son … [preaching] three Gods, dividing the sacred Monad into three substances foreign to each other and utterly separate” (Bettenson 32).

As Tertullian responds to the critics of these conceptions, a perspective of his understanding of the Trinity becomes apparent as does the significant developments that he brings to the Trinitarian construct. Tertullian, being the first to coin the word ‘trinity’ to describe the Godhead clearly challenges the Monarchian standpoint by insisting that, “…All are of One, by unity (that is) of substance…” (Schaff \textit{Tertuillian} 1321). He hereby establishes that the unity is not ontologically of One Person but of one substance (‘οὐσία’), “… how comes it to pass that God should be thought to suffer division and severance in the Son and in the Holy Ghost, who have the second and the third places assigned to them, and who are so closely joined with the Father in His substance” (1324).

Tertullian consistently affirms this ontological unity in Trinity both in substance and in relationship, “… ‘Dispositio’ means ‘mutual relations in the Godhead’” (1325). His economical principle perceives three Persons: Father, Son and Spirit who are ‘distinct’ and indivisible, although ‘degrees’, ‘forms’ and ‘aspects’ for the basis of distinctions are not based on numerical divisions, “the numerical order and distribution of the Trinity… [is] the Unity which derives the Trinity out of its own self” (1322). His formulation with regards to the Spirit and the Son is termed ‘procession’ from the Father as source, the Spirit proceeding through the agency of the Son (1325). In the use of ‘economy’ to serve the Unity of Godhead, Tertullian does consider equality of the Son explicitly and the Spirit also. One of his arguments in support of the substance of the Trinity is based on the substance referring to essence or nature rather than physicality and therefore the Father, the Son, and the Spirit all have substance, whether it be invisible or visible. If the Father has substance, how can He generate or cause procession from substance without attributing substance to the Son and the Spirit? (1330-1331). His use of ‘forms’ does intimate the recognition of one ‘οὐσία’ and three ‘ὑπόστασις’. His language holding to the ontological unity and economical persons relies upon: inseparability, distinction not division, and distribution not diversity. The concern is that in his words, “… it is not by

\textsuperscript{10} ‘Modes, expressions, or manifestations’ as a theory originated with Noetus of Smyrna (200-225), reflected also in Paptrippassianism, according to H.D. MacDonald (Sinclair and Ferguson p440-441).
division that He is different, but by distinction; because the Father is not the same as the Son, since they differ one from the other in the mode of their being. For the Father is the entire substance, but the Son is a derivation and portion of the whole” (1334). While on the one hand he affirms the Son is particular as coequal and eternal, this connotation from the economy suggests that the Son does not fully share the same perfection in substance as the Father, but a measure of. He hereby questions the import of the economy upon the ontological reality that he sees so clearly. The Son cannot be consubstantially God and yet possess only a portion of the Father’s substance. The distinction of Persons in reciprocal relationship counters the Monarchian argument of unity in the person of the Father, that Son and Spirit are all in the Father and therefore the Father can be Son to Himself and vice-versa, the one of the other or all (1337-1338), in this distinct personhood and substance are lost. Tertullian employs ‘economy’ principally to reinforce unity in Trinity not subordination, “… the Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and each is God…” (1344). His argument of the title ‘Lord’ uniquely attributed to God of the OT, clearly attributed to Christ in the new,11 established Christ as fully God. If the Hebraic use of ‘name’ to indicate attribute or substance of nature is pursued then the Son’s Godhead is no longer “a thing to be grasped” (ESV Ph.2:6).

Origen presents the Person of the Son, in the manner of the fathers, defined by Wisdom which preceded ‘λόγος’. He employs the concept of ‘ἀρχή’, a beginning, to establish the nature and relationship of Christ to the Father, the ingenerate One. The ‘ἀρχή’ is, in his logic, restricted to Christ being Wisdom, because she was in God, “He is the ‘archē’ only in respect of His being wisdom. Not even as the Word is, He the arche, for the Word was in the arche” (Origen 13). In the case of other attributes such as: light, life, and truth, reflected in the ‘I Am’ statements of John’s Gospel, Christ is not ‘ἀρχή’. The economic incidence primes over an ontological understanding of Christ and his ‘one οὐσία’ with the Father. The economic ‘ordering numerically and in time’ finds support in Origen’s thought. Attributes are traced back towards defining Christ’s divine status, “the Son is God, though His deity is derivative … He is thus a 'secondary' God” (Kelly 141). The Son is described as “participating in His [the Father’s] Godhead,” but he insists in keeping the distinction by emphasizing that the Son only possesses Godhead “by participation or derivatively” in or from the Father (143, 144). Kelly observes, “this conception of a

11 Ps.110:1; Mt.22:41-46; Jn.11:27; 20:28; Ac.2:34-36; 10:36; Ro.14:3; 15:6; Ph.2:11; 3:8.
descending hierarchy, is the product of his Platonizing background, and epitomized in the statement, whereas the Father's action extends to all reality, the Son's is limited to rational beings, and the Spirit's to those who are being sanctified” (145). When economy thus interpreted is employed to define the ontology of Godhead, incurring the loss of full divine quality by the constraints of limited function is an evident Modalistic reminder. ‘λόγος’ is no longer truly God and neither is he perfect Man which has significant ramifications for the nature and extent of Christ and His atonement. His understanding of the ‘λόγος’ incarnate describes Christ’s nature, “when the Word was made flesh can we say that it was to some extent broken up and thinned out, and can we say that it recovered from that point onward till it became again what it was at first, God the Word, the Word with the Father” (Origen 28).

The economical does subjugate, as demonstrated, the ontology of Christ, the Son, the ‘λόγος’. To further illustrate this principle, Origen appeals to Christ’s names as reflective of his nature, although the only characteristic in which he is truly ‘first’ is Wisdom, “… for the Word was in the ‘ἀρχή’ with God” (14). As he considers the other titles accorded to Christ: Life, Light, Truth, Beginning and End, Alpha and Omega, and Resurrection, etc. based on the above supposition, many of these traits are specifically for the benefit of humanity. In this, he establishes the nature of Christ economically and functionally. Ontologically, these attributes do not define the substance of Christ in any permanent way, rather they are limited and defined according to function. The vision of Christ’s person both in the divine and human is therefore weakened considerably. There are strong Monarchian overtones in Origen still. The Son then ‘becomes’ many things “for our sake,” (14) however distinct from this Son is, “God the Word is a separate being and has an essence of His own” (16). Clearly Christ loses his divine perfection in becoming Man, according to Origen; he does not hold to the indivisible or inseparable divine nature in Christ with the Father. The nature of the God-Man is weakened in divinity by this substantial ‘loss’.

In relation to the Holy Spirit, Origen refers to the ‘λόγος’ through whom everything was made, and because of this,

[We] must necessarily assume that the Holy Spirit was made through the Logos, the Logos accordingly being older than He. And he who shrinks from allowing the Holy Spirit to have been made through Christ must, if he admits the truth of the
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statements of this Gospel, assume the Spirit to be uncreated … The Only-begotten only is by nature and from the beginning a Son, and the Holy Spirit seems to have need of the Son, to minister to Him His essence, so as to enable Him not only to exist … the Holy Spirit has no essence of His own beyond the Father and the Son.” (28, 37, 36).

Origen affirms three hypostases, Father, (uncreated), Son and Spirit (both created), but his conception, Christ and the Spirit in his economical view are placed in an order, the Father and the Son, second, being of the same ‘οὐσία’, while maintaining a distinction in the Spirit as a firstborn of the Father and the Son at the beginning of creation. In this a third place is attributed. The God-Man then lowers Himself below the Spirit to accomplish the plan. The ensuing development by Origen’s exponents resulted in the economic subordinationism of Christ’s separation from the Father, denying the Son’s eternity, his ‘ὁμοος’ with the Father, setting ‘Father’ and ‘Son’ as roles when Christ came to exist, defining the Son as creature … such is the teaching of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria (Kelly 147).

Arianism, stands apart from the orthodoxy soon to be set in the creed, and is expressed concisely in Arius’ letter to Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia. In this communication he summarizes the eminent view of Pope Alexander and intimates some of his partisans: “… Theodotus, Paulinus, Athanasius, Gregory, Aetius, and all the other bishops of the East …” (Bettenson 39).

God always, the Son always; at the same time the Father and at the same time the Son; the Son co-exists with God, unbegotten; he is ever-begotten, … neither by thought nor by any moment of time does God precede the Son; God always, Son always, the Son exists from God Himself (39).

Arius expresses thoughts, incurring persecution that represent the core of Arianism thought on the Trinity, and in particular the Son,

… what we say and think we both have taught and continue to teach; that the Son is not begotten, not part of the unbegotten [God] in any way, nor is he derived from any substance; but that by his own will and counsel he existed before times and ages fully, God, only-begotten, unchangeable. And before he was begotten … he
did not exist; for he was not unbegotten … the Son has a beginning, but God is without beginning (Ibid 39).

The critical controversies concern the generation of the Son, the ‘οὐσία’ of the Son if he is entirely separate from the Father. Monarchianism is the founding principle in that there is only one unique ingenerate to the point whereby God’s transcendency renders immanence impossible and thereby gives credence to the Son as the medial immanence in creation12 (Ferguson and Wright 42-43). The Son is “… begotten or created or appointed or established…” (Bettenson 39), he is recognized as a “special creature, … God’s servant …” (Ferguson and Wright 42-43). Their difficulty lay in the biblical texts relating aspects of Christ’s humanity to his divinity that contributes to the ‘οὐσία’ of Christ as necessarily ‘other’ than God’s. The Nicene Creed establishes a definitive response, Christ’s ‘ὁμοιοτρεις’ was of the same ‘οὐσία’ as the Father. At the Council of Alexandria, Athanasius concluded in response to the Arian claim of three principles of Gods on the grounds of three utter distinct and alien hypostases, in contrast to the Trinitarian orthodox formula, “One ‘οὐσία’ three ‘ὑπόστασαι’” (Kelly 267-267). Arians’ view of the Holy Spirit by consequence followed the same line of debate, “… the Arian jibe that the homoousion of the Spirit seemed to involve the Father in having two Sons, was to differentiate between the mode of origin of the Son and that of the Spirit” (275). At this point in history the danger is of a bi-theistic Godhead, as the Pneumatomachi advocated in their view, given a lack of biblical evidence for the deity of the Spirit. The position is aptly summarized in the statement attributed to Eustathius that he did “not choose to call the Spirit God nor presume to call Him a creature;” as others expressed it, “He occupies a middle position, being neither God nor one of the others (i.e. the creatures)” (Kelly 273).

Arians considered Him a hypostasis, but regards His essence as utterly unlike that of the Son, just as the Son's was utterly unlike that of the Father … Eusebius of Caesarea, while clear that the Spirit is a hypostasis, reckons He is 'in the third rank', 'a third power' and 'third from the Supreme Cause', and uses Origen’s exegesis of John I, 3 to argue that He is 'one of the things which have come into existence through the Son' (268).

Athanasius (297-373) is a prominent figure at a critical time in theological belief and formulation particularly concerning the intra and extra-Trinitarian relationships. His eminent theological peers were the Eastern Church fathers: Basil ‘the Great’ of Caesarea, (329-379), Gregory of Nazianzus (329-390), Gregory of Nyssa (335-395) and in the Western Church Augustine (354-430).

The orthodox statement of the Nicene agreement was "One ‘οὐσία’ three ‘ὑπόστασες.’" However, to achieve a consensual agreement involved great clarity in language and meaning that the ‘homoeousian’ and the ‘homoousion’ parties of church leadership required. The former recognized that the Son was ‘ἐκ’ the Father’s ‘οὐσία’ and not from another ‘ὑπόστασις’. The latter acknowledged three ‘ὁμοιόμοιος’ distinct persons or identities, as Athanasius would insist (Kelly 268). This union of three ‘ὑπόστασες’ was void of all Arian connotation, because they share in the one ‘οὐσία’. It was thanks to Athanasius’ leadership that this concord was reached. The consequential affirmations concern the co-eternity and co-equality of the Divine Triad – consubstantial, recognizing three separate subsistence, (265, 266-267). Each member of the Godhead being fully and perfectly God. Kelly observes concerning this affirmation, there is, “… no real antithesis generic and numerical oneness …” (267). These qualities address directly not only the heretical views mentioned previously, but also Origen’s economic subordinator construct.

The other significant development concerns the Holy Spirit who, being fully divine, is consubstantial with the Father and the Son. He is therefore not of the created order neither in substance nor in nature. The ontological is restored to a place of primacy that was lacking in Origen, “for the Divine Word must of necessity be united to the God of the Universe, and the Holy Spirit must have his habitation and abide in God; thus it is absolutely necessary that the divine Triad be summed up and gathered up into a unity …” (Bettenson 32). Athanasius further develops the nature of relationship between the Son and the Spirit describing their indivisibility in co-activity. He attempts to describe the economy of the Triad in these terms, “The Godhead, according to this conception, exists eternally as a Triad of Persons… sharing one identical and indivisible substance or essence. All three Persons, moreover, are possessed of one and the same activity, so that ‘the Father accomplishes all things through the Word in the Holy Spirit’” (Kelly 271). He sets out again the divine ontological relationship of individuality and unity as the foundation for understanding their words and activity. Athanasius combines
acknowledgment of the ontological Triad relationship with a simple economic statement of all works and operation flowing from the Divine unity without subordinating the ontological Trinity beginning with defined roles and operations, thereby addressing the Monarchian and the subordinationist viewpoints.

The Eastern fathers played a significant role in the agreement and affirmation of the Nicene Creed, “[At] the council of Constantinople in 381… the consubstantiality of the Spirit as well as of the Son was formally endorsed. The theology which prevailed, as exemplified by the great Cappadocians” (Kelly 277).

They identified the Western tendency to comprehending the Trinity beginning with the three ‘ὑπόστασαςες’ perceiving in them the one ‘οὐσία’, while the Eastern approach began with the one essence to express Trinity. St Gregory of Nazianzen puts it succinctly, “… we will not quarrel about names so long as the syllables amount to the same meaning; but One in respect of the ousia-that is, the Godhead. For they are divided indivisibly … and they are conjoined dividedly. For the Godhead is one in three, and the three in one, in whom the Godhead is … who are the Godhead” (Lossky 52).

The Fathers affirmed through detaching the Godhead from creation and creational order so that before creation, as an act of will, the Trinity existed Father, Son and Spirit according to nature and absolutism, in reference to the absence of process, dialectic, becoming, development or tragedy (45). The numerical principle is raised above division, or distributive designation, to affirm the indivisible unity of Godhead, whereby each member is fully and perfectly God in substance. The numerical distinction does not concern ‘οὐσία’.

What of the numerical distinction? St Basil of Caesarea comments with reserve, “if we use number of deity at all we must use it 'reverently'… pointing out that while each of the Persons is designated one, They cannot be added together. The reason for this is that the divine nature which They share is simple and indivisible” (Kelly 281). St Gregory of Nazianzen maintains the tension of the unbegotten giving to the First the name Father, the begotten, the Second Son, to the Third, the Holy Spirit, “for neither is the Son Father, for the Father is One, but He is what the Father is; nor is the Spirit Son because He is God, for the Only-begotten is One, but He is what the Son is. The Three are One in Godhead, and One Three in properties …” (Lossky 52-53). St John of Damascus, (652-
750), brings clarity as he perceives the ontological unity as the source of the economy, “In Holy Trinity … the hypostases dwell in one another … a single will, a single power, a single operation …” (Ibid 53-54). Gregory of Nyssa concurs from an economical consideration,

a single activity of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, in no respect different in the case of any, we are obliged to infer unity of nature … from the identity of activity; for Father, Son and Holy Spirit cooperate the Godhead is one because the Father never acts independently of the Son, nor the Son of the Spirit. The divine action begins from the Father, proceeds through the Son, and is completed in the Holy Spirit; none of the Persons possesses a separate operation of His own, but one identical energy passes through all Three (Kelly 279-280).

St John also suggests that the numerical distinctions are restricted to “being unbegotten, filiation and of procession…” as “the only characteristic of the hypostases… exclusively proper to each [one] … by reason of their consubstantiality” (Lossky 54). This responds particularly to Origen’s conception of endless and indiscriminate hypostases. In maintaining consubstantiality in tension with the hypostatic numeration these Eastern fathers preserve the ontological unity, the co-eternity and co-equality of the Godhead in all their individual perfection. There is an absence of subordinationist and hierarchal considerations that would be contrary to their vision of Trinity. The ontological approach to both the Godhead and the manifestation of the Trinity corrects the antecedent subordinate orientations.

The procession of the Holy Spirit, the ‘filioque’, would be the contention that was one of the major reasons causing the schism between East and West. The West adopted a ‘double procession’ of the Holy Spirit sent from the Father and conjointly from the Son, while the East held to the Father as unique source of the Son and the Spirit, “the Father … source of all divinity within the Trinity brings forth the Son and the Holy Spirit in conferring upon them His nature, which remains one and indivisible, identical in itself in the Three” (Lossky 59). St John of Damascus would later reaffirm, “we speak of Him [the Son] both as from the Father and as the Son of the Father. And we speak … of the Holy Spirit as from the Father, and call Him the Spirit of the Father. We do not speak of the Spirit as from (‘ek’) the Son, but yet we call Him the Spirit of the Son” (61). The Father is perceived as the unique origin of generation and procession. The distinction is drawn
between the Spirit and the Son as ‘ἐκ’ the Father with the identification and unity of the Person of the Spirit with the Father and the Son. Gregory of Nyssa insists that the Person of the Spirit is, “not begotten, not created, not fellow-brother nor brother to the Father, not forefather nor offspring, but out of the same substance of Father and Son. He is ‘Spirit of the Father’ and ‘Spirit of the Son’” (Kelly 276). The Eastern reading of the Western interpretation is described as,

a more rational doctrine which, in making of the Father and the Son a common principle of the Holy Spirit, places the common nature above the persons; a doctrine which tends to weaken the hypostases by confounding the person of the Father and Son in the natural act of spiration, and in making the Holy Spirit a connection between the two (Lossky 62).

St Basil of Caesarea reiterates that the ‘οὐσία’ is inseparable from and not anterior to ‘ὑπόστασις’. The ‘filioque’ formula, while perceived as emphasizing the unity of nature at the expense of real distinction between person according to the Greeks, risked to displace the unity from the Father to the ‘οὐσία’, the common nature itself becoming the foundation to Godhead. A system of relationships is redefined from within the essence rather than being characterized by the ‘ὑπόστασις’, the three Persons are identified by relationships. This results from the premise that the Holy Spirit “…becomes the bond between the Father and the Son…” (Lossky 57). The unity then is no longer based upon the shared ‘οὐσία’ but the relationship resulting from this conception (56-58). Saint Gregory of Nyssa is attributed the definitive statement regarding the Spirit in Godhead, “The Spirit, … is out of God and is of Christ; He proceeds out of the Father and receives from the Son; He cannot be separated from the Word” (Kelly 275). Lossky observes, “Latin philosophy first considers the nature in itself and proceeds to the agent; Greek philosophy first considers the agent and afterwards passes through it to find the nature. The Latins think of personality as a mode of nature; the Greeks think of nature as the content of the person” (Lossky 57-58). The resulting divergence of philosophical conception is predictable even upon this remark. The shift from ‘οὐσία’ in the Person of the Father is a paradigmatic shift whereby, as the Eastern fathers would claim, secondary and medial principles and characteristics define the primary and causal. This would lead to economy rather than ontology in definition.
Saint Gregory Nazianzen, anticipating the devolution of the Father’s monarchy towards subordinationism attests,

[The] Godhead … neither increased nor diminished by superiorities or inferiorities; in every respect equal, in every respect the same … the infinite connaturality of Three Infinite Ones, each God when considered in Himself … one God when contemplated together; each God because consubstantial; the Three, one God because of the monarchy” (Ibid 63).

The Cappadocian fathers also had a strong anti-subordinationist stance, while maintaining the Father as the “source, fountain-head or principle of the Godhead” (Kelly 278). Christ the God-Man, is described as two different natures in one hypostasis. The Council of Chalcedon affirmed, “… perfect in deity and perfect in humanity, true God and true man … consubstantial with the Father through the Divinity and consubstantial with us through the humanity …” The two natures in union are not destroyed, nor mingled or mixed, divided nor separable (Lossky 143). Saint Maximus adds, “without being transformed into one another, they permeate one another …”, (145), although Saint John Damascene describes the ‘ὑπόστασις’ as, “… having once penetrated the flesh, gives to it an ineffable faculty of penetrating the Divinity” (145-146). The conclusion is that Christ acts in perfect conformity to perfect divinity and sinless humanity, without contradiction. The two natures are united in one person, however there is no dualistic perception, as the two are perfectly harmonized to inseparability and indivisibility; in which they recognize a principle of infiltration which the Alexandrian and Western schools would have difficulty accepting.

Christ’s ‘κενόω’ is directly related to the will not only of the Father but of the Trinity – a common, shared and united will, to which Christ is in agreement and in obedience. The Eastern fathers consider Christ’s renouncement of his own will to accomplish that of the Father’s, the act of ‘κενός’ (144).

Only the Son and the Spirit are sent into the world, their ministry is distinguished by inseparability according to the witness of Scripture. The Spirit’s own coming into the world is not subordinate or continuous to Christ’s coming, rather it is the sequel, the result of, because the Spirit is perceived as the accomplisher or accomplishment (144, 159). The nature of the revealed Spirit in his manner is allied to the ‘κενός’ of Christ, as the members
of the Trinity bear witness to and of each other. Just as the Son comes in the ‘name’ of the Father, so the Spirit comes in the ‘name’ of the Son, rather than revealing his own ‘name’ (that is His nature, identity), bearing witness to the Son, as the Son bears witness to the Father. As such, this is the ‘κενός’ of the Spirit, and of the Son and the Father also (Lossky 159, 160, 162, 164). This reciprocal relating is archetypal of Trinitarian ontology, “the mystery of the self-emptying, of the kenōsis of the Holy Spirit's coming into the world. If in the kenōsis of the Son the Person appeared to men while the Godhead remained hidden under the form of a servant, the Holy Spirit in His coming, while He manifests the common nature of the Trinity, leaves His own Person concealed beneath His Godhead” (168).

In the Western Church tradition, Augustine (354-430) stood as a pre-eminent theological figure; his writing in “De Trinitate” (399-419) expounded a biblical and theological work, understanding the Godhead. Augustine affirms the consubstantiality and co-eternity of the Father, Son and Spirit, “for this Trinity is one God … [in three Persons] the Father is the Father, and the Son is the Son, and the Holy Spirit is the Holy Spirit” (Schaff Augustine 738). Augustine repeatedly affirms the consubstantiality and equality of the Son while insisting upon his subordination to Fatherhood (48). The Trinitarian unity according to Augustine leaves no room for subordinationism. He employs the term ‘ἀρχή’ indicating that the Father is a beginning in relation to the Son, as the Father and the Son are to the Spirit; to creation, the Father, the Son and the Spirit are one Beginning (598). W.G.T Shedd comments in a footnote commentary,

The Son by eternal generation receives from the Father the one uncreated and undivided substance of the Godhead, and the Spirit by eternal spiration receives the same numerical substance from the Father and Son. The term “beginning” relates not to the essence, but to the personal peculiarity. Sonship originates in fatherhood; but deity is unoriginated. The Son as the second person “begins” from the Father, because the Father communicates the essence to him. His sonship, not his deity or godhood, “begins” from the Father. And the same holds true of the term “beginning” as applied to the Holy Spirit. The “procession” of the Holy Spirit “begins” by spiration from the Father and Son, but not his deity or godhood (598).

Augustine places the generation and procession as “without time … without any changeableness of nature, gives to the Son essence, without beginning of time” (507,
The attributes of Life, Light, Truth, etc. previously considered by Origen as not part of the ‘ἀρχή’, are considered by Augustine to be essential attributes of the consubstantiality of the Triad. God is identical to his attributes and therefore the perfection in attributes is found in the Son and the Spirit by rendering evident the one ‘οὐσία’, “… as a Trinity, … the Persons can be said severally to indwell or coinhere with each other … while each of the Persons is in-create, infinite, omnipotent, eternal, etc., there are not three in-creates, infinites, omnipotents, eternals, etc., but one” (Kelly 286, Schaff Augustine 744). Augustine considers that before the name and relationship of Father-Son-Spirit, existed in the eternal triad, a communion of substance and relationship, preceded the definitions attributed to the titles. He introduces the principle of eternal relationship, whereby the generation of the Son and the procession of the Spirit with the ingenerate Father are foremost perceived as relationships, (287-288) “the distinction of the Persons, which Augustine sees is grounded in Their mutual relations within the Godhead” (286). The precedence given to establishing equality and eternity in unity has for primary ramification, the qualification of operations and actions as indivisible and inseparable, “They are inseparable, so They operate inseparably’ … ‘where there is no difference of natures, there is none of wills either’, in the external operation of the Godhead, the role which is appropriate to Him in virtue of His origin” (286-287). In this Augustine seems to affirm the principal distinctions as ingeneration, generation and procession. His relational concept is what determines the character of the operations, on the basis that reciprocally the Father is in the Son, and likewise in the Spirit. Relationship then, rather than function, determines the economy. He develops the argument from creation as a work or an operation of God, confounding the heresy that the Son was created, but how could someone created create creation? And he affirms, “if all things were made by the Father, and all things by the Son, then the same things were made by the Father and by the Son. The Son, therefore, is equal with the Father, and the working of the Father and the Son is indivisible” (Schaff Augustine 32). He likewise provides the same argumentation to justify the absolutely equal, co-eternal and consubstantial Person of the Spirit in unity, in Trinity (33).

Augustine takes several difficult biblical concepts or passages, reinterpreting them in the light of indivisibility or unity in economy or operation. Of Christ’s ‘κενός’ Shedd observes,
Augustine is careful to teach that the Logos, when he took on him “a form of a servant,” did not lay aside “a form of God.” He understands the kenosis (ἐκένωσε) to be, the humbling of the divinity by its union with the humanity, not the examination of it in the extremist sense of entirely divesting Himself of the divinity, nor the less extreme sense of a total non-use of it during the humiliation¹³ (Ibid.).

Augustine puts the relevant biblical texts in tension with the wider theological context, bringing into sharper focus the divinity and humanity of Christ, maintaining them in tension, “… without cause the Scripture says both the one and the other, both that the Son is equal to the Father, and that the Father is greater than the Son” (35). The form of God in Christ, equality in divinity, postures with Christ who took the form of a servant in humanity, similarly, when in the ‘form of a servant’ Christ declares that the Father and He are one and the Father is greater than Him. From One Corinthians chapter fifteen, he confronts putting all things under God, including Himself with the willing delegation of all things under the Son. Likewise, if equality and eternity of consubstance are viewed uniquely from the earthly, human and economic perspectives, the Son is subordinated. But this is to misinterpret Scripture where the consubstantiation of the Son causes Him to be in Godhead and therefore sharing in the reign over all things, “He Himself is not excluded; because He is one God together with the Father” (36-38). Augustine’s argument rests upon the indivisibility of the Son in Trinity and in operations. Where actions are sometimes attributed in certain contexts to one Person of the Trinity, he speaks of the perfect sufficiency of each Person, knowing that they are indivisible and inseparable, “but in order to intimate the Trinity, some things are separately affirmed, the Persons being also each severally named; and yet are not to be understood as though the other Persons were excluded, on account of the unity of the same Trinity and the One substance and Godhead of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” (43). He justifies this by interpreting the usage of the term ‘God’ as inclusively Trinitarian. In doing so, Augustine sets operations in the interpretive context of the consubstantial Trinity; the ontology and relational dimensions of the Trinity take pre-eminence over tendencies to subordination and hierarchy in Trinity, thereby favouring the ontological over a structural and economical interpretation of the eternal, equal, indivisible Trinity.

Due significance should be given to the ‘filioque’ of the Holy Spirit given the historical magnitude on Eastern and Western theology and relations. Augustine’s statement summarized, “as the Father has in Himself that the Holy Spirit should proceed from Him, so has He given to the Son that the same Holy Spirit should proceed from Him” (Schaff Augustine 507). He recognizes that the Son does not have this in and of Himself but it is “a property derived by the Son from the Father’ (Ibid.). This proposition is built upon the founding principle of the Son being or having all that the Father has or is. If this is the case, then the Son logically participates in the processional sending of the Spirit. His argument seems to defend against the idea that the Spirit was created or born (509), affirming that He is not inferior instead He is consubstantial (738). According to J.N.D. Kelly,

The Holy Spirit is not the Spirit of one of Them, but of both' … in relation to the Holy Spirit the Father and the Son form a single principle: inevitably so, since the relation of both to Him is identical, and where there is no difference of relation Their operation is inseparable …' The Son is from the Father, the Spirit also is from the Father. But the former is begotten, the latter proceeds. So, the former is Son of the Father from Whom He is begotten, but the latter is the Spirit of both since He proceeds from both … The Father is the author of the Spirit's procession because He begot such a Son, and in begetting Him made Him also the source from which the Spirit proceeds.' The point is that, since the Father has given all He has to the Son, He has given Him the power to bestow the Spirit (288-289).

This text encapsulates the premise for the double procession. It is notable that the origin or source of the Spirit’s procession is the Father, “… despite the double procession, the Father remains the primordial source, … inasmuch as it is He from Whom the Son derives His capacity to bestow the Spirit” (289); it is through the generation of the Son that He participates in one procession. By consequence, Augustine suggests there is order in generation and procession from the Father, the Son existing before the Spirit to effect procession. “In respect to order of relationship. Generation is second, procession is third. In the order of nature, not of time (for both generation and procession are eternal,
therefore simultaneous), procession is after generation.”\textsuperscript{14} Much of Augustine’s proposal rest upon the delegation of all things of the Father to the Son. Does ‘all things’ apply intra-Trinity or does it apply extra-Trinity? The witness of Scripture tends to the latter. He also elaborates a hypothesis by which the Son is not the eternity of the second person of the Trinity, which could imply that he considers the title ‘Son’ to indicate function rather than ontology. In affirming the eternal generation of the Son, the tension is heightened as to whether he is looking to the ‘λόγος’ or to Wisdom of the early Fathers as a pre-sonship form of existence.

Finally, Augustine does develop analogies from the composition of the human soul that are conjectural in terms of understanding Trinity and comprehending human composition and psychology, of an altogether different tenure in the light of his previous construct.

From this entire period of Patristic development of Trinitarian thought, J.N.D Kelly concisely elaborates a ‘Catholic Consensus’ of Latin, Greek and Evangelical Orthodox Christendom (912, 920):

Trinity

i. The Unity of the Divine essence. (Against Atheism, Dualism, Polytheism.)

ii. The Trinity of the Divine Persons. Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the Maker, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. (Against Arianism, Socinianism, Unitarianism.)

iii. The Divine perfections: Omnipotence, omnipresence, omniscience, wisdom, holiness, justice, love, and mercy. (912)

Christology

i. The Incarnation of the eternal Logos or second Person in the Holy Trinity.

ii. The Divine-human constitution of the Person of Christ.

iii. The life of Christ. His superhuman conception; his sinless perfection; his crucifixion, death, and burial; resurrection and ascension; sitting at the right hand of God; return to judgment.

iv. Christ our Prophet, Priest, and King forever.

v. The mediatorial work of Christ, or the atonement. 'He died for our sins, and rose for our justification.'

Pneumatology

i. The Divine Personality of the Holy Spirit.

ii. His eternal Procession from the Father, and his historic Mission by the Father and the Son.

iii. His Divine work of regeneration and sanctification.

Anselm, (1033-1109) considered the founder of scholasticism (Ferguson and Wright 26-28), was renowned for his originality, although Augustine’s work “De Trinitate” is referenced by him, in the context of the ontological argument for the existence of God as the ultimate Good, something than which a greater cannot be thought exists so truly that it cannot even be thought not to exist. And You are this [being], 0 Lord our God... You alone exist most truly of all and thus most greatly of all; for whatever else exists does not exist as truly [as do You] and thus exists less greatly [than do You], typifying the philosophical approach to the ontology of God (Anselm 9). His writings on Trinity reflect God the Father as “the Supreme Good” in which the equality of Father, Son and Holy Spirit concords with one ‘οὐσία’. The ‘λόγος’ is the Son, and “cannot be anything other than what You are or anything greater or lesser than You” (22-23). The Son is recognized as fully God, equal to the Father in permanent perfection. The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, being also of the same consubstantiate equality, “nor can there proceed from Supreme Simplicity anything which is other than what the one from whom it proceeds is” (Ibid.), in reference to the nature of the Spirit. Anselm recognizes the distinctions of Father, Son and Spirit as Trinity emphasizing the ‘oneness’ in substance – “singular simplicity” as each one is perfect; they are collectively neither multiplied nor differentiated in essence (Ibid.). This represents the tenure of Anselm’s pure ontology.

In the Reformation period both John Calvin (1509-1564) and Jacobus Arminius (1560-1609) defend against Arian and Sabellian arguments in their presentation of the Trinity. Calvin introduces the term “subsistence” as a translation of ‘ὑπόστασις’ referring to the
distinguishing incommunicable properties; likewise, ‘οὐσία’ is defined as ‘essence’ rather than ‘substance’. He affirms three subsistences who are perfectly God (Calvin 91, 92) demonstrating, “…an indissoluble tie, being incapable of separation, yet has a special mark by which it is distinguished from it… each of the three subsistences while related to the others is distinguished by its own properties” (93, 102). Calvin does not foresee any difficulty with Tertullian’s early economy of the Trinity whereby, distinctiveness is the only dissimilarity (110), “I have no objections to adopt the definition of Tertullian, provided it is properly understood, “that there is in God a certain arrangement or economy, which makes no change on the unity of essence —Tertull. Lib. contra Praxeam” (93). While the eternity of the Father, the Son and the Spirit, is one and the same in which “there can be no room for first or last, still the distinction of order is not unmeaning or superfluous, the Father being considered first, next the Son from him, and then the Spirit from both” (101). Calvin does not employ the term subordinately, he emphasizes the unity in essence and in operation, “… God spoke in such a manner as left the Word his peculiar part in the work, and thus made the operation common to both” (94). He avoids subordinate economy when considering the words of Jesus inferring superiority in two ways: the distinction between the earthly Christ and the divine Christ,

Nothing can be more absurd than to deny the perpetuity of Christ’s divinity. But if he will never cease to be the Son of God, but will ever remain the same that he was from the beginning … Christ descended to us for the very purpose of raising us to the Father, and thereby, at the same time, raising us to Himself, inasmuch as he is one with the Father … Accordingly, John, declaring that he is the true God, has no idea of placing him beneath the Father in a subordinate rank of divinity (109).

The Son as ‘λόγος’ according to John the Evangelist, enables him to conclude “that the Word was eternally begotten by God, and dwelt with Him from everlasting. In this way, His true essence, His eternity, and divinity, are established” (Ibid.). The use of names or titles according to Calvin reflects what Augustine meant in relationships; when the Son is singly named, his full divinity is in view, likewise with the Father and the Spirit. When they are named together the relational is emphasized, “in this way the unity of essence is retained, and respect is had to the order” (102). He sought to maintain the balance of one essence shared by three distinct persons residing in it. That is to say, the essence of the Father, Son and Spirit is essentially unbegotten.” Calvin distinguishes between the
ingenerate essence and the person who has beginning in God (108). In doing so he establishes in essence the eternity of the Son and the Spirit. It could therefore be perceived that the Son and the Spirit as ‘persons’ were not eternal, implying that there is change in subsistence through generation and procession. The question is what is the relationship of the eternal ‘λόγος’ and the eternal Son, if the essence of deity precedes the Son?

In reference to the Holy Spirit, Calvin suggests that the clearest way to identify his divinity is to consider the nature of his works in Scripture that attest to his divine essence as God (99-100). The double procession from the Father and the Son is asserted because He is the Spirit of the Father and the Son; the ‘ὑπόστασις’ of the Spirit uniquely being his subsistence in the perfect unity of the Godhead (Ibid 101-102).

Jacobus Arminius in, “The works of James Arminius,” writes in a context of allegations of teaching the Son as ‘αὐτόθεός’ from the phrase of the Nicene Creed in reference to Jesus Christ, “… God of God …” (Bettenson 24) inferring that Christ was God in and of Himself, moving from generate divinity to causal God. Arminius refers etymologically to the term ‘αὐτόθεός’ as unibiblical, yet meaning, “either one who is truly and in Himself God, or one who is God from Himself. In the former signification, I said, the word might be tolerated; but in the latter, it was in opposition to the Scriptures and to orthodox antiquity” (Arminius 341). The former term equates to generate while the latter would refer to ingenerate divinity. He clearly identifies the risks of Tritheism or a recurrence of Sabellianism (259). In response, Arminius sets out his doctrine of the Trinity to demonstrate its alignment with the Patristic and Orthodox creedal confessions.

The name Father signifies God, “the fountain and origin of the whole Divinity, and the principle and the cause of the Son Himself … We attribute to Him "active generation"” (467). Arminius affirms Personhood in the Godhead, although his initial observations of the Spirit are impersonal, “in its first act and essence is most subtle and simple but which in its second act and efficacy is exceedingly active, that is, powerful and energetic. This word belongs primarily and properly to a self-existing power; and to an inhering power or energy, only secondarily and by a metaphorical communication…” (474). He does affirm the Spirit as, “subsistent and a Person … by whom God the Father and the Son perform all things in heaven and earth” (475). For all three Persons of the Deity he establishes the individual subsistence, undivided and incommunicable as: living, intelligent, willing, powerful and active (467, 468-469, 476); according to Arminius these
shared qualities in divine nature establish personhood. The Father has communicated His deity to the Son, not by creation nor adoption, but by generation; Him being eternal means “he had no existence at all before he existed as the Son, ...it is proper to a son to be begotten, we correctly assert on these grounds, that "he was eternally begotten"” (Ibid 472), differentiating between Augustine and Calvin who perceive the Trinity existing before Fatherhood and Sonship. He admits that, “…he must have been from the Father, before he was with the Father … except according to the mode of generation … otherwise, the Word will be from the Father in one mode, and the Son in another, which contradicts the eternity of the Son” (473, 468). The divinity of the Son, according to antiquity, is through: names, attributes, works and appropriation of OT truth of the Father found in the Son revealed in the NT (469).

The Spirit, identified as a person on the same basis as the Father and the Son, is described by Arminius as emanating from the Father, given and sent by the Son, and proceeding from both, according to his Person (475). He is careful to ensure that his equal consubstantial divinity is not diminished by modes of existence and operation. Arminius declines from fully embracing the ‘filioque’ of the West, as he does not suggest the Spirit to be ‘ἐκ’ Christ, by emphasizing his procession from the Son being given and sent by Him (478).

Arminius does refer to ‘numerical order’ in that the Father is the ‘first,’ the Son ‘second,’ and the Spirit ‘third,’ although qualifies this as “not in relation of time but of order [regarding the Father] ... not in time and degree, [concerning the Spirit]” (467, 469, 478). With regard for the Spirit, his initial point is the order of ‘ingeneration-generations-procession’. He observes, “this does not betoken any diminution of his Divinity, but is an intimation of his origin from God, of his procession from the Father and the Son, and of his mission to his office” (479). In the context of Redemption, in doxological form, there is suggestion of modes in economy, “… if regard be had to that economy and dispensation by which the Father and the Son, and both of them through the Holy Spirit, accomplish our salvation ... God the Creator, the Son the Redeemer, and of the Holy Ghost, the Sanctifier” (Ibid.). The latter comment is directly related to Modalism, although Arminius is careful to distinguish the equality in Deity, the one nature “incapable of being divided” (480). The attribution of roles or modes refers to function rather than subordination, but then the Latin fathers and Augustine would see Trinitarian God as actively Creator,
Redeemer and Sanctifier. The difficulty arises when any One of the Trinitarian Persons are defined ontologically and economically in a scheme of generic principle which will not bear up before the witness of Scripture.

In the modern era a typically Reformed understanding of Trinity pervaded much of theology. Berkhof lucidly perceives the Tritheism, Arian, and Sabellianism struggles of the patristic period as present in this period too through, Socinianism, Unitarianism and later liberal theologies in which he comprehends no significant further developments “just repetition of the same old errors” (83).

Like Calvin, Berkhof clarifies terminology, employing ‘essence’ instead of ‘substance’ for ὀὐσία and ‘subsistence’ for ὑπόστασις as in ‘person’, a conscious distinct individual. He comes dangerously close to Sabellianism when he distinguishes the Trinity as, “… in God there are no three individuals alongside of, and separate from, one another, but only personal self-distinctions within the Divine essence… three hypostases in God, three different modes…of existence or subsistence” (87-88). In question is the concept of ‘personhood’ in ὑπόστασις, while affirmed subsequently, “the divine essence is not divided … but is wholly with all its perfections in each one of the persons, so that they have numerical unity in essence” (88-89). His use of ‘persons’ eases the tension created by his conception of the divine essence having three modes of subsistence (Ibid.): the unbegotten Father who uniquely generates and spirates (90).

The preincarnate Son, is fully God, uniquely generate from eternity within the Divine Being, (90-91, 89). The Son is with the Father and therefore personal and relational, the ‘λόγος’ being an expression of that intimacy shared with the Father (92). The subsistence of the Son is not an act of will instead a necessity of God to be Trinity, concurring with Athanasius, and Augustine’s relational conception. This qualifies the Son and His generation as eternal (93). Berkhof defends the Son from being created out of nothing (94), by affirming “… His generation of personal subsistence rather than divine essence … [for] He is “generated out of divine essence,” of which the “communication [is] an indivisible act” (93, 94). In his expression Berkhof distinguishes the pre-Son existence of Christ as part of the one essence, but personhood is ambiguous, especially if essence is communicated simultaneously at generation. He does affirm the perfectly divine nature of the Son as God that is founded upon similar Scriptural categories as Arminius, adding explicit assertions, of divine honour, and the ‘τέλος’ of the old and of the new age (94-
Berkhof is affirmative that the Holy Spirit is a Person in response to the Monarchians and Pneumatomachians, the Socinians, Unitarians and Sabellians (95-96). He establishes His person through personal characteristics, actions and functions and relationship. He understands procession and spiration synonymously as the distinctive property of the Spirit, effected by the Father and Son, to be considered as an eternal and necessary act (97). The Spirit is the perfect essence of divinity. In terms of essence, while generation precedes spiration, no subordination is perceived (Ibid.). The dilemma with the rationality of this approach is that breath (‘νεῦμα’) logically precedes word (λόγος). This implies that the utility of numerical ordering has limitations in understanding procession of the Son and Spirit.

In the Economical Trinity, in contrast to the ontological Trinity, Berkhof perceives a principle of subordination by derivation relating to personal subsistence: the Father first, then the Son, and thirdly the Spirit, (88-89). In the same way the distinctions of generation, filiation and procession belong incommunicably to each person, (89). Primarily, aspects of attribute therefore belonged to the one divine essence, but the distinctions point to an order in divine operations and therefore to an essential order in God and forms the basis for the “economic Trinity” (Ibid.). If this supposition holds then it follows that, “this ontological Trinity and its inherent order is the metaphysical basis of the economical Trinity” (Ibid.). The economy is particularly attributed to extra-Trinitarian activity in creation and redemption and epitomized in the citation “all things are out of (“ek”) the Father – the absolute cause, through (“dia”) the Son-the mediatorial agency, and in (“en”) the Holy Spirit– the efficacious or efficient agent of accomplishment” (Ibid. 94).

More recently, within the Trinitarian dialogue, the ontological and economic tension has fed much debate. Some scholars have made significant contribution to developing the ‘Economic Trinity’ which elaborates the structure and function. The considerations of this dissertation require further examination of this contemporary view, which emerges historically from Origen’s economical reading, and arises contextually in response to feminist and egalitarian arguments. Wayne Grudem, reflects Berkhof’s analysis, “The real difficulty lies in the relation in which the persons in the Godhead stand to the divine essence and to one another” (89), when he comments that, “… the real issue is the relationship between the Father and the Son within the Trinity …” (Ware and Starke 20).
The current tensions in interpretation are rooted in an ontological and/or economical comprehension of the Trinity and the extent of the implication in the eternal and temporal intra-Trinitarian relationships and functions.

The proponents of the economical view assert the eternal relationship of submission as based on the Father-Son generate relationship, the very fact of being Son implying submission to a Father. The assumption, based on the Nicene Creed, is that Jesus Christ only relates to the Father as Son (Ibid. 28). The difficulty that the reliance upon ‘names’ presents is, it is a partial revelation of the person that does not necessarily affirm explicitly the attribute in substance (‘ουσία’) or in person (‘ὑπόστασις’) in any full or defining measure. Christ’s relationship with the Father during his earthly ministry, which reflects function and therefore economy, exhibit a subordinate relationship to the Father and His authority, representing further distinctions beyond the generation of Son. The purpose being to establish clear distinctions within the one ‘ουσία’ in the light of divergent viewpoints where no distinctions are defined on the grounds of ontological oneness. Grudem expresses the unique non-reciprocal nature of Christ’s relationship and function to the Father. In prayer for example, the Father never prays to the Son, the Son does not create through the Father, etc (35). In the context of creation, the later point can be countered by affirming that the Father did not create without the Son, but that does not imply any form of subordination. The concern comes from the Patristic period where the unity of one ‘ουσία’ was grounds for economy, so where the Son takes prominence, it was understood that the Father and Spirit were actively and implicitly present.

The argument of temporary or limited submission during the incarnation is countered by demonstrating from seven key texts that the Father had a leadership role the Son did not have before creation.\(^{15}\) Grudem also implies that Christ’s mediatorial role, “… suggests submission to God the Father” (42-43). He also asserts that the scriptural witness portrays the Son as eternally in submission to the Father’s authority (20).

These assertions are quite dogmatic and disconcerting as they undo the unity, co-eternity and co-equality of the Trinity’s ‘ουσία’ to the extent that Monarchianism of the Father

\(^{15}\) The seven texts referred to are: Ep.1:3-5 God alone elects and predestines; Ro.8:29 authority to predestine; 2Ti.1:9 The Son subordinate to the Father’s planning; Ep.1:9-11 God plans the entire history of salvation; Ep.3:9-11 God’s eternal purpose; 1Pe.1:19-20 of Christ foreknown, [Note: In the TR Greek text believers are foreknown not Christ]; Rev.13:8 Ibid.
prevails in the divine counsel, whereby the Son, and by default the Spirit, are subordinate and uninvolved in the eternal purpose and will of God, inferring that divine will is decreed outside the scope of Trinity, uniquely implicating the Father.  

Grudem seems to respond to opposing arguments by stating the pole opposite, which in effect might counter the argument but does not positively present a construct. In the present argument the subordinate effect on the Trinitarian relationship is under consideration.

Christopher Cowan, reflecting on Jesus relationship with the Father in John’s Gospel, puts forward three principal arguments to support the eternal subordinate relationship of the Son to the Father: Christ the sent one; his relationship of dependency and obedience; and Father-Son terminology. His premise is, “this equality of divine nature between Father and Son exists alongside John’s ubiquitous depiction of a hierarchal relationship between the two, in which the Son is perfectly obedient to his Father” (48). The Son as the sent One, is the agent of salvation seeking the glory of the Father; Jesus’ feet-washing is quoted to substantiate, “… a servant is not greater than the one who sent him” (Jn.13:16). The sent one being subordinate to the will of the Sender. The context of the chapter is set in the phrase “Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into His hands, and that He had come from God and was going to God” (NKJV Jn.13:3). This contextualizes the impetus of sending, at least in this narrative. To what extent can subordination be presupposed from a verse that serves to exemplify a spirit of servanthood? Jesus’ does not explicitly anchor the principle in His relationship with the Father which leaves a very tenuous proposition.

Secondly, an examination of the phrases where the Father ‘gives’ to the Son, thereby making him entirely dependent on the Father; because Jesus accomplished all of redemption, showing his perfect obedience. Quoting, “Gruenler’s argument of unilateral dependency … on John 5:27, Son’s judgment … the Father willingly subordinates Himself to the Lord Jesus Christ” (54) demonstrating that the alternative view is ultimately stuck within a subordinate mechanism and can only offer unilateralism as an alternative to subordinationism. Carson commenting on John chapter five verse nineteen,

---

16 Is.30:1; 40:5, 8, 13-14; Is.41:4; Rev.1:8, 18; Is.46:9-10; Ep.1:9, 11; 1Th.5:18 serve to reinforce the divine attributes which make eternal counsel and will of God a Trinitarian exercise of ontology before entering economy and function.
“... the relationship between the Father and the Son is not reciprocal” (Ware and Starke 55), suggests that the opposite of reciprocal implies subordination. The author, admits that John does not employ etymologically the term ‘obedience’ however, he interprets synonymously the use of ‘τηρέω’ (57). The term means to take careful care of, according to Thayer, “expresses watchful care and is suggestive of present possession.” This does not in effect support the present argument, as its meaning refers to a belonging to someone and the attitude of care for something or someone precious and valued. This does not concur, neither with a relationship nor a position of dependency nor subordinate obedience. The acceptance of Jesus’ having a will and that will being united, one with the Father’s, serves according to the author as the Son’s obedience (58).

Thirdly, the language of Father-Son, reflective of analogous human relation illustrates relationship, familiarity, and intimacy, “[one that] does not rule out a relational hierarchy – which the Father-Son terminology conveys in its original context” (53). Whether the conclusion be accurate or not, the principle of explaining a divine archetypal relationship based on human and cultural principles is wanting. “It seems clear that John intends his readers to view the Son in a subordinate role to his Father-right alongside the view that the Son equally shares in the same divine essence of the Father…” (60). The author suggests that the subordinate relationship belongs not to the incarnate relationship and function of Christ but to his equality in their eternal relationship or more accurately, ontological relationship. The dependant, delegatory and subordinate describe the Son’s relationship from pre-existence, in eternity prior to incarnation and post resurrection. The author states, “equality of divine essence with the Father in creation, sovereignty over death, glorious pre-existence. … presents no testimony to counter the subordination theme (61). The significant shift in this proposal is defining the distinct properties outside the economic framework and inside the ontological context. Generally, to date the ground for this construct affirmed that unique distinctions in properties were ingeneration-

---

17 ἑτεροθεία TGEL 2016.


19 Jn.3:17; 13:1, 3; 16:28; 6:38; 8:42; 17:8.

generation-procession, even when numerical order is considered no preceding criteria have given a basis for such a proposal.

Philosophical arguments are presented to support the subordination theory. The two opposing views have been encapsulated in two concept phrases: “eternal functional subordination”\textsuperscript{21} that is, “the Son eternally and necessarily subordinate to the Father, not in terms of deity but in his role in relationship to the Father and “eternal functional equality”\textsuperscript{22} defined as, “Father and Son who are completely equal in all noncontingent ways: all subordination is voluntary, arbitrary and temporary” (Ibid 197). Beginning with the orthodox creedal statement, one ‘οὐσία’ and three ‘ὑπόστασις’, by which there is one shared essence, and whereby each person is perfectly and fully the essence, the three are distinct in subsistence or person with incommunicable personal properties. In response to whether Christ’s subordination is functional and/or ontological, the inference is that he could be of a different essence than the Father and the Spirit, Tri-theism rises again, with hints of Monarchianism, Arianism and Sabellianism. The essential question concerns consubstantial essence and distinct or personal properties. According to the authors, Gons and Naselli, “The proposal of the authority-submission property distinction belongs to the persons and not the essence” (203). The example of the ‘sending’ employed demonstrates subordination of the Son and the Spirit sent by the Father, but then the mutual sending of the Spirit and the Son suggests they are “subordinate to each other” (210-211), distinguishing the preincarnate sending from heaven and the incarnate Spirit sending the God-Man in order to argue that Jesus, the Second Adam, while sent subordinately by the Spirit remains hierarchically over the Spirit throughout the incarnation (211). This seems highly hypothesized and lacking explicit scriptural justification, the result being scriptural concepts forced into a theoretical framework, where supposition moves beyond theoretical, when mutuality and reciprocity in relational equality is so evident.

Ware, in defence of “Eternal Authority-Submission Relationship, [(E.R.A.S)] in the Trinity affirms “… one common divine nature possessed eternally and fully by each of the three persons of the Godhead, and person-specific properties that are not of each of the persons of the Godhead” (243). The ingenerate and generate distinctions of the Father

\textsuperscript{21} E.F.S.

\textsuperscript{22} E.F.E.
and the Son are recognized as essentially unique to the identity of a person (242), “without these person-specific properties, there is no basis for distinction among the Trinitarian persons” (243). Ware refers to ‘E.R.A.S’ not as a personal property but as an attribute (242). In doing so he moves from presuppositional economy to ontology and essence, (‘ουσία’); what began in economy becomes one defining principle of inter-Trinitarian being and relationship. The Son’s eternal submission is therefore a personal relational property (243). In this brief history of pivotal developments in Trinitarian understanding, the distinction in economy has primarily concerned the (ingenerate-generate-procession) incommunicable properties. The postulated eternal subordination, authority-submission theory assigns these qualities to the nature of ‘ουσία’; economy thus interpreted has redefined ontology.

Starke’s statement in appreciation of Augustine comments, that his “… doctrines of eternal generation and inseparable operation undergird and support an order of authority and submission …” (156). The principle is exemplified as follows, “if the Father is the beginning of substance and activity (eternal generation) and there is unity in operation (one of harmony, not unison), among the persons … the Father initiates the activity, and the Son faithfully accepts and joyfully carries out the Father’s plan” (170). When this genre of economical supposition is the grid for interpretation of the Godhead, and particularly of the Son, his perfections, his equality, his full divinity in his common and distinctive properties could be undermined. In the previous non-exhaustive assessment of Augustine’s writings on the Trinity in “De Trinitate,” there are no explicit grounds for economy with hierarchal and subordinator principles; to impose this on the begetting and begotten relationship of how the Son came into relation with the Father is assumptive and not evidenced in Augustine’s writings, less so the authority-submissive personal property theory within the Father-Son eternal relationship, as previously evidenced in this chapter. It is again the nature and primacy of the ontological that are founding principles that define economy.

This concludes considerations of the pivotal developments in Trinitarian thought and understanding. The threads developed facilitate the elaboration of efforts to grasp the mystery of the infinite Trinity. It is on this foundation that the following section will seek to construct a view of Trinity based on biblical and ontological principles, “the real
difficulty lies in the relation in which the persons in the Godhead stand to the divine essence and to one another” (Berkhof 89).
THE ONTOLOGICAL TRINITY IN EXISTENCE, RELATIONSHIP AND FUNCTION

This section considers the implications of the pivotal developments to an ontological reading of Trinity in Scripture, and in doing so contributes to the ongoing quest to comprehend the intra and extra Trinitarian ontology and economy. This development has for purpose, to restore ontological significance in the light of the believer’s introduction into Trinity and his existence therein; it also provides a theological foundation to reconstitute the ontology of the Church and ministry. An in-depth examination of these themes is expounded in the following chapters to provide, through an understanding of Trinity, an articulate and cohesive ontological construct.

Trinity from a perspective of being

Monotheism and Monarchianism in OT revelation, as determined and accepted universally, are based on the evidence of Scripture, and God’s witness of Himself. The use of names is secondary to ontological attributes because a name is analogous with an attribute. A name portrays certain aspects of nature and operation but remains a partial revelation of an attribute or of a person. It is open to interpretation because it is analogous, there is potential for loss of the immensity, infinity and eternity within the limits of a name. In the same manner, ‘function’ is secondary for it is also a partial revelation of being or identity. No one can be accurately or fully known ontologically uniquely through function. Function is a partial disclosure, providing fragmentary insight into aspects of one’s nature. As such a function may reveal one or several limited aspects of a person’s identity or being. Sovereign and all-powerful God is not reflective of function it is an attribute of his being. God does not reveal Himself in Scripture constantly and in full measure of either attributes. In the OT, Israel’s journey is marked by acts of immense power and sovereignty, yet they serve only as sporadic measured expressions, partial and temporal, of who God is in Himself. In the NT there is only one passage where the all-powerfulness of God could be attributed, the reason being that the four principal Greek words for power are united in one verse and in one thought regarding the power displayed in the resurrection of Jesus out of the dead, the same power that is at work in believers,

1 Dt.6:3-4; 31:6; Ex.20:3; 34:14; 2Kg.19:15; Ps.50:1; Is.45:14, 21; 1Co.8:4.
according to Paul. The exercise of function does accurately demonstrate attribute according to the principles set out. The exercise of function points to the attribute that is perfectly and fully found ontologically in the Person of God, for it is one aspect of identity of ‘I Am’. It is only the misuse of function in this regard that will deform the vision of Godhead. God is sovereign and all-powerful by nature, he cannot be anything else than what He is; that would be the ‘dis-integrity’ of God, for his integrity is witnessed to in Scripture as, ‘what He is, is what He says, is what He does.’

The Patristic fathers saw the principle of ‘personification’ in both the OT and NT as a strong endorsement for Tripartite God. As with names, personifications rely upon external mechanisms for appropriation of secondary support for the Divine Triad. Functions and operations of Godhead are limited in utility for establishing clearly the ontology generally of anyone and especially of Godhead. The belief in revelation, is of God’s self-revelation, that is general and specific or special; it increases in measures and degrees climaxing in Jesus Christ; even if in Christ, God is perfectly and fully revealed, human finite perception will not grasp completely the infinite. Function therefore is secondary to establishing the ontology of Godhead; the contrary however is true that primacy in ontology defines and establishes demonstrable function.

Three in One

Attributes, or “properties is better … it is preferable to speak of the “perfections” or “virtues” of God” (Berkhof 52). Given the specific ontological focus, it is not necessary to develop the categorization of attributes. Figure I in Appendices chapter two, sets out the attributes or perfections of God in such a way as to render evident the nature of the

---

2 In Ep.1:19 ‘δύναμις’ inherent ability; ‘ἐνέργεια’ operational efficacy; ‘ἰσχύς’ potential power and ‘κράτος’ prevailing power.

3 Is.45:23; 46:10; 55:11; Ezr.1:1; Lk.4:17-21; Ro.5:8

4 “Wisdom” Pr.8:12-31; 33:4, 6; “The Servant” Is.42; 48:16; 59:20-21; 61:1; 63:9-10; “Right hand or arm” Ps.16:8; 44:3; 63:8; 80:15; 98:1; 118:16; Is.62:8; Ac.2:33; Heb.1:3; “Covenant” Is.42:6; “Light” Is.42:6; 49:6; Salvation Is.49:6. Although ‘names’ have been considered the Triad appellation, “Lord, Redeemer, and Holy One” may be literary parallelism but also suits the personification concept: Is.41:14; 43:14; 47:4; 48:17; 49:7; 54:5.

5 Most of the categories are in pairs: natural/moral and absolute/relative; immanent/intransitive and emanent/transitive; Personality and Constitutional; Greatness and Goodness; Essence and Attributes (Berkhof 53; House 39).
one ‘οὐσία’ (substance) of each of the three ‘ὑπόστασις’ (Persons) of the Triune God. To assert that God the Father, Jesus Christ the Son, and the Holy Spirit are divine, requires imperatively that they have in ‘οὐσία’ and as foundational to ‘ὑπόστασις’ the same attributes. This establishes Personhood or Identity in the one common ‘οὐσία’. Upon this assertion lies the affirmation of divinity, equality and unity. In accordance with orthodoxy each Person is singly perfectly God, with no need ontologically of the other Persons, in order to be. There is therefore no interdependency in substance.

“In the beginning was this Word, and this Word was near to God and God was this Logos. This One was in the beginning near to God. All [things] through him came to be, and apart from him nothing came to be not even one [thing] that had come into being” (TLT Jn.1:1-3). A closer examination of this text reveals three key Triune principles: eternal existence, eternal relationship, and divine substance. The term ‘ἀρχή’ means origin, the first initiator, the first active cause. Etymologically, concerning time, the term “…denotes a new beginning in a temporal sequence … of the Logos; the Logos is before all time, so that no temporal statements can be made about him. Eternal pre-existence is plainly implied” (Kittel and Friedrich @102), reflective of Christ’s words affirming Himself as Alpha (‘α’) and Omega (‘Ω’), ‘ἀρχή’ and ‘τέλος’, ‘πρώτος’ and ‘ἐσχάτος’; Initiator and ultimate Accomplishment-Eternal End; the Pre-eminent First and Uttermost Conclusive Extremity. The development of ‘λόγος’ is unambiguously and unanimously accepted as the Person of Christ, as the preceding section has shown. This being true, the term demonstrates the Divine ‘λόγος’ to possess initiatory, causal, defining, and consummatory attributes. In eternity, there has never been a point when He did not exist. The ingenerate causal God, the Father is from eternity in relationship with a generate causal Divine ‘λόγος’.

The second consideration is that He is ‘πρός’ God, indicative of motion towards or before, accession or nearness to someone, contextually in the accusative therefore, of accompaniment or relationship (Rienecker 217). The nature of the bond between God and

---

6 ‘ἀρχή’ TGEL 2016.
8 ‘τέλος’ TGEL 2016.
9 ‘πρώτος’ TGEL 2016; SECB 2015.
Divine ‘λόγος’ is ‘near’ relationship. This determines the fundamental nature of the intra-Trinitarian rapport as an eternal ‘close or near’ relationship, emerging from ‘being’ God. While the existential attributes determine the substance of the Persons of the Godhead, particularly those that belong to the infinite and eternity of God, the moral or character attributes substantiate Trinitarian existence. For God to be, a Person or Identity, character is essential to being, and therefore requires imperatively an object who can receive the demonstration of the character in identity. In simple terms, God cannot be love for love requires an object to be demonstrably experienced and authenticated by another who witnesses in return that this is truly the love attribute manifested. The moral attributes therefore require Trinitarian existence. In the same way that God demonstrated his love by sending Christ, the incarnate God-Man, likewise in the eternal perspective, God demonstrates He is love, among the other moral or character attributes, by existing in Trinity in a ‘subject–object’ eternal relationship.

The previous section raised the issue of reciprocity in Trinity. If rationality replaces relationality, then three perfect beings stand distinct by their perfection because they have no need of anything from the other. However, the nature of the eternal relationship substantiates the relational primacy in Trinitarian existence. The relationship is not one of need of ‘property’, to use Reformation language, rather it reflects the manner of relating reciprocally and mutually, ‘A relational complicity between the individuality of Perfects’. This demonstration and attestation to mutual honouring,\(^\text{10}\) glorifying,\(^\text{11}\) witnessing,\(^\text{12}\) accessing,\(^\text{13}\) testifies to the inaccuracy of non-reciprocity in Godhead, an assertion that Carson makes (quoted by Cowan, Ware and Starke 55). The ontological relationship finds this witness to reciprocal unity outside of need or dependency or any form of subordination. While there is unity in substance, there is also unity in eternal relationship. The structure of the Trinity is the perfect relationship between Perfects. The textual reference for relationship to function is this unity. Co-eternity, co-equality in

\(^{10}\) Jn.5:23; 8:54; 2Pe.1:17.


\(^{12}\) Jn.5:31-32, 37; 8:13-14, 18; 15:26; Heb.7:17; 1Pe.1:11; 1Jn.5:9.

\(^{13}\) Jn.6:37, 44, 65, 14:6.
substance clearly indicate cohesion of collaborators in function. In context, the structure requires neither ordination nor subordination to demonstrate neither ontology nor economy, it requires relationship and collaboration among eternal perfects and equals.

If, according to this exegesis, the Divine ‘λόγος’ possesses causation, the text also indicates agency, “all [things] through him came to be …” at least in the creational context, then there is a clear demonstration that ontologically, substance and relationship of persons is unity and it is out of unity that God the Father and Divine ‘λόγος’ operate. One can express interdependency, not as a reflection of need, but of substance, relationship and unity as the eternal primacy for operation. The phrase, “apart from him nothing came to be not even one [thing]” reiterates the principle. The Father and the Son (and the Spirit also) because of substance, can create, but because of relationship and unity do not operate outside of this ontological context. Therefore, inseparability and indivisibility are not only in substance but in relationship and in unity, and logically form the foundation for all operations. In restoring the primacy of the ontological relationship, the functional economy should congruously demonstrate measures, degrees, possibilities, and limits of the interrelatedness expressed in these ontological principles.

Critically, the ontology of Jesus own words saying, “The Father and I are One … the Father is in Me and I Am in the Father … All that is the Father’s is mine and all that is mine is yours …”14 reflects the ‘ὅμοιος’ of ontological consubstantiality, relationality and reciprocity that constitute Trinitarian unity. In John chapter ten the context is significant as Jesus responds to a question of identity. His argument is simple and builds block upon block from, ‘I have already told you’. If taken contextually could refer to Jesus saying to the Jews, ‘εγω ειμι,’ an explicit reference to his Divinity and Godhead.

The reciprocal ‘γινωσκω’ is knowledge by personal experience preceding operation. Contextually that is laying down His life; He compounds the motivation to his love relationship to the Father with his own inherent authority to decide to lay down and take up again his life.15 The connexion of ontological relationship to economical operation occurs in a context of reciprocal and perfect experiential knowledge between the Father

---

14 Jn.10:30, 38; 14:9, 11, 20; 16:15; 17:10, 21.

15 Jn.15:14-18.
and the Son; the mutual love relationship\textsuperscript{16} and the autonomous authority to exercise in the distinct Person of the Son. The latter reflects Christ having all authority and the Father agreeing that he use it.

“My works done in the Father’s name” witnesses to who ‘I Am’. Jesus states it is Him who gives believers eternal life and they will not be snatched neither out of Jesus’ hands nor the Father’s, because these two phrases are identical, the statement of oneness emanates from them. It is difficult to apply ‘the Father being greater than all to Jesus’, as He is one, united to and in the ‘μείζων’ as an ontological attribute. If these three verses were not correlated together then subordination could be implied. The believer held securely in the hands of the Son and the Father intimates the reciprocal, collaborative and profound unity in operation. The same principles of reciprocity, unity and collaboration are found in coming to the Son or the Father: “… no one comes to the Father except through me … no one can come to Me unless the Father who sent Me draws him… everyone who has heard and learned from the Father comes to Me … no one can come to Me unless it has been granted to him by My Father” (NKJV Jn.14:6; 6:44-45, 65). This clearly defines the reciprocal nature of the relationship the believer has with both Father and the Son. The point is that it is impossible to have experiential knowledge of the Father without coming to the Son, and vice-versa. From a Trinitarian perspective, there is a reciprocal giving by the Son to the Father and the Father to the Son setting out in this ontological unity. It is a collaborative and reciprocal demonstration of economy where there is no hint of hierarchy in rank, pre-eminence, in authority or in submission. The theology of these texts partially expresses the essential union of every believer in the Father, the Son and the Spirit, and the Trinity in union in them.

The tension between the ontological and the economical (as authority, submission, and hierarchy), cannot be avoided nor explained by the leanings towards the ontological unity statements of Jesus, neither can strenuous emphasis upon the verses where this genre of ‘economy’ appears. As this initial section demonstrates, both dimensions must be held together in tension and explained accordingly with coherence and cohesion.

The Patristic fathers agreed that the original personal property in ‘ὑπόστασις’ was for God the Father being unbegotten or ingeneration, for God the Son, his generation, and for

\textsuperscript{16} Jn.3:35; 5:20; 10:17; 14:31; 15:10; 17:24
the Holy Spirit, his procession. What qualified the personal property distinction, is that it is not communicable intra-Trinity, being unique to each Person. If ‘unbegotten-begotten-procession’ refers to the agency through which God existed eternally in Trinity, then the means of being are explained. Historically, there has been ambiguity over the distinction between generation and procession, “… because it is most difficult to distinguish generation from procession in that co-eternal, and equal, and incorporeal, and ineffably unchangeable and indivisible Trinity…” (Schaff *Augustine* 509). However, Augustine does hold to the eternal being by spiration or procession, whereby the peculiarity of being ‘third’ is supported by the ‘filioque’ (double procession). This distinction is one of agency rather than attribute, or substance. St John of Damascus says, “their two persons are distinguished by the different mode of their origin; the Son is Begotten, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father. This is sufficient to distinguish them” (Lossky 55). The generation and procession are agency then, they are not defining ‘substance’, nor ‘hypostasis’. The significance is that when authority-submission is introduced to attribute or substance the generation and procession are interpreted by a subordinationist approach. If generation and procession are agency, then co-eternity, co-equality, and perfect divinity in all attributes are preserved. That the Son originate his essence in God, and it be attributed to Him, recognizes ultimate origin, “The Son receives all from the Father, and the Father nothing from the Son,” (Starke quoting Calvin), is an evident statement of origins. However, the Father has generated a perfect ‘όμοιος’, providing insight into the intention of God for co-equality and not subordination. Therefore, that the Father put all authority, all judgment, all creation, all redemption, etc. upon Jesus is not delegation of an office to a subordinate, but the natural participation in co-equality and co-eternity.17

The Patristic fathers and more recent writers considered, have referenced the natural created order of a father-son relationship to substantiate subordination in the Divine Father-Son relationship. It is firstly inappropriate to take creational order to define the eternal order. The contrary however is valid. The reasons are that human relationships are finite and experienced from a place of imperfection and limitation in human nature and in the natural order. Secondly, it is regenerate relationships in Christ and in Trinity that hold significance but even then, not enough to serve as comparison or analogy of the perfect divine Father-Son relationship. In the natural order, the point of sonship is not to

17 Heb.1:1-3; Mt.11:27; Jn.3:35; 5:20, 22; Ro.8:32.
remain forever son, the point is to become an adult, and in turn a parent. The process of parent-child development leads not to subordination but to freedom, not to dependency but to autonomy. In the same vein, the father is progressively losing authority from day one of birth to the adolescent crisis. Authority undergoes a significant shift in the balance from that of the parent diminishing before the increasing authority of the young adult, (see Figure XX, XXI). The point of fatherhood is to equip, train, teach, and exhort the internal construction of the person and in their identity, (values, experiences, affection, security, relationship, belonging, etc). The father is doing everything to free the son effectively from his own authority in such a way that he perceives in the son, the consolidation in his being, thereby inspiring: confidence, increasing responsibilities, experiences, freedoms, which are based on trust in the identity of the person. When the Heavenly Father says of His Son, I commit everything into your hands, He is reflecting the perfection of the Son, whereby autonomy, freedom, unity, and ‘oneness’ form the basis for this Father-Son relationship. The subordinate grid for Father-Son relationship does not equate to the creational intentional order nor does it concur with the Divine order in the ontological and relational perspective.

But as for me, who derive the Son from no other source but from the substance of the Father, and (represent Him) as doing nothing without the Father’s will, and as having received all power from the Father, how can I be possibly destroying the Monarchy from the faith, when I preserve it in the Son just as it was committed to Him by the Father? The same remark (I wish also to be formally) made by me with respect to the third degree in the Godhead, because I believe the Spirit to proceed from no other source than from the Father through the Son” (Schaff Tertullian 1325).

**Ingenerate, Generate and Spirate**

The starting point for comprehending the Trinitarian order is often referenced in this verse, “… because also even if after all there are those being called gods whether in heaven whether on earth, just as there are many gods and many lords but [for] us one God

---

18 Jn.1:3; 3:35; 5:20; 13:3; 16:15; 17:7; the same is relationally true for the Person of the Spirit: Jn.14:26; 16:13-15; additional proof is found in the cohesiveness of the same principle in the believer’s relationship to Trinity: Mt.11:27; Jn.15:15.
this Father out of whom [is] everything and we [in]to Him also one Lord Jesus Christ through whom [is] everything and we through Him” (TLT 1Co.8:6).

[For] Gregory of Nyssa, the Godhead is one because the Father never acts independently of the Son, nor the Son of the Spirit. The divine action begins from the Father, proceeds through the Son, and is completed in the Holy Spirit; none of the Persons possesses a separate operation of His own, but one identical energy passes through all Three (Kelly 280).

Augustine, commenting on this verse and Colossians chapter one verse sixteen says,

For if of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, so as to assign each clause severally to each person: of Him, that is to say, of the Father; through Him, that is to say, through the Son; in Him, that is to say, in the Holy Spirit,—it is manifest that the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit is one God, inasmuch as the words continue in the singular number (Schaff Augustine 32).

Fee considers the text’s primary,

…emphasis is not on the unity of the godhead, although that may be assumed, but on the uniqueness of the only God … Father and Son … that expresses both the divine activity characteristic of each and indirectly the functional subordination of the Son to the Father … God the Father is the source of all things, which were mediated through the creative activity of the Son … the one through whom God also redeemed us, so that our existence is now “for” and “unto” God (374-376).

Grudem and Ware state, “The Father is always the one who creates through the Son, but the Son does not create through the Father … This was the pattern in the planning of salvation prior to creation, and … in the process of creating the world … the Father created the universe through the agency of the Son” (Ware and Starke 35, 42, 248). In doing so, he establishes an ontological and economical subordinate Trinity on the basis that origin, agency and realization have not only chronological order but hierarchal order.

Textually, Paul’s primary purpose is not a Trinitarian statement that should be a warning of caution. The tenure of the text is the contrast between the polytheism and henotheism of first century Greco-Roman empire and the ‘One Existential Creator God’ of Christianity. The purpose of the text is that Christians understand that they are ‘to’ or
‘into’ (‘sic’) Him, meaning God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ are the only objects to whom believers relate as Divinity. The principal perspective of the text is of ‘God’ in whom the Christian understands, the Father-Son-Spirit,

whom meant either God essentially considered, the one God, Father, Son, and Spirit, called the Father, not in relation to any person in the Godhead, … when he is said to be the one God, it must be understood, not as exclusive of the Son and Spirit; … as dominion or lordship belongs to the Father, so deity to the Son, and also to the Spirit … in opposition to the lords … Christ is the one Lord of all, as he is God over all, the Creator and Former of all things; and he is so likewise as Mediator (Gill @5389).

God the Father is affirmed as the origin, ‘ἐκ’ Him emanates existence. The text, however does not place the Father in a separate clause from the Son, as source and creator with the Father. Consideration is now given to the relationship of the Trinitarian Persons to each other, to the world and people.

[The Son] who is likeness [of] God the unseen, firstborn all creating, because in Him being created all in the heavens, and into the earth, the visible and unseen, not only if throne seats but also if spheres of lordship, not only if originators but also if authorities, all through Him and [in]to Him having been created, and He is before all, and all in Him have held firmly together (TLT Col.1:16-17).

The Son who is God relates to creation as ‘ἐν’ Him, indicating the creative potential within Christ and referring to the entire created universe; as ‘διά’, cause and agency; and ‘sic’ completes a cycle and defines the ultimate purpose and end of creation in or into Christ. These aspects of relationship are continuous as he sustains all He has made.

---

19 See also Barnes, “The word “Father” …is applied to God as God; …but to the Divine nature as such, without reference to that distinction…”Lord” here does not imply of necessity any inferiority to God; since it is a term which is frequently applied to God Himself;” Calvin, “God who gives existence to all, and from whom all things flow…there is only One…For he designed to ascribe the same operation to the Father and to the Son;” Hodge, “The universe was created through Jesus Christ,… He, the one God, is the source of the whole universe, and all that it contains. He created all things by the word of his power. All other beings are his creatures” (@5389).

20 Jn.1:3 “All [things] through Him were made and separate from Him not any one thing was made that had been made” (TLT); see also Heb.1:2-3; Ep.3:9; Ro.1:20, Rev.3:14 “…ἀρχη της κτισεως του θεου” (TR).
Grudem’s argues, “The Son does not create through the Father but the Father through the Son,” (Ware and Starke 35) is textually accurate in terms of wording. Unfortunately countering the argument by opposites does not engage with the issue of the Father not creating without the Son Jesus Christ. The nature of Christ’s relationship to the creational function cannot elude the causal, agency and centricity of His Person, and the ontologically defining relationship with the Father and the cosmos. The only act whereby God is unique and sole Supreme Initiator is in generation and in inspiration.

Creation being a Trinitarian act, the Hebrews author captures the concept, “because it was outstanding for him because of whom [are] all things, and through whom are all things, bringing many sons to glory …” (TLT Heb.2:10). The text employs the term ‘διὰ’ twice, and captures two dimensions of Christ’s relationship to the Father in creation: the first is causal, because of Christ, the second is agency, referring to locality, time, and means. To counter Grudem’s logic, it is correct that the Son does not create ‘διὰ’ the Father, but equally so the Father cannot create without the Son. The quest for subordination becomes divisive in the ontological Trinity. The restoration of the Son’s equality ontologically and economically, is herein supported and finds compounding evidence in the meta-narrative, “… with a view to an administration suitable to the fullness of the times, that is, the summing up of all things in Christ, things in the heavens and things on the earth. In Him … who descended is also the One who ascended far above all the heavens, that He might fill all things” (NAS Ep.1:10; NKJV 4:10). It is therefore in and for Christ that the cosmos has being and ultimate raison d’être. “And He put all things in subjection under His feet, and gave Him as Head over all things to the church …” (NAS Ep.1:22), places Christ in co-equality with God, if He is indeed ‘origin’, then Christ is Cause, Head, Source and Foundation. The point of creation is Christ, in Godhead and in the Father as the Father is in Him. The pre-eminence is Christ, “that He Himself will come to have first place in everything” (NAS Col.1:18) which has ramifications for the placing of Christ the Son in relationship to the Father and in the economy, ontologically speaking. These observations, communicate the impossibility of the Trinity to create individually and independently of one another. The portrait of Christ does not require subordination for him to co-create with the Father ontologically and

---

21 Ac.17:24-26; Is.45:7-12; Jn.1:3, 10; Col.1;16-17; Ge.1:1-2; Is.40:12-13.

22 ‘διὰ’ TGEL 2016.
economically, “For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, (NKJV Ro.1:20). This text exemplifies that the eternal attributes of God are demonstrated in Godhead, that is, in the Father, in the Son and in the Spirit distinctly and unitedly.

The distinctive properties: ‘ἐκ’ the Father and ‘διὰ’ the Son demonstrate a relationship characterized by the imperative of interdependency, of unity and as such these terms may distinguish properties but they do not define the unity nor suppositional subordination. As creation and all things are ‘ἐκ’ God, Christ is also the spiritual rock ‘ἐκ’ which life came, and the church exists; the Spirit also is the origin of created and recreated life. Jesus demonstrates the ‘ἀπό’ preposition referring to source or resource and separation, revealing a principle of distinction in Trinitarian relationships. He repeatedly affirms he did not come ‘ἀπό’ Himself, likewise, the disciple will recognize that he is ‘ἀπό’ God; John’s witness to Christ existed ‘ἀπό’ the beginning in reference to his eternity; similarly, God is pouring out the Spirit; he is coming ‘ἀπό’ God to create temple in the believer; in the same manner, He does not speak ‘ἀπό’ out of Himself; in turn the believer is redeemed, transformed made alive ‘ἀπό’ the Spirit ‘ἐν’ Christ.

John speaks of the Spirit figuratively as ‘anointing’ taken and possessed, the question is ‘ἀπό’ whom is he? Gill suggests the ‘holy one’ is a reference to Christ, (@7426 also Henry, and Poole @7433), while Jamieson, Fausset and Brown refer to, “believers have the anointing Spirit from the Father also, as well as from the Son … the Spirit is the token that we are in the Father and in the Son…” (@7426). The context speaks of God substantiated in the Father and Christ. While the text cannot be used as explicit support for a dual procession, it does suggest the sending of the Spirit ‘ἀπό’ both in one Godhead. All gifts and graces are ‘ἀπό’ God the Father, in the same manner as with Christ; John speaks of the Father ‘ἀπό’ the beginning. The essential point is to demonstrate that the Trinity as individuals do

23 1Co.1:30; 1Co.10:4; Ep.4:16; Jn.3:5; 4:14; 7:38.
24 Jn.5:19; 8:42; 13:3; 16:30; Ac.2:22; 1Jn.1:1.
25 Jn.16:13; Ac.2:17-18; 1Co.6:19; 1Pe.1:12.
26 1Co.1:30; Ro.8:2; 2Co.3:18; Jn.15:4.
27 1Jn.2:20, 27; 24-25.
28 Jm.1:17; 1Jn.2:13-14.
not claim ‘ἀπό’ within themselves individually, but in the Godhead. It is therefore a reference to the unity and interdependent relationship. The message is that all three persons however distinct their personal properties and functions, intrinsically subsist and act within these characteristics of Godhead, beyond the distinctions and functions that are difficult to attribute to any one person of the Trinity. In itself this conveys the importance of distinction that comes from unity and leads to unity.

If existence is ‘ἐκ’ and ‘ἀπό’ Godhead it is by necessity responds not only ‘εἰς’ the persons of the Godhead, but the intention is ‘ἐν’ Trinity individually and collectively, and ‘ἐν’ the believer reciprocally. As the Father is in the Son and the Son in the Father, just as the Spirit is in the Father and the Son, so they are in perfect union one with the other. Likewise, the believer is introduced as an extension of this union, whereby he is ‘ἐκ’ originated, and ‘ἀπό’ sourced, and ‘ἐν’ the Tri-Unity which reconciles transcendency and immanence through union.

Paul writing to the Romans, encapsulates the unity of the Godhead,

Oh, the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and how inscrutable his ways! “For who has known the mind of the Lord, or who has been his counselor? ... for from (‘ἐκ’) him and through (‘διὰ’) him and to (‘εἰς’) him are all things. To him be glory forever. Amen (ESV Ro.11:34-36).

In view is the Trinity, through the OT Prophesies of Jesus, as Wonderful counsellor, the Spirit of Messiah in all wisdom, searching the depths of God. Christ the ‘λόγος’ and wisdom of God is not identified in distinct and individual functions in a divisive manner, according to Paul. The properties possessed equally in ontology and economy are expressed in perfect unity, therefore the concluding perfect doxology is Trinitarian.

---

29 Of Jesus Jn.14:10; Ac.2:22; Ro.8:2; of the Spirit 1Co.6:19; 1Pe.1:12; 1Jn.2:27; of the believer Jn.15:4; 1Jn.2:24.

30 Of Godhead 1Jn.3:9; 4:4, 4; the Father 1Co.1:30; 2:12; 2Co.4:7; 5:18; Ep.3:15; Ph.3:20; Of Christ Jn.3:13; Col.1:18; Ro.6:4; 2Co.13:4; of the Spirit Jn.4:14; Ro.8:11; 1Jn.3:24; 4:13.

31 Of the Spirit: Is.11:2; 30:1; 40:13-14; of Christ: Pr.8:14; Jn.1:14, 18; 1Co.1:30; 2:14.
‘ἀποστέλλω’ and ‘πέμπω’

If Christ begotten/generate of the Father describes the nature of his eternal existence and procession, as with the Holy Spirit, then the concept of Trinitarian apostolicity describes the ontological Son and the Holy Spirit sent out from Godhead. This is not a sending primarily to function or economy but to being. The nature of the sending relationship is in view although it is evident that sending includes notions of economy. The significance of apostolicity to the Trinity has been underestimated considering the technicalities distinguishing generation from procession.

There are two dimensions of Trinitarian apostolicity, ‘ἀποστέλλω’ and ‘πέμπω’ both of which are applied to Jesus and reflected in the apostolic NT period. The mandating and equipping for liberation to sending out and to accomplish, is the first notion of ‘ἀποστέλλω’. Nonetheless, there is another apostolic sending ‘πέμπω’ which appears synonymous but carries an additional concept of accompaniment by God, whereby continuous relationship is emphasized. ‘ἀποστέλλω’ composed from the preposition ‘ἀπό’ designating source, resource or origin; contextually the word refers to Godhead. The definition also relies upon ‘στέλλω’ which means: to prepare, to repair or restore, to equip or train, to assemble with the idea of putting in order, to liberate and to send mandated with purpose. The source establishes its divine nature, for what originates out of God bears a measure or aspect of His nature. In Scripture ‘ἐξαποστέλλω’ is also employed,32 a term composed from ‘ἐκ’ defined as origin, out from, and ‘ἀπό’ meaning source or separation, from ‘ἀποστέλλω’, defined above. The composite term emphasizes the origin from, the source of resource sent out integrated into the six-fold purpose. In Greek grammar composition intensifies the meaning of the original term. It is used: in human relationships,33 in the apostolic church, among the apostles;34 of God sending out angels and Paul,35 and of Trinitarian significance, of God sending His Son in redemption.

33 Lk.1:53; 20:10,11; Ac.7:12.
34 Ac.9:30; 11:22; 17:14.
and the Spirit in adoption of believers to the Father.36 ‘ἀποστέλλω’ shows all three persons in Trinity as ‘Senders,’ God Father,37 Jesus Christ the Son38 and the Holy Spirit.39 ‘πέμπω’ completes and reinforces the apostolic sending with the continued actualized relationship constituent emphasis as: the Father is the Sender of the Son and of the Spirit,40 the Son sending the disciples,41 and the Spirit.42

The ‘πέμπω’ sending is often classed as synonymous with ‘ἀποστέλλω’, however there are distinctions that require attention to deepen understanding of Trinitarian relations. Etymological considerations put the emphasis upon sending in the framework of an ongoing sustained relationship and accompaniment. Jesus affirms apostolically he is not alone, because the Father is with Him.43 The continuous nature is confirmed by the participle mood.44 Just as the Spirit and Jesus are ‘ἀποστέλλω’ they are likewise ‘πέμπω’,45 by the Father. The Scriptures witness the same apostolic relationship between Christ and the Spirit.46 The apostolic sending then reflects relational unity and inseparability. It is recognized that the Father is not sent but Sender, whereas the Son and

36 Gal.4:4 6.
37 Mt.10:40 apostolic logic to receive the believer is to receive Christ and the Father who sent Him; Mt.11:10; Jn.1:6 of John the Baptist; Mt.21:34, 37 of the Old covenant servants, and the Son; Lk.1:19, 26 of angel Gabriel; Jn.3:16-17 of Christ, Jn.10:36; 1Jn.4:9 Christ the Son; 1Jn.4:10, 14 Saviour; Ac.7:34-35 of Moses; Ac.10:36; 13:26; 28:28 of the word of God, of salvation; Heb.1:14 of angels to serve believers; Rev.5:6 of the Spirit sent into the world.
38 Mt.10:5, 16; Jn.4:38 of the 12 disciples; Mt.13:41; 24:31 sending angels at ‘παροιμία’; Mt.23:34, 37; Lk.11:49; 13:34 the ‘οφθαλμο’ of God, explicitly Christ in Matthew, of servants, as the Father (21:34, 37); Lk.24:49 of the Spirit; Jn.17:18 of all believers in union; Ac.9:17 of Ananias sent to Paul; Ac.26:17-18; 1Co.1:17 of Paul to the nations.
39 Lk.4:18, 43 sending of Jesus Servant; Ac.10:19-20 men from Corneille to get Peter.
40 Jn.12:44-45; Ro.8:3; Jn.14:26.
41 Jn.20:21 as an extension of the Father’s sending of the Son.
42 Jn.15:26; 16:7.
43 Jn.8:16, 29; 16:32.
44 Participle mood 27 times of 32 mentions; The exceptions Jn.14:26; 15:26; 16:7; 20:21 where the indicative is employed.
45 Of Jesus: Gal.4:4; Jn.8:42; of the Spirit Gal.4:6; 1Pe.1:12; Jn.14:26.
46 By Jesus: Lk.24:49; Ac.3:20; Jn.15:26; 16:7.
Spirit are Senders and Sent Ones. The point being that the nature of relationship is demonstrated in this bond of collaborative unity and oneness.

‘ἀποστέλλω’ and the Son and the Spirit

Jesus apostolic mandate is etymologically expressed in six facets that are evident from a reading of the Gospels. The Holy Spirit’s ‘ἀποστέλλω’ of Jesus, reflects the accomplishment of the Servant-Messiah, as he exercises the six-fold mandate, manifested in Redemption, Salvation, in Kingdom come, and embodied in paradigmatic ‘restoring of all things to God’s original intentions in Christ.’ The ontological considerations of Christ’s ‘ἀποστέλλω’ concern firstly the Father.

The apostolic mandate is ontologically resumed, “And this is eternal life, that they may know You, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom You have sent” (NKJV Jn.17:3). This sending is for a reciprocal purpose, eternal life found inseparably in the Father and Jesus Christ together. The believer is brought to an experiential knowledge of both Persons of the Trinity and this twin experience is eternal life. The ultimate sense of salvation given is compounded later in the text, “in order that all in one just as you Father in me, in the same manner I in you in order that them also in us, in one, in order that the world believe that you sent Me” (TLT Jn.17:21). This emphasizes the ontological union between the Father and the Son which encompasses the believer in union. Jesus repeats this giving as causal and medial, “As the living Father sent Me, and I live because of the Father, so he who eats Me, he also will live because of Me” (NAS Jn.6:57). The term ‘διά’ in relationship to the Father indicates causal grounds. In view is the eternal generation, the eternal Father necessitates an eternal Son. Because the Son is Life in Himself, ‘feeding’ being an analogy for source, Christ is the causal grounds for the believer to eat life and live eternally. The wider context is Trinitarian, “… the Living Father … the Spirit who gives life” (ESV Jn.6:57, 63). The life giving is an ontological attribute causally common to all three Persons, ministered through the persons of the Trinity into the believer. The point seems to be less of a structured approach as to which

47 Lk.4:18; Is.61:1-3; See also 42:1-4; 49:5-7; 50:4-9; 32:15-17; 35:1-7.
48 Jn.3:16-17; 6:29, 57; 17:3.
49 ‘ἀποκαταλλάσσω’ Ep.2:14-16; Col.1:16-17.
person of the Trinity gives life, but rather the united singular intention of the three persons in Godhead is the experience of eternal life. To eat Christ, is to eat of the life of God and of the Spirit. The apostolically sent Christ and Spirit are not lesser because of their sending because they are equally sources of eternal life. The life is the life of the Godhead, expressed in three persons manifesting one substance. In this context, the ontology is perfect oneness, but the economical revelation as ‘Life-Givers’ equally demonstrates the same perfect oneness. Not only does ontology hold primacy but this text undeniably demonstrates the ontology in operation as the same as that declared in substance.

In the dilemma surrounding Jesus’ origin and identity, he corrects the religious leaders’ human conception by his response to the two questions, “But I have known Him since I am beside Him, He also sent Me” (TLT Jn.7:29). Jesus speaks of his ‘πέμπω’ in verse twenty-eight, emphasizing his unity and relationship with the Father. He is the ‘other witness’ authenticating the veracity of Christ’s person and mandate. His second assertion out of interdependent relationship of unity is his ‘ἀποστέλλω’ knowing the Father through being eternally ‘παρά’ Him, an affirmation of divinity and co-equality in close proximity with God.

There is only one reference to Jesus being ‘εκ’ originated out of God, “Consequently, Jesus said to them if this was your Father God whoever [of you] would [have] loved me because I come out ‘εκ’ God and because neither have I come ‘ἀπό’ myself but He sent me” (TLT Jn.8:42). John seems to focus on the distinct ‘ὑπόστασις’ as being sent or coming from ‘παρά’ the Father. It would be consistent with rest of the NT to hold the same principle of proximity. What Jesus is essentially arguing in context is His divinity, whoever is ‘εκ’ God, hears the words of God. The reason why you do not hear them is that you are not ‘εκ’ God,\(^{51}\) climaxing with his explicit confession, ‘ἐγώ εἰμι’.\(^{52}\) Christ is therefore establishing His equal divinity with God in His identity revealed, which explains the next clause that He is apostolically sent not ‘ἀπό’ Himself but ‘παρά’ the Father. Jesus is expressing individuality and divinity while reinforcing plurality in Godhead, for the Father is His sender. It is the divine Tri-Unity that Christ’s ‘ἀποστέλλω’

\(^{51}\) Jn.8:47.  

\(^{52}\) Jn.8:57.
is attesting, not his subordination. His apostleship authenticates His Person and flows out of equality and unity in Godhead.

The apostolicity of the Spirit proceeds from the OT prophetic voices of the New Covenant. The distinctions are: the Spirit indwelling as opposed to being ‘upon’ or ‘with’ and the Spirit in recreation or regeneration within the believer. It is not that these are distinct properties in the Trinity’s economy because coherently within themselves they all have the attribute and the function. They are realized with His apostolic sending into all believers. The Spirit is sent in fulfilment according to the Father’s promise and as such, it is His Person that is given to the believer to effectuate salvation in the Father and in the Son, rather than being sent to a particular function. The ontological view of salvation, developed in the chapter three is existential and therefore, is founded upon the indwelling or abiding of the Tri-unity.

The Trinitarian formula is witnessed by the Son who ‘ἀποστέλλω’ the Spirit to the one hundred and twenty disciples waiting on the promise following the ascension of Jesus. The Spirit is, through the apostolic definition, to realize the new covenant of incarnate union in the believers with the Persons of the Trinity. The Spirit is ‘πέμπω’ by the Father in the name of the Son, ‘πέμπω’ by the Son and coming out from the Father; reflected also in the vocabulary of the Father who ‘gives’ the Spirit, Jesus takes hold of and distributes largely, and the Spirit who ‘comes’. In each case the Spirit comes or is sent out ‘παρά’ the Father, that is not from his person but from his presence, as with Jesus. His distinct ‘ὑπόστασις’ is in view ontologically and relationally in Trinitarian unity. This also reinforces his individualisation in identity or personalization in personhood. The emphasis of the ‘πέμπω’ sending is the nature of the relationship between Father-Son-

---

53 Is.59:21; Jer.31:31-33; Ez.11:19; 36:25-27.
54 Lk.24:49; Ac.1:8; 2:33; Gal.3:14; Ep.1:13.
56 Ac.2:33.
58 Jn.14:16; 15:26; Ac.2:33 – ‘τούτο οὗ’ this One, in reference to the person of the Spirit.
59 ‘παρά’ employed twice in Jn.15:26 recognizing his distinction from the Jesus and the Father.
Spirit. The Spirit’s procession is in the middle-passive voice and therefore bears a sense of reciprocal and mutual agreement. In the context of John chapter fourteen Jesus intimates the Spirit’s relationship with the believer as ‘μετά’ in the middle of, ‘παρά’ proximity, and ‘ἐν’ indwelling union. This relationship is compounded by the witness to the Father and the Son’s indwelling.⁶⁰ In John chapter fifteen the immediate context of persecution and hate is a consequence of union in Trinity. It is the result of being in Trinity; as Christ was hated because you are ‘in’ Him, and the Father then by extension, believers experience the same thing. In response, Jesus explains his ‘πέμπω’ sending, the Spirit’s coming, and in mutual agreement with the Father, his coming out or procession as a witness to Christ the Sender. The emphasis is profoundly Trinitarian and unitarian in being and operation. In John sixteen the context is Jesus having more to say, that will be spoken by the Person of the Spirit. The dynamic of the Spirit’s ministry is comparable to that of Jesus, as previously developed in this treatment: He does not speak ‘ἀπό’ Himself, of his own resources.⁶¹ He takes hold of what is Christ’s, the verb is in the middle voice and therefore attests to a mutual reciprocal relationship and action.⁶² The reason Jesus’ gives, flows from his consubstantiality and co-quality in substance and economy. “All that the Father possesses is Mine” (ESV Jn.16:15), forms the basis for the Spirit’s ministry. This results in a cycle of glory, as the Father and the Son glorified each other reciprocally, moreover the Spirit of glory glorifies the Son.⁶³ These principles affirm the unity that emanate from the one ‘οὐσία’ and the three distinct but inseparably ‘ὑπόστασες’. These texts support with difficulty a subordinate reading in the light of the evidence. They do express the simple beauty of the interrelatedness that transcends being and function, opening eyes to the Tri-Unity ontological ‘Oneness’ of being, relating and operating.

‘πέμπω’

The distinction between ‘ἀποστέλλω’ and ‘πέμπω’ influences how Jesus speaks of his ontological relationship with the Father, in view of how he exercises his earthly ministry.

---

⁶⁰ Jn.14:20-23.
⁶¹ Of Jesus: Jn.5:19; 7:18; 11:51.
⁶³ 1Pe.4:14; Jn.16:14; 2Co.3:8.
Where ‘πέμπω’ is employed Jesus consistently refers to the Father to emphasize the primacy of the indivisible united relationship that defines the term, “Then Jesus cried out in the temple, teaching and saying, "You both know Me and know where I am from; and I have not come of Myself, but He who sent Me is true, whom you do not know”” (NAS Jn.7:28). He refers to his coming as not ‘ἀπό’ Himself, the inference in the previous phrase ‘πόθεν’ defines a place or a source, an origin or cause, and compounds the statement; as he declares that his authenticity lies not in his coming but his sending. The unity of relational agreement between sender and sent one authenticates Christ’s identity, a reflection of the purpose of apostolic sending. The apostolic language has been used by proponents of subordinate-authority-submission hypothesis of Trinity and the Father-Son relationship in economy. However, the exegesis offered demonstrates equality in unity both ontologically and functionally, whereby inseparability and indivisibility prevail.

Jesus says: he has come not to accomplish his will but the will of the one who ‘πέμπω’ him; His teaching is not his but the Father’s; he seeks not his own glory but the Fathers. He is not without his own glory ‘παρά’ the Father; belief in Christ for life which he affirms, concedes to belief in the Father. The balance of Scriptural testimony, as referenced below, clearly puts faith or belief in Christ as the pivotal axis in knowing Him and the Father, yet here he gives preference to the Father.

In ‘ἐξουσία’ Christ possesses all authority over the heavens, the earth and under the earth. When he says, “since I, out of myself, absolutely not speak but the Father sending me he gave me a commandment which I say and this I might speak out” (TLT Jn.12:49),

64 See also Jn.8:16, 29.
65 ‘πόθεν' TGETL 2016.; see also Jn.7:27, 28; 8:14; 9:29-30; 19:9; 4:11; Mk.12:37.
66 Jn.4:34; See also 5:30; 6:38, 39, 40.
69 Jn.17:5.
70 Jn.1:12; 3:16-17; 6:29, 40; 9:35; 12:36-37; 17:20; Ph.1:29; 1Jn.5:13.
71 Jn.12:44.
72 Mt.28:18; Jn.10:18; 17:2; Ep.1:21; Col.1:16; 2:10; 2:15; 1Pe.3:22.
it should be interpreted in the wider ontological context of Christ possessing ultimate supreme authority. In the same way he says without doubt that he possesses authority over his own life to lay it down and take it up again.\(^73\) Contextually, Jesus exercises his authority within the parameters of: ‘γνώσκω’ a personal experiential reciprocated knowledge of and with the Father – the basis for his sacrifice;\(^74\) in this the love of the Father is manifested towards the Son and towards believers.\(^75\) The use of ‘ἀπό’ referring to the taking away or laying down of his life means that the source of the laying down is in Himself. Secondly, the use of ‘λαμβάνω’ refers to Jesus taking back his life, the same term is employed concerning the Father’s commandment. Jesus took hold of the command, it is not imposed upon him hierarchically, for of his own will he actively takes it for Himself, to accomplish. If Jesus were passively receiving the command as a subordinate then ‘δέχομαι’ would have been used, meaning to passively receive, the pole opposite of the intended meaning and usage.\(^76\) A subordinate reading does not respect the dynamics of the wider ontological context of Jesus neither does it respect the linguistics of this text. Christ having all authority, restores the meaning of freedom to the definition of authority. In a Trinitarian context of mutual experiential knowledge and love, he takes upon Himself the sacrificial mandate of his own initiative and exercises his own authority for that to be fulfilled. The Eastern view of there being one divine will of Godhead, does not reflect the individual will considered in these texts; likewise, the subordinate school of thought runs close to denying any individual will in Christ or at best only perceives that will exercised in subordination to the Father’s will, as previously mentioned. These passages witness to a depth of personal unity within the Godhead in operation whereby Christ demonstrates his consubstantiality in ontology and in operation. The manifestation therefore is of ‘oneness’ whereby Christ does not function outside the common agreement of the Godhead even though ontologically he potentially could.

The apostle Paul’s eschatological statement, “When all things are subjected to Him, then the Son Himself also will be subjected to the One who subjected all things to Him, so that

\(^73\) Jn.10:18.

\(^74\) Jn.10:15.

\(^75\) Jn.10:17; Ro.5:8.

\(^76\) In a similar vein ‘κομίζω’ means to receive and is employed the middle voice again distinct by the collaborative nuance differentiated to the active ‘λαμβάνω’ and ‘passive ‘δέχομαι’.
God may be all in all” (NAS 1Co.15:28), is used by Grudem in defence of a subordinate Christ. Cowan likewise affirms that “‘God’ in this context is clearly not the entire Trinity, but God the Father only ‘theos’ applies only to the Father” (Ware and Starke 28, 63). They stand in opposition to Augustinian orthodoxy,

Neither may we think that Christ shall so give up the kingdom to God, even the Father, as that He shall take it away from Himself because He is one God together with the Father …The Father will then be revealed by the Son, “when He shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and all power;” that is, in such wise that there shall be no more need of any economy of similitudes, by means of angelic rulers, and authorities, and powers. (Schaff Augustine 38).

This biblical passage is unique in its tenure as no other reflects the eternal subordination of the Son to God to the Father as those proponents suggest. Given the unique content of the text, it can only be correctly interpreted in the light of wider Scripture. The following argument seeks to demonstrate the ontological and economical unity in the eternal purpose.

In Ephesians, in the context of Christ’s resurrection and reign Paul teaches,

According to the working of His mighty power which He worked in Christ when He raised Him from the dead and seated Him at His right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this age but also in that which is to come. And He put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be head over all things to the church, which is His body, the fullness of Him who fills all in all (NKJV Ep.1:19-23).

Christ is seated far above, in reference to place, rank or power (‘ὑπεράνω’), the ‘firsts’ originators, authors, leaders, initiators (‘ἀρχή’), authorities (‘ἐξουσία’), inherently capable powers (‘δύναμις’), prevailing mastery, seigneuries (‘κυριότης’), and named identities or persons in all their attributes (‘ὄνομα’). This position is Christ’s in this world and eternity. To Christ alone is submission (‘ὑποτάσσω’)77 due that He be established ‘κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα’ translated as the Head and Source beyond, more than, or for the sake of, the church. In view is the absolute pre-eminence over universe, heaven, earth,

77 See also Ph.3:21; 1Pe.3:22; Ac.10:36.
etc. Christ in the cosmic sphere of archetypal primacy is filling all in all. This makes reference to accomplishment, completion or perfection that is the outcome of his ‘ἀποκαταλλάσσω’ of the cosmos and the church to God. In this God is perfectly comparable to Christ, “all in all.”

The writer to the Hebrews, quoting ‘freely’ Psalm chapter 8 verses four to eight, “You made him for a little while lower than the angels; you have crowned him with glory and honor, putting everything in subjection under his feet.” Now in putting everything in subjection to him, he left nothing outside his control. At present, we do not yet see everything in subjection to him, (ESV Heb.2:7-8), describes the humbled Christ, taking the form of a servant God-Man, in contrast to everything in subjection to Him. It therefore cannot be deduced that because Christ humbled Himself that he, by any measure, compromised or set aside his supremacy that was to be realized progressively through: his preincarnate eternity, his incarnate life and ministry and his post resurrection eternal reign. Peter states, “… that in all God might be glorified through Jesus Christ who is this glory and this prevailing lordship to forever and forever Amen” (TLT 1Pe.4:11). In this Christ is the glory and dominion of God, thereby indivisible from Him, as he is an essential expression of God and of absolute authority.

The visions of the heavenly throne in John’s revelation illustrate in prophetic and apocalyptic language, a vision of the reign of God in Trinity. They are objects of worship viewed with distinctions that do not alter the divine unity and equality in the heavens, “The kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever” (ESV Rev.11:15. The throne, and the phrase, “He who sits on the throne,” are accompanied by seven torches of fire the symbol of the perfection of the Holy Spirit; the four animals traditionally depicting the Gospels of Jesus Christ figuratively of Christ, present the Trinity in reign. The Lamb alone worthy to open the scrolls, and the Spirit are in the first circle where the throne of God is. Both God and the Lamb are objects of the same adoration, the Lamb is in the middle of the throne, the

---

78 Ep.2:16; Col.1:19-20; 1Co.15:28; Ep.1:23.
79 See also Ro.9:5.
80 Rev.4:2, 5, 6.
81 Rev.5:1, 5, 6, 13.
springs of living water symbolize the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{82} The reign of God, the Marriage of the Lamb and the witness of the Spirit; the Father, Word and the Spirit in judgment;\textsuperscript{83} and the eschatological realization of the reign of God.\textsuperscript{84}

A final argument is from the etymology of ‘ὑποτάσσω’. This term has two principal meanings one from a military analogy and the other concerns all non-military uses. The military use suggests a defined hierarchal submission. The latter use, refers to being beside and assuming a part in responsibility, in cooperation.\textsuperscript{85} In the relationship of Trinity to mankind, only in Christ does the first application apply,\textsuperscript{86} the latter applies to all other human relationships and structures.\textsuperscript{87}

In the light of this evidence it is the equality of Christ in the reign of God expounded as co-equal, co-eternal and therefore without hierarchal distinction from the Father in the earthly or heavenly realms. The unity and indivisibility in the reign are evidenced. Christ according to Paul’s thought in first Corinthians fifteen, suggests that the role of the Son, in redemption, regeneration, in perfecting and bringing to ultimate fulfilment, has been accomplished; the mediatorial work is fulfilled, no more need for intercession, sacerdotal role, no more subduing of enemies, his and ours; just as believers perfected enter into the kingdom reign, so Christ may enter co-equally with the Father into the eternal kingdom reign of Godhead (Barnes, Clarke @5602), as Revelation witnesses and the supremacy of Christ demands.

In the same manner, this is not to be understood as a subordinate clause, drawing attention to the ontological and relational qualities in the vision of Trinitarian apostolicity. The same reciprocal or mutual principle applies to the glorifying of the Father by the Son and the Son by the Father.\textsuperscript{88} The reciprocal glorifying of all three Persons underpins the
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\textsuperscript{82} Rev.7:9-12, 17.
\textsuperscript{83} Rev.19:1-4, 7, 10, 11-13.
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purpose of function. This being true, function is subjugated to the ontological purpose of mutual glory and this is to be foremost in view. The principle stands for each of the categories referenced.

Secondly, the Trinity is demonstrating the principle of two or three witnesses,\(^89\) Father, Son and Spirit authenticating the veracity each other.\(^90\) It is therefore suggested that the witness to the apostolic ‘πέμπω’ relationship concords with the relational reciprocity, equality and unity, serving the purpose of mutual authentication. Considering the ontological one ‘οὐσία’, while recognizing the distinct ‘ὑπόστασις’ of the Father, Son and Spirit, the apostolic sending exemplifies a oneness that cannot be adequately explained on a subordinationist basis.

Thirdly, the Eastern church fathers perceived a principle of revelation that carries significance in relation to the ‘κενόω’ of Christ, the Son revealing the Father, as the Spirit reveals the Son. There is a clear case for the three Persons self-revelation,\(^91\) and for God revealing His Son and for the Spirit revealing God, Christ and man mutually.\(^92\) In the apostolic ‘πέμπω’ the Son is committed to revealing the Father rather than Himself, “if in the kenōsis of the Son the Person appeared to men while the Godhead remained hidden under the form of a servant, the Holy Spirit in His coming, while He manifests the common nature of the Trinity, leaves His own Person concealed beneath His Godhead” (Lossky 168). The apostolic ‘πέμπω’ demonstrates the inseparability in unity between Father, Son and Spirit. The ontological consubstantial attributes in co-equality and co-eternity remain the foundation upon which Christ is expressing the imperative of not speaking, acting, or being outside of the Trinitarian relationship of ‘oneness’. If this is missed it in inevitable that some form of hierarchy be imposed upon the reading of the Scriptures in question.

The effect of procession upon the apostolic concerning Jesus Christ reflects two realities: the procession is typically indicated by the preposition ‘παρά’ indicating a relationship of

\(^{89}\) Dt.19:15; Mt.18:20; 26:60; 1Co.14:29; 1Ti.5:19; 1Jn.5:5-8.

\(^{90}\) Jn.3:31-33; 7:18, 28; 8:14, 16, 18, 26; 14:10, 26-27.

\(^{91}\) Ro.1:19-20; Mt.11:27; Jn.1:4-5, 9-11, 14, 16-18.

\(^{92}\) Gal.1:16; 4:6; 1Co.2;10-12, 14, 16; 2Pe.1:17.
proximity, being alongside. Therefore, the incarnation of the Word, the only-begotten came from alongside the Father. In addition, John perceives a proximity and an apostolic sending that is relationally eternal.93 The procession, ‘ἐξέρχομαι’94 reflects neither the apostolic mandate of the Father nor the relational sending, rather the autonomous choice of the Son to come, conjoint with the ‘ἀποστέλλω’, “For I have given them the words that you gave me, and they have received them and have come to know in truth that I came from you; and they have believed that you sent me” (ESV Jn.17:8). This coming out from is not the generation from God, instead it is the apostolic impulsion from the presence of the Father. As much as Christ was ontologically sent by the Father and the Spirit, He came of his own impulsion. Homogeneously, the relation of the Father and the Son ‘coming to reside with believers’ indicates the relational disposition of the Father collaborating with Christ in favour of the believer.95

The second reality also concords with the apostolic sending, in that Christ comes ‘ἀπό’ God,96 the Father entrusting all things into the Son’s hands precedes the statement of His coming out of the Divine Presence. His equality is firstly declared as having ‘all things’ that are in the sphere of the Father, shared entirely in the sphere of the Son, reflecting all that is yours is mine and all that is mine is yours.97 The secondary phrase of Jesus coming ‘ἀπό’ God is reflective of the source or resource as equally in God as in Himself, therefore of Trinity - the expression of collaborative unity.

The procession of the Holy Spirit agrees with that of Jesus in that the Spirit apostolically comes ‘παρά’ the Father, from His presence not His person. He ‘ἐκπορεύομαι’ from alongside the Father.98 The term ‘ἐκπορεύομαι’ is synonymous with ‘ἐξέρχομαι’ (Zodhiates 553). The former term is in the middle-passive voice while the latter term is primarily in the active voice. The procession of the Spirit then is a collaborative action

93 Jn.16:27, 28; 17:8; 1:14; 7:29.
94 The term communicates an impulse of sending out with a connotation of expansion; See 1Co.5:10; Ro.10:18; Mt.12:44; Lk.6:19; Mt.24:27; 27:53; Jn.11:44.
95 Jn.14:23.
96 Jn.13:3; 16:30.
97 Jn.17:10.
with the Father and the Son. This is compounded in both the Spirit and the Son ‘coming out’ using ‘ἐρχομαι’ in the active voice. The significance for the Spirit and Christ in the apostolic understanding is, they are sent ones but they also came out of their own accord. In Christ, the inseparability of relationship and of function identifies Godhead as the source, the cause and the agency. Jesus never functions outside of the ontological state of unity with the Father and identically with the Spirit.

The proposition of this section is that the apostolic sending ‘ἀποστέλλω’ and ‘πέμπω’ expresses with clarity, the ontological and economic considerations of the intra and extra-relating of the Trinity, considering the difficulties encountered in procession. The apostolicity of the Father and Christ stands in conjunction with the eternal generation and spiration of the Spirit, demonstrating the ontological primacy in the revelation of the three Persons of the Trinity in relationship to the world, the believer and the church. The mutual apostolic sending and coming ‘παρά’ the Father provides a conception of intra and extra Trinitarian relationships and operations that cohesively places apostolic function in the inseparable operation of the Godhead. The conscious choice of the Father, Son and Spirit conceives that none reveal or operate outside of the unity and relational collaboration in the divine ontology of being and operation.

**Jesus Christ**

Whether named ‘λόγος’, Wisdom, Son or Jesus Christ, or Lord these names used interchangeably, represent the one Person who is eternal in nature, who is God, The Fathers held unanimously to the eternity of the three distinct ‘ὑπόστασις’ (Kelly: Athenagoras 118, Tertullian 139, Origen 142). It is Calvin who makes a distinction, “his essence is without beginning, while his person has its beginning in God” (Calvin 108). The Fathers perceived the ‘λόγος’ to be the mind or rationality of God in Himself and therefore attributing eternity to the ‘λόγος’ (Kelly 113); in the same way the Spirit is said

99 Jn.15:26; Jn.16:8 – Holy Spirit; Jn. 16:28.

100 Jn.1:14, 18.

101 1Co.1:30; Pr.8:12, 14; 3:19; Ps.104:24; Jer.10:12.

102 Jn.8:35; Heb.7:28; 1Jn.5:11, 20.

103 Jn.12:34; 17:3; 2Ti.2:10; Heb.6:20; 13:8; 1Pe.5:10; 1Jn.5:10; Rev.1:15.
to be the breath of God in Himself and therefore eternal. Calvin may well be affirming the same principle of the one eternal essence or substance. Berkhof comments that “generation and procession take place within the Divine Being … If generation of the Son is a necessary act, it naturally shares in the eternity of the Father … its eternity follows not only from the eternity of God, but also from the divine immutability and from the true deity of the Son … conceived as spiritual and divine” (89, 93, 94). The supposition that before eternal generation and spiration there was one substance in whom was the Godhead, does not follow the eternal generation and ‘ὑπόστασις’ of the Son-Word-Christ. Scripture attests to eternity that has always known the eternal Father,\textsuperscript{104} the eternal Son and the eternal Spirit,\textsuperscript{105} there has been no time when there were not three ‘ὑπόστασις’. If, however the supposition is confirming one ‘οὐσία’ found perfectly, fully, and eternally in each person inseparable from the three eternal ‘ὑπόστασις’, then there is no discrepancy.

\textbf{Begotten}

The OT term, ‘yālāḏ’ is used in the ‘Qal’ verb form extensively for a woman bearing and birthing a child and synonymous with ‘ḥûl’.\textsuperscript{106} In the other verb forms ‘Niphal, Pual, Hiphil’ is in the passive and applied to men as generators or begetters.\textsuperscript{107} There are some exceptions to the rule: the sons of Noah, and in some figurative usages.\textsuperscript{108} The Pual form (masculine) is applied to Naomi and is understood in the context of the levirate marriage. As the last remaining member of her family, Obed is the son that will carry her family name and therefore she receives him in a unique generative manner in order that he inherit her family name.\textsuperscript{109}

The significance concerning God in the literal and figurative descriptions of his relationship to his people in which the masculine and feminine, especially the writhing

---

\textsuperscript{104} 1Ch.29:10; Ps.90:2; Is.63:16; 2Co.11:31; Ph.4:20; Jm.1:17.

\textsuperscript{105} Jn.14:16; Heb.9:17; 1Pe.4:14; Is.59:21.

\textsuperscript{106} Is.26:17, 18.

\textsuperscript{107} Ge.17:17; Ge.36:5 Jer.16:3; 22:23; 29:6.

\textsuperscript{108} Ge.10:8, 13, 15, 24, 26; 1Ch.1:10.

\textsuperscript{109} Ruth 4:17; Dt.25:5-10.
pains of childbirth in reference to creation\textsuperscript{110} and Israel’s idolatry, and voluntary fatherlessness, is shown.\textsuperscript{111} “You neglected the Rock who begot you, And forgot the God who gave you birth” (NAS Dt.32:18), encompasses in God the maternal as He speaks of Israel, ‘begot’ (‘yāla’d’) is in ‘Qal’ form and ‘gave you birth’ (‘hûl’) is in the ‘Polel’. In the same manner ‘Wisdom’ before creation from eternity,

From everlasting I was established, From the beginning, from the earliest times of the earth. When there were no depths I was brought forth, when there were no springs abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, Before the hills I was brought forth; While as yet He had not made the earth or the fields, Or the primeval dust of the world (NAS Pr.8:23-25; NKJV 8:26),

Expresses the pre-creation existence from eternity of Wisdom. The begetting language, ‘hûl’ in Pulal form is again a maternal reflection of the Father’s begetting in eternity. Isaiah prophesies the incarnational begetting of Christ, in the first instance to a virgin and then ‘to us’.\textsuperscript{112} The former is conform to the maternal term, the second mention however, is in the masculine form, underling the paternal begetting of a Son, Christ, “Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of peace” (NKJV Is.9:6). Psalm two describes the Father-Son relationship, “I will tell of the decree: The LORD said to me, “You are my Son; today I have begotten you” (ESV Ps.2:7), in the same terms the verb is used in the maternal form setting, its use is peculiar.\textsuperscript{113} In the overview can be perceived, the perfect begetting of the Son by the Father, the perfect parent in maternal and paternal aspects. This text quoted by Paul employs ‘γεννάω’ in the active voice emphasizing the paternal begetting.\textsuperscript{114} This perfect begetting reflected in the paternal and maternal of the person of God counters the argument for the Spirit being the bearing mother, “My mother, the Holy Spirit”, from the pseudograph Gospel of Hebrews that Origen ridicules (Origen 38).

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[110] Ps.90:2; Is.21:3; 42:14.
\item[111] Dt.32:18; Ps.90:2; Pr.26:10.
\item[112] Is.7:14; 9:6.
\item[113] See also Moses bearing Israel as a mother Num.11:12.
\item[114] Ac.13:33; see also Heb.1:5; 5:5.
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In the NT two terms apply to bear or begetting ‘τίκτω’ and ‘γεννάω’, the former is employed uniquely in the maternal sense, the latter term literally applies to fathering in the active voice\(^{115}\) and the maternal bearing in the passive voice,\(^{116}\) when not referring to the baby his/herself.\(^{117}\) The believer is the object of God’s paternal generation\(^{118}\) and the Spirit’s generating,\(^{119}\) indicating the act of paternal generation of the Trinity through Mary.

“You are my Son; today I have begotten you” (ESV Ps.2:7), is a foundational NT text for the eternal begotten relationship of the Son with the Father. The first comment is that the language for the eternal generation and the incarnate generation is the same. The major distinction is the orthodox view of eternal consubstantiality, possessing perfectly and fully the same substance or essence in being, whereas the human and divine nature of Christ incarnate is not consubstantial rather hypostatic, whereby the divine and human natures are inseparable yet distinct in one person, Christ. The context for this verse varies according to interpreters: some see the eternal generation of the Son (Jamieson, Fausset, Brown, Augustine quoted in Calvin @4251), others understand the incarnation (Poole Ibid.) or the resurrection of Christ the Son (Clarke, Barnes, Calvin Ibid.). Barnes comments, “If it refers to his resurrection, it means that that resurrection was a kind of begetting to life, or a beginning to life” (Ibid.). Paul quoting in Acts clearly places the citation in a context of resurrection from the dead. While the author to the Hebrews, presents a more global vision of the Son: he is the Word of the Father, the eternal ‘λόγος’ which is now revealed in the last days. His causal and medial role in creation, his perfect ‘ὁμοιός’ in essence with God, his atoning redemption and ascension, (his resurrection either being assumed or glossed), his pre-eminent reign, suggest that in view is his eternity through creational and redemptive function to eternity again. “And when He again brings the firstborn into the world,” (NAS Heb.1:6) affirms that there is a repeated action in brings the ‘πρωτότοκος’ into the inhabited world, (‘οἰκουμένη’), which refers to the earth.

\(^{115}\) Mt.1:16.

\(^{116}\) Mt.1:16, 20.

\(^{117}\) Mt.2:4.

\(^{118}\) Jn.1:13; 1Jn.3:9; 5:1.

\(^{119}\) Jn.3:5, 6, 7, 8.
The disclosure of the Son and the giving to the world reflects the sending of Christ. This contrasts with his attributes and Trinitarian role in creation, enthroning in the heavens. It could be considered that the coming in incarnation, in the salvific apostolic mission is in view.\textsuperscript{120}

The Son as the ‘πρωτότοκος’ is uniquely applied to Christ\textsuperscript{121} and used ontologically to describe the Divinity of the Son as God, over all creation\textsuperscript{122} and as the ‘πρωτότοκος’ from the dead in teleological redemption.\textsuperscript{123} The first ‘πρωτότοκος’ is the eternal generation of the Son-God consubstantial with the Father and the Spirit. If God the Father is eternally ingenerate, then it is ‘ἐκ’ God that God-Son-Word-Christ is generate, “As the Jews term Jehovah שולח שאל הברור, the first-born of all the world, or of all the creation, to signify his having created or produced all things; … so Christ is here termed” (Clarke @6336). Clarke asserts through a Hebraism the equality of divinity in Christ-Son, for the Father is also considered a ‘πρωτότοκος’ and therefore affirming the Son as truly and fully God. In the light of Scriptural names and qualities, it is unclear what the name of the Son-Word-Christ would be according to Calvin’s argument for a pre-Son existence of Jesus, which suggests there was a beginning. Paul however, places Christ as ‘πρωτότοκος’ in relationship to the cosmos, “the relation between Christ’s headship of the Universe by virtue of His Eternal Godhead…” (Lightfoot @6339).

The second ‘πρωτότοκος’ is the incarnation where the form of a servant manifests in the hypostatic relationship of the divine and human natures in the one person Christ Jesus the Son,\textsuperscript{124} as the Chalcedon creed affirms, “… recognized in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation; the distinction of natures being in

\textsuperscript{120} Jn.3:16; Is.9:6.

\textsuperscript{121} Mt.1:25; Lk.2:7; Ro.8:29; Col.1:15, 18; Heb.1:6; 12:23; Rev.1:5; Heb.11:28 is the only reference not explicitly referring to Christ, although it is figuratively.

\textsuperscript{122} Col.1:15.

\textsuperscript{123} Col.1:18; Ro.8:29.

\textsuperscript{124} Jn.1:14.
no way annulled by the union, but rather the characteristics of each nature being preserved and coming together to form one person and subsistence …”125 (Bettenson 51).

The third ‘πρωτότοκος’ refers to his death and resurrection whereby a new state is observed in the hypostatic God-Man, in that death, sin, law, and Satan have no authority on a human corporeal and spiritual existence now fitted for eternity.126 Scripture witnesses to several resurrections that are implicitly to temporal life,127 but Christ’s resurrection is unique in that it was to eternal life in His whole person, “… He raised Him from the dead and seated Him at His right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this age but also in that which is to come, and He put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be head over all things …” (NKJV Ep.1:20-22). This unprecedented ‘πρωτότοκος’ is the deification of the human nature conform to eternal existence and His divine nature.

While this is ontologically significant for the person of Christ, it has ontological implications for the believer. The purpose is the work of regenerative incarnation of Father, Son and Spirit in the believer, the divine nature operating in hypostatic union with the human nature of the believer.128 Christ is therefore the ‘πρωτότοκος’ of a new, or newly defined humanity.

For since by man came death, by Man also came the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ all shall be made alive. But each one in his own order: Christ the firstfruits, afterward those who are Christ’s at His coming … Just as we have borne the image of the earthy, we will also bear the image of the heavenly (NKJV 1Co.15:21-23; NAS 1Co.15:49).

The fuller vision developed of the ‘πρωτότοκος’ affirms the co-eternity and co-divinity of the Son with the Father, therefore asserting that generation is not implicitly or explicitly hierarchal and therefore not subordinate. The eternal relationship of unity from which operation is an expression of the ontological nature and relationship rather than the

125 Jn.1:14; Mt.1:1; Lk.3:38; Ro.1:3-4; 9:5; Ph.2:6-7; Col.1:19; 2:9; Heb.:2:9-10, 14, 17; 4:14-15; 1Pe.1:20.
126 Ac.3:15; Ro.1:4; 6:9; Ep.1:19-22; Rev.1:5.
127 Lk.7:1-10; Mk.5:38-43; Jn.11:38-44.
128 Ro.6:4-5; Ro.8:11; 1Co.15:20; Ro.8:29; Ph.3:21; Heb.2:10; 1Pe.3:18.
constraining definition of subordinate function. This exegesis of the ontology of the Trinity cannot support the subordinate in the eternal relationship. 

**In Redemption**

In Scripture there is an ontological model of divine thinking regarding redemption: in order to deal with sin Christ became sin, in order that believers become righteousness in Him; He became curse to redeem believers to blessing in Him; He became under law to deliver from law; He was dead in order to vanquish death to establish eternal not temporal life; He became mediating Priest, where no other could in expiatory, substitutionary and propitiatory priestly service and sacrifice, in order to restore a new priesthood to God. The ontological significance concerns Jesus. It is necessary to perceive in the Son and heir the ‘πρωτότοκος’ so that the believer could become a son or daughter and heir of God. Augustine distinguishes Christ being Son from sonship (Schaff *Augustine* 507). He identifies a difference between ontology and relationship from function and economy. He became human, taking on human nature so that the believer, being human, could know incarnate divine nature. Hebrews talks of Jesus being, “tempted as we are yet without sin … although he was a son, he learned obedience through what he suffered. And being made perfect, he became the source of eternal salvation to all …” The sufferings of Christ are not his own, they are humanity’s; His temptation, his natural and redemptive sufferings, and his obedience are not his own, rather they are the believers; Christ being Son, indicates that he previously did not know what obedience was because it was learned behaviour. It is not an obedience relationally between Father and Son but between the Son and his suffering. The necessary suffering was for the perfecting of salvation. This perfection describes an eternal ontological state,
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(in the passive mood participle voice form), a prerequisite for an eternal salvation. The
eternity of the Son is found in the nature of the redemptive work; likewise, his perfection
in a perfect sacrifice and sacerdotal service, “bringing many sons to glory the arche-leader
[of] this salvation, it perfected through suffering” (TLT Heb.2:10).

Christ became wisdom, righteousness and sanctification and redemption; these attributes
being found perfectly in Him, so that through the indwelling Godhead in Christ these
same qualities become manifest in the believer. 137 The substance and attribute of
ingenerate God are found in Christ (Fig. I, II). He is those qualities in the believer because
humankind is the object of Christ’s substitution and propitiation.

The subordinate proposition referring to these verses as proof of the Son’s subordination
to the Father, is confronted by the difficulties of beginning with redemptive function to
define the eternal ontological Trinity. The suggested exegesis of the texts, demonstrates
that the eternal relationship of the Son was not an expression of obedience, rather the
‘πρωτότοκος’ of the God-Man, in the redemptive mandate ‘became’ or took into Himself
these principles that are foreign to the divine nature. They are part of the function of
Redeemer, Priest, and Son. Likewise, the principles of obedience, concerning Christ are
not humanly conceived but come voluntarily in love and relationship from oneness, unity,
distinguished by reciprocity, and equality and as a such cannot reasonably bear
subordination.

**Holy Spirit**

‘Rûah’ like ‘πνεῦμα’ translate as wind, breath, life energy or force whereby it is difficult
to identify a person. Job says, “but there is a spirit in man, And the breath of the Almighty
gives him understanding. The Spirit of God has made me, And the breath of the Almighty
gives me life” (NKJV Job 32:8; 33:4), through parallelism the breath or wind is
syonymous with the Spirit of God. This concords with the creational record, “then the
LORD God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath
of life; and man became a living being … all in whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit
of life, died …” (NAS Ge.2:7; 7:22), agree with the image of the breath as the Person of

137 1Co.1:30; Heb.2:11; 1Pe.1:15-16.
the Spirit of the Lord. “O LORD, how manifold are your works! In wisdom have you made them all; the earth is full of your creatures. When you send forth your Spirit, they are created, and you renew the face of the ground” (ESV Ps.104:24, 30), testifies to a Trinitarian work in creation by the Lord-Wisdom-Spirit/Breath. If the text is translated as breath, it is the activity that identifies it with the Person of the Spirit conform to the wider witness of Scripture. Ezekiel is commanded to speak to the ‘Breath,’ as a Person. Secondly, through His action of reanimating and regenerating life, the Spirit can be personalized and identified through function. The nature of Spirit is therefore personified and identified through character or attribute. Activity leads back to identifying Personhood. Figure III, demonstrates this principle, identifying the Person of the Spirit as fully God through function that serves this purpose of identifying the unseen but revealed Holy Spirit. In doing so what is established is not distinct property but common shared properties in the operation of the Godhead. It therefore proves the divinity of the Holy Spirit as co-equal.

Etymologically, in use of the term spirit, there are twenty-three descriptions of a spirit, good or bad in character, that refers to the nature of a person rather than to the Person of Spirit, (Fig.V). In similar fashion the Spirit of God is also identified and personalized by designated characteristic. One deduces that the specific or singular appellation indicates perfection in that attribute; the collection of attributions undeniably endorses the Spirit’s full divinity in Godhead. His qualities are perfect and not dependent upon the other Persons.

The personalization of the Spirit is found in the Greek phraseology identifying Him as: ‘πνευματι θεου’, ‘πνευμα του θεου’, ‘πνευματος θεου’, ‘θεον πνευματι’. and

138 See also Job 27:33; 34:14; Is.42:5.
139 Ez.37:8-10; 1Kg.19:12-13.
140 Truth: Jn.14:17; 16:13; 1Jn.4:6; Holy: Jn.14:26; Lk.11:13; Ac.13:4; 15:28; 28:25; glory: 1Pe.4:14; grace Heb.10:29; Revelation, wisdom, and knowledge Ep.1:17; adoption Ro.8:15-16; life: Jn.6:63; Ro.8:2, 10-11; 2Co.3:6; Gal.6:8.
141 Mt.12:28; Ro.8:14; 1Co.12:3; 2Co.3:3.
142 Mt.3:16; 1Co.2:11; 3:16; 1Jn.4:2.
143 Ro.15:19/.
144 1Pe.4:6.
‘τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα’. 145 These terms concord that the Spirit is neither God’s nor Christ’s Spirit, but He is ‘God the Spirit’ in Person and therefore consubstantial, equal in divinity and relationship with the Father and Jesus the Son. The perfect distribution of attributes and functions demonstrate His substance and relationship in the Trinity (Fig. I, II, III, IV).

Founded on the individualization and the personalization of the Spirit in the Trinity, the biblical references to the Spirit of Jesus or the Spirit of the Father should be interpreted in the light of: His Personhood, His inter-Trinitian being, relationship and function, as the Spirit who is given, or sent by, or with the Father or the Son. 146

Two Scriptures present a difficulty in Luke’s record, of Jesus temptation and emergence in ministry where Luke observes Jesus, “being filled with the Holy Spirit … returned in the power of the Spirit to Galilee” (NKJV Lk.4:1, 14). The Spirit is a person and is perfect. The Son is perfect in Godhead and therefore without ontological or functional need to receive anything from the other to be who he is, so it is with the Father and the Spirit. “For He whom God has sent speaks the words of God; for He gives the Spirit without measure” (NAS Jn.3:34) in a Trinitarian and ontological thought, perceives the Person of the Spirit as given fully to the Person of the Son, in a relationship of collaboration; of reciprocal witnessing to the Person of Christ and to His words, just as Jesus testifies to the Spirit as corroborating with His words, ‘life and spirit’. 147 The ontological reading recognizes the Spirit in such unity as that demonstrated by the Father and the Son, they are one. “Jesus of Nazareth just as he anointed Him this God Holy Spirit and power which going through [towns] doing good and healing all [under] oppressive control of the devil that this God was in the middle with Him” (TLT Ac.10:38), sets out the Spirit as God and as a Person through character. The anointing is a simile indicating the intimacy of the Spirit-Son relationship, reflective of the Servant mandate. 148 This indivisible

145 1Pe.4:14.

146 Mt.10:20; ‘Spirit of your Father’ see also the synoptic parallel Mk.13:11 ‘the Holy Spirit’; Ac.5:9; 8:39; 2Co.3:18 ‘of the Lord’; Ro.8:9, 14; 15:19; 1Co.2:11; 3:16; 6:11; 7:40; 12:3; Ep.4:30; 1Jn.4:2 ‘of God’; Ro.8:9; 1Pe.1:11; ‘of Christ’; Gal.4:6 ‘of His [God’s] Son’; Ph.1:19 ‘of Jesus-Christ’; Ac.16:6-7 ‘of Jesus’ (not in TR but included in WH, IPNT, NTIG Greek texts).

147 Jn.6:63, 68; 12:48; Mt.4:4; Ep.6:17; Heb.4:12; 1Pe.1:23.

148 Is.61:1-3; Lk.4:18-19.
collaborative unity is confirmed. This principle reflects the homogenous nature in ontology as in operation, vital to the Trinitarian Father-Son relationship that can also be identified in the Spirit’s relationship to the Father and the Son.

**Redemption**

“But you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and in the Spirit the God of us” (TLT 1Co 6:11), draws attention to the ontological and economical unity in redemption, perceived in both: Jesus, his ‘name’ as Lord with authority, Jesus Saviour, and God the Spirit, that salvation will be accomplished. There is no apparent distinction. The writer to the Hebrews says, “How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?” (NKJV Heb 9:14) The rhetorical question contains the answer as to how a believer becomes a serving or worshipping priest, (‘λατρεύω’) to God. However, the identification of the eternal Spirit has produced several interpretations: the Holy Spirit, third Person of the Trinity, the ‘λόγος’ Christ, his divine nature, or an impersonal eternal life or life force (Barnes @6975). The early Father’s reading of the manuscripts speak of the Holy Spirit or the eternal divine ‘λόγος’ (Clarke Ibid.). Although Clarke rightly perceives the Trinitarian context of redemption, “But still we must say, that the Holy Spirit, with the eternal Logos, and the almighty Father, equally concurred in offering up the sacrifice of the human nature of Christ, in order to make atonement for the sin of the world” (@6975). If the uniqueness of Christ’s atonement, it’s eternal effect, it’s universal reach, it’s perfection, and it’s efficacy are applicable to every sin, it is obvious that the Spirit as eternal corresponds to the nature of Christ and of His redemption. Otherwise how could the Spirit minister with Christ eternal salvation effectively to believers in every age? The ontological perspective considers the eternal relationship of unity and equality, and in that light, the relationship of the Spirit with Christ: in human-divine conception, baptism, ministry, redemption, resurrection, and glory, presenting a unified sense of relationship

---

149 Ph.1:19; 2:1.

150 Heb.5:9; 9:12; 1Pe.1:2.

151 Lk.1:31-35; Mt.3:16-17; Jn.3:34; 5:17, 19; Mt.12:18, 28; Ac.10:38; 1Co.6:11; Ro.8:1-2; Heb.9:14; Ac.2:31-32; Ro.8:11; 1Pe.3:18; Jn.17:1-5; 1Pe.4:14; 2Co.3:8, 18; Ep.3:16.
that transcends function. There is perhaps no other purpose for the Father and the Spirit in Christ’s redemptive work other than authenticating mutual witness to: a perfect oneness, a relational collaborative unity, and as such is always set in the Trinitarian context, “for Christ also suffered once for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh but made alive by the Spirit” (NKJV 1Pe 3:18).

**Tri-unity**

“… that God the Lord of us, Jesus Christ, the Father [of] the glory gives ardently\(^\text{152}\) to you a Spirit wisdom and revelation in in-depth experiential knowledge of Him” (TLT Ep.1:17), is a Trinitarian passage that affirms the divinity of Jesus Christ and the Father of glory who both ardently desire to give the Spirit. Scripture records that Christ is wisdom, He alone knows the Father and reveals Him, because He knows Him, in the same way as the Spirit.\(^\text{153}\) Similarly, the Father has the same knowledge, wisdom and self-revelation in Himself. It is therefore necessary to recognize the principle of function as subordinate to the ontology of the three Persons of the Trinity. The truth expounded is that the believer is encompassed and indwelt by three perfect and distinct but inseparable sources of the same wisdom, revelation and knowledge of each other, in which they reciprocally reveal in some measure these dimensions of the other. Paul confirms God revealing through the Spirit,

> Even so no one knows the things of God except the Spirit this God … we have received … the Spirit who is from God, that we might know the things that have been freely given to us by God … For "who has known the mind of the LORD that he may instruct Him?" But we have the mind of Christ. (NKJV 1Co.2:10, 12, 16)

The Spirit originates eternally and apostolically ‘ἐξ’ God and like Jesus, knows the intimate depths of God and therefore Godhead. His co-omniscience is in view; his role as Revealer is the same as Christ’s, the intimacy is reciprocal as God self-reveals to the Son and the Spirit.\(^\text{154}\) The Spirit’s purpose in revealing the depths of God, the depths of man,

\(^{152}\) Reflects use of the Optave – the strongest desire, wish.

\(^{153}\) 1Co.1:30; Mt.11:27; Jn.10:15.

\(^{154}\) Gal.1:15; Jn.14:8-10; 16:13; 1Pe.1:11.
is to manifest and renew the mind of Christ. The unity of intention, the reciprocal revealing of the Other sets the ontological framework that is Trinitarian and not just limited to the Father-Son relationship, thereby establishing unequivocally the Spirit ontologically and operationally in the collaborative unity of the Trinity, into which the believer is introduced as object. Subordinate or numerical ordering principles are found lacking in the light of three perfects in science, wisdom, and revelation whereby the categories of ontology and economy are confounded in the oneness of being and the unity in operation. The point being that the three compound and intensify the three-fold intention towards the believer.

**Temple**

The concept of temple applies to the individual believer and the collective expression of church. It is the ontological presence of the indwelling Spirit that makes temple. This example illustrates perfectly the interrelated operation of the Trinity. Paul teaches, “… being built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the cornerstone in whom the whole building being intimately joined together grows into a holy temple in the Lord in whom also you are being built intimately together into a permanent dwelling of God in Spirit” (TLT Ep.2:21-22), establishing the temple in a Trinitarian construct, employing terms such as: household or body, building or temple. The Trinitarian message is of belonging to God the Father, being founded upon and in union to Christ, with the indwelling of the Spirit, are together the origin and source of spiritual existence and life. While three spheres of operation can be identified they are inseparable and indivisible, for they are a whole and one operation. This interdependency expresses the centrality of Christ in the foundational and reciprocal union in His indwelling and in the same manner, the indwelling Spirit, (the same reciprocity is expressed in the baptism into the Person of the Spirit that Christ inaugurated). The text indicates an organic growth to become the temple in Christ the centre, and the indwelling Spirit. There is no reference to specific function from the text, what can be deduced is the mutual indwelling of God the Spirit and God the Christ and the God the Father. The

---

155 1Co.2:16; Ep.4:30.
156 1Co.3:16; 6:19-20; 2Co.6:16.
157 Mt.3:11; Mk.1:8; Lk.3:16; Jn.1:33; Ac.11:16; 1Co.12:13.
indwelling, the belonging, the source and resource, are all commonly shared and operated. Believers through this incarnate Trinitarian ministry of origin and source become a temple defined by the ontological presence and operation, which is defined by who Trinity are.

**Collaborative**

But you are absolutely not in human nature, but in Spirit, if after all the Spirit God inhabits in you. But if whoever/whatever Spirit Christ absolutely not possesses, these [ones] are absolutely not [of] Him. But if Christ [is] in you, truly the body [is] dead through sin, but the Spirit life through right[eous]ness. But if the Spirit raising up Jesus out of [the] dead inhabits in you, the raising up the Christ out of dead will produce full life also the mortal bodies of yours, through the inhabiting of him Spirit in you (TLT Ro.8:9-11).

The premise to these verses is that in Christ there is no condemnation if one walks according to the Spirit, because the law of the Spirit in Christ Jesus sets free. The collaborative relationship is demonstrated in the unity of ministry in Christ and in Spirit. It is not a synonymous concept but rather a double indwelling of the Spirit and Christ. While Christ is ministering death, the Spirit is engendering new life, regenerate life. To restrict the two Persons functionally is to deny the fuller ontological truth: Jesus who is causing death, is Life in Himself and by definition;\(^{158}\) likewise the Spirit is cause and source of life.\(^ {159}\) The indwelling of Christ is viewed redemptively as the ministry of his atonement in killing law, sin and death. Just as Christ is life, it is the Spirit of Life who indwells, engendering the life of the Godhead in the believer. The Spirit, who with the Father, raised Jesus from the dead is equally cause and source of divine life.\(^ {160}\) The ontological unity again stresses the believer as object of Trinitarian relationship and ministry in which operation cannot be separated from or attributed to One member of the Trinity. Whether the Father, Son or Spirit are in the forefront, it is the ontological and collaborative unity that is expressed. The function can be fulfilled by anyone of the three

\(^{158}\) Jn.5:21, 26; 6:57; 11:25-26; 14:6; Ro.6:23; Gal.2:20; Col.3:3; 1Jn.1:1-2.

\(^{159}\) Jn.6:63; 2Co.3:6; Gal.5:25; 6:8; 1Pe.3:18.

\(^{160}\) Jn.5:21; Ro.4:17; 1Co.8:6; Ep.1:19-20.
Persons, the revelation of truth depends not on the perception of one or the other but of the Three as One.

Through these three examples of revelation, temple and indwelling, a vision of the Spirit’s person and operation emerges distinguishable from and yet clothed in a profound unity. A unity that points not to individual function or order rather to the collaborative oneness whereby the nature of the Trinity’s ontology impregnates their operations.

**Procession and Spiration**

Ontologically, how the Spirit proceeded from God, both the Eastern fathers and Augustine confessed difficulty distinguishing between the generation of the Son and the procession of the Spirit (Kelly 275, 278, 288). Calvin, explained God as the first of Godhead and speaks of the generation of the Son and the Spirit (108).

As demonstrated biblically, the ‘rûaḥ’ of the OT is identified in certain texts by activity that corroborates with the nature of the Spirit in Trinity. In the NT reference is made through John’s witness to Jesus’ post resurrection appearances to the eleven apostles, “as the Father has sent Me, I also send you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and said to them, "Receive the Holy Spirit. If you forgive the sins of any, they are forgiven them; if you retain the sins of any, they are retained"” (NKJV Jn.20:21-23). This text is used to justify the spiration of the Spirit as the means of His eternal procession. Scripture has demonstrated the correlation between breath, wind and Spirit, therefore when Jesus breathes the Spirit, this assertion harmonizes. Contextually, it is said to concern only the circle of the eleven, however the wider disciple band including the women are with them.161 The word employed, ‘ἐμφυσάω’ occurs only once in the NT and therefore only has grounds on the basis of the OT conception and of John describing those born ‘ἐκ’ the Spirit, likened to the wind.162 The universal coming of the Spirit into believers remains anchored in the Pentecost experience to which the apostolic witness is that God gave the Spirit,163 to those also attesting to His personhood. These two biblical texts explicitly

---

161 Lk.24:33; Jn.20:19.
162 Jn.3:8.
163 Ac.2:17; 5:32; 15:8; 1Th.4:8.
indicate the Spirit comes ‘ἐκ’ God,\textsuperscript{164} no other scripture expresses the same truth of Christ. The remaining NT witness is that He comes ‘παρὰ’ the presence of God the Father which presupposes His eternal existence alongside the Father, analogous with the Son. That John’s text infers that the Spirit proceeds from Jesus, there is no further evidence to confirm. Augustine’s writings explain that,

The third person is denominated the Spirit because of the peculiar manner in which the divine essence is communicated to him—namely, by spiration or out-breathing: spiritus quia spiraturus. This is supported by the etymological signification of πνεῦμα, which is breath; and by the symbolical action of Christ in John xx. 22, which suggests the eternal spiration, or out-breathing of the third person\textsuperscript{165} (Schaff Augustine 228-229).

Western theology, typified by Augustine, with a preoccupation for order, affirms that the begetting of the Son preceded the spiration of the Spirit and thereby made the Son source along with the Father (Kelly 289). Augustine affirms, “He is referred both to the Father and to the Son, because the Holy Spirit is the Spirit both of the Father and of the Son” (Schaff Augustine 227). A reductionist view would suggest that ‘ῥύα’ or ‘πνεῦμα’ breath logically precedes ‘λόγος’, word, thereby conflicting with the assertion. If Jesus were source (‘ἐκ’) of the Spirit then the double procession would have grounds for assertion. “It was Gregory of Nyssa, however, who provided what was to prove the definitive statement. The Spirit, he teaches, is out of God and is of Christ; He proceeds out of the Father and receives from the Son; He cannot be separated from the Word” (Kelly 275). The apostolic principle developed addresses the nature of Godhead in oneness, unity and reciprocity, ontologically and economically and therefore resolves the tension of hypothetical order.

What Jesus did communicate of the Spirit remains ambiguous, as to what previous experience the disciple band did have of the Spirit: Christ was to baptize into the Holy Spirit,\textsuperscript{166} but there is no record of that happening in the Gospels. Jesus clearly

\textsuperscript{164} 1Co.2:12; 1Jn.4:2.


\textsuperscript{166} Mt.3:11.
demonstrated the Spirit at work in power;\textsuperscript{167} power and authority was delegated to them for the mission of the twelve and the seventy, but no evidence asserts the continuity or permanence of those qualities at work, and so their experience appears transient.\textsuperscript{168} It is evident that the Pentecost coming of the Spirit fulfilled OT prophecy\textsuperscript{169} and Jesus’ promises.\textsuperscript{170} This coming, is distinguished by his indwelling rather than the Spirit ‘on’ or ‘over’ or ‘with’; the permanency and eternity of the Spirit’s indwelling: supersedes the transience, promise becomes fulfilment, visitation becomes permanent residency. The spiration of Jesus therefore requires contextual meaning: some scholars distinguish between a limited prior experience of the Spirit in sanctification, of being consecrated or set apart (Poole \@3745). Gill perceives regeneration as acquired (Ibid.); “… they were only sprinkled by his grace, but were not filled with full power; for, when the Spirit appeared on them in \textit{tongues of fire} … they were entirely renewed” (Calvin Ibid.). F.F. Bruce comments,

\begin{quote}
The relation of the insufflation (as the act of Christ in John 20:22 is called) … records is no mere anticipation of Pentecost but a real impartation of the Spirit for the purpose specified. The Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit was more public, and involved the birth of the Spirit-indwelt community, the church of the new age\textsuperscript{171} (Bruce 31).
\end{quote}

This breathing of the Spirit is distinguished, according to these scholars, from receiving the equipping in gifts, full power in the Spirit for ministry. Contextually though, the disciples were disbelieving and rebuked for their hardness of heart;\textsuperscript{172} they were locked in for fear of the Jews;\textsuperscript{173} Peter has abandoned Jesus and returned to fishing, only later to be restored to relationship with Jesus and the shepherding mandate.\textsuperscript{174} These events are

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{167} Mt.8:16; 12:18, 28.
\textsuperscript{168} Mt.10:1; Lk.9:1-2; 10:1, 9, 17-20; Lk.9:38-43.
\textsuperscript{169} Jl.2:28-32; Ez.37:26-28.
\textsuperscript{170} Mt.3:11; Jn.14:16-17, 26; 15:26; 16:7-15.
\textsuperscript{172} Mk.16:14.
\textsuperscript{173} Jn.20:19.
\textsuperscript{174} Jn.21:1-23.
\end{flushleft}
read within the wider synoptic and Acts narratives of the forty day period of Jesus’ further ministry of the kingdom. After which they are subsequently to wait in Jerusalem for the promise of the Father, to be baptized into the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{175} Christ’s spiration of the Spirit on the evidence presented is not a definitive, regenerating or renewing experience. That Jesus gave a token or seal upon them, setting them apart for the coming baptism in the Spirit is plausible. Etymologically, the receiving of the Spirit employs the term ‘\(\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\alpha\nu\omega\)’ not to be confused with giving but rather taking hold of the part offered in contrast to Christ’s breathing upon them, a passive reception. The evidence does not necessarily attest the signs concordant with the indwelling Holy Spirit, and therefore while Jesus spoke with an imperative, the disciples may not have been consciously enacted upon with the same resolution.

In conclusion, this story of Jesus’ spiration of the Spirit does not retain the textual proofs necessary to support His spiration of the Spirit in His eternal procession.\textsuperscript{176} Consequentally, the argument of a spiration by the Father and the Son holds little explicit evidence. If ontological primacy is given to the eternal Godhead, one ‘\(\omega\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\)’ and three ‘\(\upsilon\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\sigma\omicron\varsigma\)’ existing in co-equality, co-eternity, co-perfection, distinct yet inseparable and indivisible, in perfect oneness and relationship, it is to this that the Spirit is spirated and the Son generated by the apostolic Father. As to procession out from ‘\(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\)’ the Godhead an apostolic understanding is preferred, as previously developed.

**Gender in Trinity**

In the light of rising trends of the Spirit being attributed the motherhood of Christ, in a representation of ‘divine family’,\textsuperscript{177} it is necessary to comment theologically and historically.

The source text is in the Gospel of the Hebrews, classified among the pseudo-Gospel documents, quoted by Origen, who states,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{175} Ac.1:1-5.
  \item \textsuperscript{176} The language of forgiving sin releasing and binding is a repetition of Mt.16:18-19 and Mt.18:18-20 where the context is the founding and distinctive forgiveness culture and practice of the church. A breathing of Spirit authoritative comprehension and enabling may be in view.
  \item \textsuperscript{177} A concept used in Bethel-Sozo International healing ministry where by Father, Mother and Son analogies of a ‘divine family’ are taught and used in healing ministry. Morgan de Rivery, Patricia. Personal interview. 25\textsuperscript{th} Feb. 2018.
\end{itemize}
If anyone should lend credence to the Gospel according to the Hebrews, where the Saviour Himself says, "My mother, the Holy Spirit took me just now by one of my hairs and carried me off to the great mount Tabor," he will have to face the difficulty of explaining how the Holy Spirit can be the mother of Christ when it was itself brought into existence through the Word. But neither the passage nor this difficulty is hard to explain. For if he who does the will of the Father in heaven is Christ's brother and sister and mother, and if the name of brother of Christ may be applied, not only to the race of men, but to beings of diviner rank than they, then there is nothing absurd in the Holy Spirit's being His mother, every one being His mother who does the will of the Father in heaven (Origen 38).

Origen’s figurative approach does explain a certain highly figurative response. However, it lacks consideration of the Trinitarian ontology and relationships. Zinzendorf (1700-1760) the Moravian, was a theological proponent of the motherhood of the Spirit. He asserts that “God [Christ] is even our dear husband, his Father is our dear Father, and the Holy Spirit is our dear Mother,” as the divine family of the Trinity, restored through Christ’s atonement. “Zinzendorf insists that the word "Mother" does not introduce a distinction of genders into the deity but deals only with the activity of God in the world… the Holy Spirit… in the role of mother to the church,” observes Atwood.

Biblical justification is sought from the concept of the ‘Comforter’ read with maternal qualities in view, “The Mother also cares for her spiritual children just as a human mother cares for her physical children. She protects, guides, admonishes, and comforts the child of God throughout the changing years of earthly life.” Being born of the Spirit, from Nicodemus’ conversation with Jesus is said to corroborate as a uniquely motherly function. The consequences are that the Holy Spirit Mother conceived Jesus in Mary’s womb and presented him to her at term. The Holy Spirit as Life Giver, is the mother of all believers in rebirth and in creational order of all through “the Holy Spirit [being] very close through the breathing of the breath of God into the man. Thus, the Holy Spirit is the mother of all living souls in a general way.”

Ontologically in respect of consubstantiality, where each person of the Trinity is of one ‘οὐσία’ perfectly and equally, then the maternal aspects of being cannot belong uniquely to one person of the Trinity. If the Father alone possesses fatherhood, then He is incomplete and dependent upon the Spirit, supposited as mother; Christ cannot be father and so must be child, Son, yet Isaiah spoke of Him as the ‘Everlasting Father’.\(^{179}\) The hypothesis does affect the Trinity if the Holy Spirit is the mother of all, despite what Zinzendorf says. The Scriptures teach that Christ causally and mediately created all things; the Spirit is not disclosed in the same way as Christ, although the Trinitarian unity and the witness of Scripture do attribute creatorship to Him.\(^{180}\)

The argument from attributes, is that if the love, fidelity, goodness, etc. of Godhead are perfect in them, then what humanly is categorized as masculine and feminine, paternal and maternal must be an integral part expressed in perfect love, etc. Scripture exhibits strong maternal images of God the Father, “Keep me as the apple of Your eye; Hide me under the shadow of Your wings … He shall cover you with His feathers, and under His wings you shall take refuge; His truth shall be your shield and buckler …” (NKJV Ps.17:8; 91:4). These verses demonstrate the maternal protective covering, an image that is also shown by Christ, “How often I wanted to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, but you were not willing” (Mt.23:37; Lk.13:34; 19:41-42). The tumultuous covenant relationship of God with his people through Isaiah especially, contains a plethora of analogies and figures drawn from human relationships and experience to express the intention and the heart of God towards a rebellious and hard-necked people, a son, exemplified by this text,

> Do not fear, for you will not be ashamed; Neither be disgraced, … For your Maker is your husband … For the LORD has called you Like a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit, Like a youthful wife when you were refused, (NAS95) "In an outburst of anger I hid My face from you for a moment, But with everlasting lovingkindness I will have compassion on you," Says the LORD your Redeemer. Says your God (NKJV Is.54:4-7; NAS 54:8).
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\(^{179}\) Is.9:6.

\(^{180}\) Ps.104:30; Ge.1:1-2; Job 33:4; Ez.37:4-6.
The imagery communicates the nature of relationship, that evidently encapsulates male and female qualities perfectly in the Perfection of God. It is therefore incorrect to suggest that one Person of the Trinity contains the maternal quality. To project the conception of human family upon God as roles and function falls short of the grandiose vision of the paternal and maternal perfectly expressed in all three persons of the Godhead. This being the case, the act of the Father sending the Son can be interpreted as a strong paternal apostolic sending. The sacrifice of the Son portrays certain aspects of the sacrificial self-giving maternal nature, although Paul calls for husbands to give themselves for their wives as Christ gave Himself for the church.\(^{181}\) The danger of polarization fractures the holistic vision of a God strong yet tender, King and Shepherd, Lover and Corrector, Warrior hero and Gentle Carer, Nurturer and Sender, in the perfect balance of paternal and maternal\(^{182}\) attributes maintained in each person of the Godhead. Paul reflects this principle as he considers apostolic authority,

But we proved to be gentle among you, as a nursing mother tenderly cares for her own children, Having so fond an affection for you, we were well-pleased to impart to you not only the Gospel of God but also our own lives, because you had become very dear to us … just as you know how we were exhorting and encouraging and imploring each one of you as a father would his own children, (NAS 1Th.2:7,8,11)

Paul authenticates the assertions made regarding the maternal and paternal as they are found in Godhead. Paul in the incarnate Trinitarian relationship is the natural extension ontologically and functionally. He expresses fully the maternal and the paternal qualities exemplified in language and approach. Albeit a finite reflection, Paul the masculine apostle, expresses the fullest expression of love, nurture and strengthening exhortation held in perfect harmony together, void of ambiguity and contradiction.

Etymologically, in the previous considerations of the begetting of the Son, the paternal and maternal attributes of generating were affirmed in God. The Greek vocabulary and grammar do not entertain a maternal reading of the Spirit’s masculine begetting of the Christ God-Man in Mary. The Spirit’s role in birthing again the believer is also masculine,

\(^{181}\) Ep.5:25, 28.

\(^{182}\) 2Sa.5:2-3; Shepherd and King; Hero-Warrior and Shepherd Is.31:4-5; 40:9-11; Jer.31:8-14; Ze.3:17.
he is the generator not the bearer. The argument from etymology also reinforces the argument against the maternity of the Spirit.

This concludes the consideration specific to the Son and the Holy Spirit in Trinity.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has articulated an ontological frame of reference for the intra and extra Trinitarian relationships and operations taking into consideration the pivotal developments in Trinitarian thought, particularly from the Patristic period, the Reformation and contemporary theories. The Trinitarian vision has been developed from substantial and moral or characteristic attributes, to demonstrate the consubstantiality of co-equality, co-perfection, co-eternity in an ontological relational oneness. The Trinity has been established in cause and agency. The generation of the Son and spiration the Spirit have been established apostolically in eternal relationship. Apostolicity proposes an explanation of the procession of the Son and the Spirit from eternity, revealed to the world. This view asserts a reaffirmation of the ontological Trinity and the inherent qualities developed as primary over function and over operation whereby the subordinate hypothesis and assumptions have been challenged in the light of a cohesive ontological interpretation whereby submission-authority hierarchal subordination are neither necessary nor adequate theories to a full and concordant consideration of the principal Trinitarian ontological concepts presented. Specific attention has been given to the person of Christ and the Spirit to address the ontology in operation whereby personal distinction contributes to the reinforced oneness. Economy, if such a separate distinction should be made, is interpreted and demonstrated in Trinity through ontological being and relationship, where inseparability and indivisibility of collaborative oneness are evident.
SIX KEY ONTOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES

Introduction

This section examines and elaborates six core principles of intra and extra-Trinitarian relationships, in continuation of the ontological proposal. The internal relationships and the external relationships primarily with the believer and the church will reflect this homogeneity. While the exposition focuses upon the Father-Son relationship, it is implicit upon the ontological unity that the Spirit is identifiable in relationship and operation, being entirely integral to these relating principles. This text exemplifies the thought and expression repeatedly reiterated in the Gospels as Jesus describes his relationship to the Father. These texts read without context will inevitably lead to a subordinate and humanized view of the Son, undermining his divine qualities and relationships. It is therefore essential to address them as critical to this ontological proposal.

John chapter five and particularly verses seventeen to thirty are the key texts which substantiate six principles: i. collaboration; ii. utter dependency; iii. revelation; iv. unity, equality, honour; v. delegation; vi. autonomy. These are ontological considerations that have consequence upon economical considerations in Trinity.

But Jesus answered them, this Father of mine till this present time is at work and I likewise am at work. Then because of this thing even much more the Jews sought to kill him, that he not only broke out of the Sabbath, but also he spoke of the Father as belonging to Himself this God, making Himself equal to God. Consequently Jesus answered and said to them, truly, truly I speak to you, the Son is absolutely not able to produce sourced in Himself, nothing, if not this [that] He might see the Father producing because that whatever He might produce, these also this Son likewise and equally produces. Because this Father loves the Son, and

---

1 ‘λύω’ has implicit redemptive and liberational nuances. It is not about transgressing law, but of breaking out free from its bonds that is etymologically in view.

2 ‘δύναμαι’ is in the Present/Middle-Passive/Indicative. There by suggesting that Jesus in terms of capability is neither enabled by a third party (middle) nor from within Himself (passive).

3 ‘ὁμοίως’ the term carries both significant terms referring to shared substance, equality of being and ability and of mode or manner. The emphasis being the indivisible consubstantial unity.

4 ‘φιλέω’ in contrast to ‘ἀγαπάω’ reflects a reciprocal, friendship love whereby the collaborative, partnership, depth of knowing, understanding of the persons are in view.
everything He shows Him that He Himself produces and works greater than these He will show Him in order that you might wonder with amazement. Because even as however much this Father raises the dead and produces life in this same manner also this Son to whom he actively desires He produces life. Because even the Father judges no one, nothing, but all the judgment He had given to the Son; in order that all honour the Son, to the proportion they honour the Father this one not honouring the Son, he honour absolutely not the Father the sending one. Truly, truly, I say to you, that he hearing my word, and believing this One sending me, he possesses life without beginning and end and to judgment he will absolutely not come, but he has passed over out from death into this life. Truly, truly, I say to you that the hour is come and this is the precise moment, when those dead will hear the voice of the Son this God, and those hearing will live. Because even as however much this Father possesses life in Himself, in this same manner he gave also this Son life to possess in Himself and authority he gave to Him also to produce judgment, because He is the Son of Man. Do not wonder at this; because the hour is coming in which all these tombs will hear My voice, and will go out, those of them producing good, to resurrection life; but those of them habitually practising useless evil, to resurrection judgment. Absolutely not inherently capable myself to produce out of

5 ‘ζωοποιέω’ refers to the origin of life itself. The attribute that enables cause, generation and qualitative increase; references to eternal, creational and regenerational orders as in view.

6 ‘τιμάω’ meaning also to estimate, to value which puts the emphasis upon the inherent worth of the person concerned.

7 ‘καθώς’ translated as just or even as or accordingly. The inherent reference is to proportion, degree or measure bearing significance on the nature of the egalitarian relationship, reference to substance and nature.

8 ‘αἰώνιος’ is a reference to life with limits and has always been as it is, so without beginning nor end. It is a direct reference to Christ as beginning and end and therefore as ‘Life’ reflects the nature of substance with the Father, and the nature of Life to the believer in ontological terms.

9 ‘ἐρχομαι’ in the Present/Middle-Passive/Indicative form reiterates that neither through a third party nor in him/herself in the begotten immeasurable life judgment can have no hold.

10 ‘οὕτω’ is defined as in this same manner Himself which is generally not translated from the Greek or with the word ‘so’ which lacks the strength of meaning in this context of the Father-Son relationship.

11 ‘φαύλος’ the inconsequentially, lightweight person, of no apparent worth or use; the moral connotation is base or bad, “a good for nothing” (TGEL 2016).

12 ‘ἀπό’ puts the emphasis on the source, resource of the Son as inseparable form the Father; the secondary meaning ‘separation’ also bears weight textually in that the Son does not act outside of the Trinitarian relationship with the Father and the Spirit.
myself nothing according to the proportion I hear, I judge; and this judgment of mine is righteous; because I seek not the active desire of me, but the active desire of this One sending me (TLT Jn.5:17-30).

These principles are often found together in Scripture, thereby indicating a cohesion in which several or all are found together explicating the ontology of the Trinity in existence and function. This approach represents the recognition of repeated values that the Son uses to describe His relationship and function with the Father rather than a systematic or schematic approach.

i. Collaboration

“This Father of mine till this present time is at work and I likewise am at work” (5:17), expresses ‘complicity among Perfects’. The thrust of this text is Jesus the Son demonstrating his ‘oneness’ with the Father. The Jews accuse him of having a belonging relationship with the Father making Himself equal. If unity, equality and eternity in consubstantial relationship are the ontological foundation, then a collaborative relationship between perfect likeness and equality is the only possibility to remain faithful to the fundamental nature of Trinity without contradiction.

The collaboration is also reflected in relationship to the person of the Spirit, “For He whom God has sent speaks the words of God; for He gives the Spirit without measure (NAS Jn.3:34). This Spirit is the One causing life, the flesh is absolutely not useful for anything. The words that I speak to you are Spirit and are life” (TLT Jn.6:63). The image is firstly Trinitarian, of God sending the Son, speaking the same words that God speaks and the Person of the Spirit given ‘εκ μετρου’ (out with any measure) to collaborate with the Son. The perfect unity in perfect substance of Persons is what is in view. If the words are those of the Father, and are the same as the Son, he in turn relates them to the person of the Spirit. It is the Spirit who will take from the fullness of the Son and teach, guide, exhort, and witness and the same words are found in the Spirit, in the Son and in the Father.

The relationship with the Spirit reflects the same oneness that the Son demonstrates with the Father, where distinct personhood and unity meet.13 “… But we all faces having been

---

13 Jn.10:29-31, 38; 14:10.
unveiled reflecting in a mirror the glory of the Lord we are metamorphosed permanently ‘ἀπό’ the glory to glory even as ‘ἀπό’ the Lord the Spirit” (TLT 2Co.3:18). Ladd, for example, suggests, “The Spirit is the ‘mode’ in which the Lord works in the new dispensation. The Spirit is Christ Himself present in the church … Christ in you – the Spirit in you …” (532, 535). The difficulty lies in the depersonalization of the Spirit; the conclusions then are fusional where again ontology of personhood is overridden by ‘modes’ of being. The reflection on the church in chapter four will expand on Christ and the Spirit in the church, in this context is should suffice to say that Christ is the ‘κεφαλή’ not the Spirit. Ontologically, this text points to the perfect unity of collaboration in being and function of the Christ and the Spirit glorifying believers in the image of Christ. The person of Christ is perfect as is the Spirit and so the relationship between the two cannot be compared to human experience of either one or both. If there is perfection in Christ then he does not need filled with the Spirit in the way a human being needs, for example. Therefore, the baptismal texts14 also portray the visible collaboration of the person of the Spirit and of Jesus. Concurrent with the sayings of the Son being one with the Father, the unity does not detract from personhood.

The second example comes from Jesus witness to the collaborative relationship with the Father in drawing people, “… all that the Father gives Me will come to Me … No one can come to Me unless the Father who sent Me draws him … No one comes to the Father except through Me” (NKJV Jn.6:37, 44; 14:6), is indicative of a collaborative relationship. The point being that a person is only a believer if he/she has encountered both the Father and the Son medially through each other. The Father mediates the Son and the Son likewise the Father. The collaborative is also perceived in the cycle of glory in which the Trinity are continually operating for the reciprocal glory of which the other is the object. The witness operates in the same way as previously demonstrated. The many verses where Jesus does not speak, teach, or act on his own resource in this ontological perspective should be interpreted collaboratively; the Father not operating without the Son, nor without the Spirit and vice versa.

“Whenever you might lift up on high the Son of man at that time you will know by personal experience that I Am and out of myself I produce nothing but in proportion to

14 Mt.3:1-17; Mk.1:9-11; Lk.3:21-22; Jn.1:29-34; other examples: Jn.3:34; 4:14, 23-24; 7:37-39.
what the Father gives me these [things] I speak” (TLT Jn.8:28), contextually He declares that he is perfectly God, “εγω ειμι.” Jesus indicates he has many things to say, but he will speak what the Father says. In the verse cited His adjoining next thought is of ‘ἀπό’ that being perfectly God, He will not act out of His own resource, neither will he speak out of proportion or measure as shown. This reveals that in omniscience shared is the perfect measure; Jesus speaks out, rooted not only in the divine but in the divine unity of Tri-Unity. The two sentences do not require an illogical subordinate tension, they are perfectly resolved in the collaborative relationship. In all the texts of John’s Gospel that share similar etymology the collaborative is in view, expressing the refusal of Jesus or the Spirit or the Father to speak outside of ontological and operational unity. Therefore, in the collaborative there is the reciprocity that demonstrates unity; of which the authentication demonstrates consubstantiality in oneness.

There is no distinction based on works but rather there is distinction in personhood and the essential economical collaboration whereby the purpose as illustrated, is the believer, beneficiary of the Trinitarian being and function. The theological significance is that core beliefs will always lead the believer to experience the Trinity and this collaboration, as demonstrated, serves that purpose.

ii. Entire Dependence

Consequently Jesus answered and said to them, truly, truly I speak to you, the Son is absolutely not able to produce sourced in Himself, nothing, if not this [that] He might see the Father producing because that whatever He might produce, these also this Son likewise and equally produces (TLT Jn.5:19).

This text, and others like it, at a first reading indicate that Christ is emptied of personhood and identity because he declares Himself not to have ‘δύναμαι’ (inherent ability power). He is therefore incapable of acting upon his own means and initiative, requiring the leadership and resources of the Father. The Son is simply reproducing someone else’s thoughts, actions, will or power. Evidently, the deduction that the Son is in a relationship of subordinate dependency would be plausible. A typical example of Jesus expressing that his teaching is not his own, that he is taught by the Father, can at a first reading clearly

15 See for example: Jn.7:28; 8:16, 18, 38; 12:49; 14:16-17, 26, 28-31; 17:1, 6, 10.
put into question his divinity and his nature as God-Man.\textsuperscript{16} However, these words interpreted from the primacy of the ontological perspective perceive Jesus’ omniscience as an essential attribute – understanding of the text fundamentally changes through the ontological lense.

However, the language reflects homogeneously the ‘πέμπω’ apostolic sending, as already developed, inherently containing the inseparable relationship. What is firstly in view is a refusal to act outside of the Father-Son relationship, reflecting an intensity of ontological unity. Dependency needs to be understood in the light of the ontology of consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. The ontological should have ascendancy over economical and functional because it defines the nature of the latter. The question is then, how can dependency be explained in the light of Christ’s equality, co-eternity, in substance and relationship within the Godhead? Christ makes a plain statement concerning ‘ἀπό’, source or resource. Etymologically, He is expressing his position which seems contrary to his equal divinity with the Father; the source from which he is functioning is that of the Godhead. He contrasts this with his own resources, being distinct in person, fully and perfectly divine. He is essentially ‘ὁναμα’ as his earthly ministry demonstrates, moreover shown in his exaltation at the right hand of the Father. The other aspect of the term is ‘separation’ which strengthens the argument, in that Christ refuses to function separately from the Father specifically and more generally of the Spirit. It is only as the indivisible and inseparable Trinity, that Christ operates in function.

Jesus’ argument follows by Him producing what the Father produces and working that which He sees physically the Father is operating. There is a unique relationship that Jesus confirms elsewhere of being the only one to see the Father, to physically know his breast, “God no one had seen or perceived at any time, the only-begotten Son this [one] being in the chest of the Father he declared Him … absolutely not anyone had seen the Father if not this [one] being from beside God this [one] has seen the Father”\textsuperscript{17} (TLT Jn.1:18, 6:46). Seeing the Father indicates, according to the references provided, that He holds a unique intimate physical relationship with Him. But the text makes it clear for Jesus that to see the Father is to be all that the Father is and to reveal Him fully in His own person.

\textsuperscript{16} Jn.8:28; 5:30; 7:16; 12:49; 14:10.

\textsuperscript{17} See also Jn.5:37; 8:38; 14:7, 9.
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Jesus reveals the Father, he is revealing conjointly and distinctly Himself, because of his experience of the Father and his consubstantiality with Him. The relationship of dependency then embraces the divinity of Christ who sees and is in full likeness of the Father. Functionally, from a place of equality, eternity, essential nature and distinctive properties, the unity and oneness in function is established. The closing statement of Christ producing whatever the Father produces enhances the unity in relationship, attesting to the perfect divine resources in both, severally and in Trinity unitedly, to operate collaboratively as Christ testifies through the dependency analogies.\(^{18}\)

### iii. Revelation

Because this Father loves\(^ {19}\) the Son, and everything He shows Him that He Himself produces and works greater than these He will show Him in order that you might wonder with amazement (TLT Jn.5:20).

The first consideration is the ‘φιλέω’ relationship which precedes revelation.\(^ {20}\) “All things have been handed over to Me by My Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father; nor does anyone know the Father except the Son, and anyone to whom the Son wills to reveal Him (NAS Mt.11:27), confirms that all things have been committed to the Son who has ‘ἐπιγινώσκω,’ in-depth accurate experiential knowledge of the Father. The deeper the relationship the greater the extent of revelation given. If Christ is the revelation of God, “He who has seen Me has seen the Father; so how can you say, ‘Show us the Father’? (NKJV Jn.14:9) then the relationship in question is perfect and perfect in love. This ‘φιλέω’ is reflected in the Father’s love for the Son, but Jesus indicates that in a context of revelation and indwelling. The Father loves the believer also in this way, as the believers also love Jesus in this same way.\(^ {21}\) The distinction of ‘φιλέω’ love from ‘ἀγαπάω’ love is: reciprocal, knowing experientially, and being known in the same way. Friendship implies complicity, partnership, and identification with the other in a bond of

---

\(^{18}\) See also Jn.8:28, 38; 5:30; 6:38, 57; 7:16, 18; 12:49; 14:10.

\(^{19}\) ‘φιλέω’ in contrast to ‘ἀγαπάω’ reflects a reciprocal, friendship love whereby the collaborative, partnership, depth of knowing, understanding of the persons are in view.

\(^{20}\) Scripture gives witness to a general principle and order of relationship and revelation as witnessed by Abraham (Jm.2:23; Ge.18); Moses (Ex.33:11); Peter (Jn.21:1-9); the disciples (Jn.15:13-15).

\(^{21}\) Jn.10:18; the ‘ἀγαπάω’ love is also replicated relationally with similitude: Jn.3:35 the Father and the Son; Jn.14:21 of the believer with the Father and the Son resulting in the tangible manifestation of Christ.
voluntary attachment, in trust and belonging. In a perfect sense these qualities describe the divine reality of the Father and the Son to whom the Scriptures witness. These distinctives are necessary because revelation is not associated with ‘ἀγαπάω’ and therefore is not used synonymously. This knowing and revealing relationship is found also between the Father and the Spirit and Jesus and the Spirit,\(^\text{22}\) the One revealing the other, and demonstrating the quality of omniscience of each other and of the created order.

In revelation, ‘ἀποκάλύπτω’\(^\text{23}\) is internal disclosure of someone or something hidden, compared with ‘δῆλος’\(^\text{24}\) which is revelation as internal comprehension and ‘φανερόω,’\(^\text{25}\) revelation by tangible manifestation or demonstration. In Trinity these three principal aspects of revelation are present. The magnitude of the works flows from the nature of relationship, the perfection of that is the grounds for Jesus speaking of the magnitude of revelation that He is in Himself, which reveals out of perfect disclosure, comprehension and manifestation of Himself. The ‘greater’ works that amaze, reflect the perfection in relationship and the perfection in revelation. It is out of this perfection that tangible revelation is witnessed to in the Scriptures, in increasing measure for Christ is the perfect and full revelation of the Father, “for in Him was pleased to reside permanently all the fullness … in Him resides permanently all the fulness of essence of God” (TLT Col.1:19; 2:9).

iv. Unity, Equality and Honour

Because even as however much this Father raises the dead and produces life in this same manner also this Son to whom he actively desires He produces life. Because even the Father judges no one, nothing, but all the judgment He had given to the Son; in order that all honour the Son, to the proportion they honour the Father this one not honouring the Son, he honour absolutely not the Father the Sending One (TLT Jn.5:21-23).

\(^{22}\) 1Co.2:10-12; Jn.3:34-35; 6:63; 16:12-15; Ep.1:17 – is a Trinitarian text on revelation.

\(^{23}\) Of God: Mt.11:25; 16:17; Gal.1:16 of Christ: Mt.11:27 of the Spirit: 1Co.2:10; Ep.1:17; 1Pe.1:11.

\(^{24}\) Of God: 1Co.15:27; Gal.3:11; of Christ: Lk.2:32; 2Pe.1:14; of the Spirit: Heb.9:8; 1Pe.1:11.

\(^{25}\) Of God: Jn.9:3; 17:6; Ro.1:19; 2Co.2:14; 1Ti.3:16; of Christ: Mk.16:12; Jn.21:1, 14; 14:21; 17:6; 2Co.3:3; 4:10; Col.1:26-27; 3:4; of the Spirit: 2Co.3:3; Heb.9:8.
The thought of the text is completed by verse twenty-five, “Truly, truly, I say to you that the hour is come and this is the precise moment, when those dead will hear the voice of the Son this God, and those hearing will live. Because even as however much this Father possesses life in Himself, in this same manner He gave also this Son life to possess in Himself” (TLT Jn.5:25-26).

The first assertion is the equality in function of the Father and the Son, “… even as however much … in this same manner …” emphasize the exact resemblance, that the one operates identically as the other. Likeness is not analogous, it is substantiative. The Father causes resurrection and regenerates life, as does the Son. The Son is therefore equally and ontologically life and cause in order to generate life; as they are functionally to minister that Divine Life, “As the living Father sent Me, and I live because of the Father, so he who feeds on Me will live because of Me” (NKJV Jn.6:57). The same is said of the Holy Spirit who is ‘cause’ and generator of life, in his Person and therefore in the believer, Jesus in different language expresses the same principle of equality in substance and in function. Paul states more clearly that equality in Godhead: the ministry of Christ written on hearts by “πνευματι θεου ζωντος,” and that of resurrection life just as the Spirit resurrects Jesus in a Trinitarian act, “ει δε το πνευμα του εγειραντος ησουν εκ νεκρων οικει εν υμιν ο εγειρας τον χριστον εκ νεκρων ζωοποιησει και τα θνητα σωματα υμων,” (TR Ro.8:11). All three Persons of the Trinity distinctly and equally share the essence of being as cause, generate source of life. While the God Father is ingenerate, it is clear that generation and spiration, as orthodoxy explanations of the existence of Word-Son-Christ and the Spirit, do not order their equality not only in the one ‘ουσία’, but as three distinct ‘όπόστασις’. Their distinctions are in Personhood not in function and in both cases the unity indicates that the attribution of a specific function to

26 οὕτως is defined as in this same manner Himself which is generally not translated from the Greek or with the word ‘so’ which lacks the strength of meaning particularly in this context of the Father-Son relationship.

27 Lk.20:38; Ro.4:17; 9:26; 1Ti.4:10; 6:13.

28 Jn.11:25-26; 14:19; 1Co.15:22, 45; 1Pe.2:4; Rev.1:18.

29 Jn.4:10; 7:38.

30 2Co.3:3, also verse 6; Gal.5:25; 1Pe.3:18.

31 Ac.Ac.3:1; 4:10 of God; Ro.8:11 of the Spirit; Jn.2:19 of Jesus speaking figuratively and of Himself in Godhead.
a specific person fails to adequately discern the nature of the Tri-Unity collaborative life. From the perspective of the believer, it is the experience of that life, sourced in the Trinity rather than the attachment of the attribute to one particular person that results.

Jesus describes this relationship of unity and equality, “Do you not believe that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me? The words that I speak to you I do not speak …, [out of myself]; but the Father who dwells in Me does the works. Believe Me that I am in the Father and the Father in Me, or else believe Me for the sake of the works themselves (NKJV Jn.14:10-11). Employing the concept of ‘union,’ Jesus explains the unity and oneness with the Father. In the equal and perfect participation in divine attributes that constitute the divine essence, all that is substantially in the Father is also in the Son; so for Jesus to speak of union he is not adding something to Himself that he does not already fully possess, rather he is expressing the profound nature of unity and oneness.32 The nature of union for the believer differs and will be explained in the following chapter. From this position of oneness, Jesus says he does nothing ‘απεμαυτου’ that is of his own resource. It is not that he is lacking in anything, rather the primacy is given to the Tri-unity in a relationship of three complicit persons. The purpose of functions therefore can only be to demonstrate the nature of the equality and unity. The purpose of the works, according to Jesus, is found in the Father who operates them collaboratively, is not to attest his divinity, instead His union with the Father.33 The model that Jesus sets out does have repercussions for the believer, the minister and the church, treated in chapters three and four.

Honour

Jesus connects the mutual honouring34 with glory, if ‘τιμάω’ relates to the true value of the person, ‘δόξα’ connects with opinion, estimate referring to splendour, excellence, pre-eminence, dignity, majesty, and perfection.35 The mutual honouring expresses a core principle that Jesus expounds in the language of accepting or rejecting of the believer, as

32 Jn.6:46; 8:19, 42; 3:34; 14:16-17; 14:26; 16:7; 10:38.

33 See also Jn.8:19, 29; 10:38; 14:7; Ph.2:7.

34 The verb ‘τιμάω’ in the participle mood indicating ongoing continuous action.

35 Jn.8:49-50.
synonymous with Jesus and in turn with the Father. Jesus says that if He glorifies Himself His glory is nothing, which does not detract from the glory of His Person, both divine and human, but places clearly the emphasis upon the glory of His person being restrained. The authenticity of glory comes when the Father glorifies the Son and vice versa, neither these two nor the Spirit declare their own glory; what is remarked is only what is perceived or declared by another member of the Trinity. In glory and honour there is reciprocal and mutual esteeming. The union, unity and oneness in the passive voice demonstrates the principle, “… in this precise moment the Son of Man is glorified and God is glorified in Him, if God is glorified in Him, also God will glorify Him in Himself and immediately glorify Him” (TLT Jn.13:31-32). It is incontestable that the glory is not for God the Father alone, but the Father glorifies the Son in Himself, that He would be glorified with the Father. The context of glory extends from eternity pre-creation to eternity post ascension exaltation, thereby indicating a culture of reciprocal glorifying of the other beyond function and operation. The same principle is observed, “And all Mine are Yours, and Yours are Mine, and I am glorified in them” (TLT Jn.17:10). Conclusively from the initial reference text, the honour and glory are in the exact same measure and proportion to the Father as to the Son. The principle of mutual and continuous elevating the one and the other in identical measure reinforces the equality in divinity, the equality in unity expressed ontologically and operationally. While the act of the redemptive work of the cross is distinctly of Christ the Son, it is evident that the mutual glory principle is the purpose of the Godhead and that the believer be brought into the reciprocal cycle of glory. Understanding then of operation or function is that it reveals the ontology of the three Persons in a cycle of reciprocal and mutual glorification and honour. 

36 Mt.10:32-33; Jn.8:19, 54; 12:26; 14:21; 15:18-19, 23.
37 Jn.8:54.
38 Mt.17 reveals a measure of His glory to the inner circle of Peter, James and John. There being a perfection of glory beside the Father (Jn.17:5, 24) not yet perceived.
39 See also Jn.8:54 note the participle mood of a continuous action; Jn.17:1.
40 Jn.17:4-5, 24.
41 Num.14:21; Is.60:2; Hab.2:14; Jn.11:4,40; Jn.1:14; Heb.1:3; 2:9.
42 Jn.17:10, 22; Ep.1:6, 12, 14; 2Co.3:17-18; 4:5.
v. Delegation

Because even the Father judges no one, nothing, but all the judgment He had given to the Son … Because even as however much this Father possesses life in Himself, in this same manner He gave also this Son life to possess in Himself and authority He gave to Him also to produce judgment, because He is the Son of Man… Absolutely not inherently capable Myself to produce out of Myself nothing according to the proportion I hear, I judge; and this judgment of mine is righteous; because I seek not the active desire of Me, but the active desire of this One sending Me (TLT Jn.5:22, 26-27, 30).

If entire dependency correlates to the apostolic ‘πέμπω’ then delegation and autonomy correspond to the ‘ἀποστέλλω’ inter-Trinitarian sending. The present textual consideration reflects the generic statement of Jesus, “The Father loves the Son, and has given all things into His hand” (NKJV Jn. 3:35). A Trinitarian reflection of the principle, “All [things] however many the Father possesses are mine because of this thing I say that originating out of mine he will take hold and will declare to you” (TLT Jn.16:15), reinforces the perfect delegation of the full measure of the Father, in a sense of mutual ownership. The Holy Spirit will take out of this full and perfect delegation. The term ‘ἐκ’ does not, in the NT, mean that the Spirit takes out of or He Himself originates out of the Person of Christ, as if a perfect, eternal and equal Person of the Godhead would lack anything. Rather, He takes from the substance of that which is delegated, from all that is in the Father and in the Son, because He is perfect ontologically and therefore economically. The middle voice of the verb ‘λαμβάνω’ indicates a mutual operation in giving and taking for the benefit of believers.

While recognizing that the Father has shared all things with the Son, the relevance is how does Jesus relate to the other members of the Godhead, having been delegated: all

---

43 ‘ἀπό’ puts the emphasis on the source, resource of the Son as inseparable from the Father; the secondary meaning ‘separation’ also bears weight textually in that the Son does not act outside of the Trinitarian relationship with the Father and the Spirit.
things, every person, all judgment, all authority, and all operations? Such delegation recognizes the nature of the Christ the Son, and the Christo-centricity of the Father, “… the fullness of Him who fills all in all.” (NKJV Ep.1:23). In context, economically, Christ is everything that the Father is, and is equally and perfectly able to exercise freely in his sphere, defined as, “… every knee should bow, of those in heaven, and of those on earth, and of those under the earth” (NKJV Ph.2:10). Any sense of delegation indicating subordination (Ware and Starke 62), does not stand in the light of these affirmations.

The Son’s response to total delegation and Christo-centricity is reflected in scripture concerning all people given by the Father, Christ states,

I have manifested Your name to the men whom You have given Me out of the world. They were Yours, You gave them to Me, and they have kept Your word ... And all Mine are Yours, and Yours are Mine, and I am glorified in them ... And I am no longer in the world, but they are in the world, and I am coming to you. Holy Father, keep them in your name, which you have given Me, that they may be one, even as we are one (NKJV Jn.17:6, 10, 11).

Those received from the Father by Christ, given to Him, are given over to the Father again, not in any subordinate manner, instead those believing are introduced into the mutual belonging of the Father and the Son. Those who are the Son’s are implicitly drawn into a Trinitarian relationship whereby the co-equality of Father and Son is demonstrated towards those believing; in other terms what the Father entrusts to the Son, the Son entrusts to the Father. As for all judgment,

“As I hear, I judge … Yet even if I do judge, my judgment is true, for it is not I alone who judge, but I and the Father who sent Me …” (ESV Jn. 5:30; 8:16, 26),
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“I have many things to speak and to judge concerning you, but He who sent Me is true; and the things which I heard from Him, these I speak to the world” (NAS Jn.8:26).

The ‘all judgment’ delegated to Christ is not exercised outside of the Trinitarian relationship but in oneness and unity, whereby the judgment is that of the Godhead. The ‘all authority’ of Christ, expresses synonymy with the other characteristics, “For I have not spoken on My own authority; but the Father who sent Me gave Me a command, what I should say and what I should speak” (NKJV Jn.12:49), refers to Jesus speaking ‘εξ εαυτου’ that is an authority that has its origin in Himself. While the statement is true that he has all authority in the universe, Christ places this authority in agreement with the Father’s charge. Function cannot be permitted to contradict ontology and so Christ’s relationship as ‘one’ with the Father is in view. Again, Jesus employs the similar term, ‘απ εμαυτου’ to express that his authority is not exercised of his own resource, “Do you not believe that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me? The words that I speak to you I do not speak on My own authority; but the Father who dwells in Me does the works” (NKJV Jn.14:10). Even though he possesses it fully and perfectly, He sets his authority in the framework of relational unity and union with the Father. The Father in Christ and vice versa, the Father producing operations through Christ, is indicative of this perfect union. It is not that Christ is not able to act in the sphere of full delegation that is His. Economically, the separation or distinction in function between the Father and the Son cannot be substantiated in this verse. Jesus having “all authority” refusing to exercise out with the relationship of oneness expresses the perfect relational Trinity in collaborative operation. The same principle is found in the relationship with the Spirit, thereby endorsing the assertion, “He … the Spirit of truth … He will not speak on His own authority [‘αφ εαυτου’], but whatever He hears He will speak” (NKJV Jn.16:13).

Delegation then intimates perfect mutuality, whereby the emphasis is not upon the individual person in the Trinity, rather it reflects the depth of unity, union, oneness, in relationship and ontologically in economy. In some sense, implicit in the argument is that the identity of the Person’s operating will never be singular but plural, and in that, the indivisibility of the Godhead in operation directs one to the ontological significance of the collective ministry of the Trinity in favour of the believer.
vi. **Autonomy**

“Because even as however much this Father raises the dead and produces life in this manner also this Son to whom he actively desires He produces life … Because even as however much this Father possesses life in Himself, in this same manner He gave also this Son life to possess in Himself” (TLT Jn.5:21-22, 26).

From the core text, the language indicates that not only does the Son possess the same measure as the Father, that is His perfection and fullness, but He has the free will to exercise that causal generation of divine life in whoever He desires. It is the Son who reveals the Father to whoever He desires.\(^{50}\) Christ is equally and substantially God, likewise, he is causal origin of life in those receiving Him, “In Him was life …” (NKJV Jn.1:4). Christ therefore, in His person, is the substance or essence, the origin and source of divine life.\(^{51}\) The text is indicative of God’s desire to generate a person in every way ontologically like Him, underlining the egalitarian and relational importance in Trinity. Moreover, the Spirit has the same relationship of life-originator-giver, whereby the Spirit incarnate in the believer produces this source of divine life.\(^{52}\) Belief in the Son and in the Father is into everlasting life, whereby the eating and drinking of Christ is reciprocal union, which enjoins the fountain source of the Spirit in the production of Trinitarian life,\(^{53}\) summarized in the words, “just as in the same measure He sent me the living Father in this self-same manner I live because of the Father also this [one] feeding on Me, he also will live through Me” (TLT Jn.6:57). The distinction between the Father and the Son of being life sources is contrasted with the believer who lives medially through the life of the sources,\(^{54}\) and likewise of the Spirit. It is established that both in ὀὐσία and in distinct ὑπόστασις the individual and collective property of ‘life’ demonstrates the ontological consubstantiality, uniting in one purpose the individual function of the Father, the Son and the Spirit, as communicating divine life.\(^{55}\) Jesus does affirm ‘εγώ εἰμι’ equalling

\(^{50}\) Mt.11:27; Jn.5:40; 6:33.

\(^{51}\) Jn.11:25-26; 14:6; 8:12.

\(^{52}\) Jn.4:14; Ro.8:2, 10; Gal.6:8.

\(^{53}\) Jn.6:35, 51, 53-57, 63.

\(^{54}\) ‘ζάω’ in the middle voice compared to the active regarding the Father and the Son, explicitly places the believer not as source in him/herself but as medially feeding of the Trinity source for life.

\(^{55}\) 2Pe.1:4.
Himself with God. He communicates his autonomy as legitimate and perfectly divine source, “and I have perceived that this command of His is life eternally which consequently I speak in the same proportion the Father had spoken to Me in this same manner I speak” (TLT Jn.12:50). This indicates not a submission to the command of the Father instead a mutual accord expressing unity and perfect fullness of measure concordant in communicating life. In other words, the life the Father has spoken, is the same life in substance and quality that the Son speaks of.

The apostolic sending designates the Father as living, in and of Himself, and equally so the Son, and the Spirit can be included in this assertion. It is in union with the Spirit and the Son, indwelling the believer that divine life is manifest, “... God who gives life to the dead…”\(^{56}\) (NKJV Ro.4:17). The relationship described between the Father and Jesus and the Spirit, is one of interrelatedness in the task of communicating divine life to the believer in incarnate union. Jesus verbalises that the life ministered is the life that is the one substance, demonstrated in the Father, Son and Spirit in equally full and perfect measure. Life can only be communicated through the active ministry of all three persons. Autonomy then is never separated nor detached from the primacy of Godhead functioning ontologically and collaboratively.

Finally, in Jesus’ words, “My Father if it is possible that this cup pass by away from me except absolutely not even as I actively desire but even as you … your active desire be” (TLT Mt.26:39, 42), in the sphere of will, seem to indicate that Jesus submits entirely to the Father’s will. Grudem will assert even if, “… Son’s submission to Father’s leadership only for his time on earth ... In this activity also, the Father … initiates and leads, and the Son is the one who carries out the will of the Father” (Ware & Starke 40), implying that the Son does not have a will of his own, but relates only to that of the Father. Cowan, examining John chapter ten verse eighteen affirms, “Jesus’s will is in harmony with the Father’s but he obeys him nonetheless” (58). It is attested in Scripture that Jesus does have will.\(^{57}\) Jesus witnesses that it is the Father’s will and choice or pleasure, (‘εὐδοκία’) to reveal Himself, but that revelation and the will to reveal has been attributed to the

\(^{56}\) See also Ro.5:10; 1Jn.1:2.

\(^{57}\) Jn.5:30; 6:38; 10:17-18; 17:24; Mt.23:37; Lk.22:42; 2Pe.3:9.
Son. Ephesians chapter one anchors the will of the Father in Christ Jesus; if the believer’s election, predestination in love to adoption to redemption is formed in the eternity of God, then Christ is an integral part of that will for it only exists in Him. As such, Christ is discerned in substance of union with the Father and with the believer; Christ is cause and agency through whom the divine will is manifest. In the willing, of God the Father, Christ-Son should be considered an eternal actor in that will. Just as the Father wills and desires, so it is implicit that Christ does too, from a place of the divine Trinitarian council. Likewise, the Holy Spirit indicates His will and as demonstrated, is exercised in unity within the Trinitarian relationship. The words of Jesus, “I can of Myself do nothing. As I hear, I judge; and My judgment is righteous, because I do not seek My own will but the will of the Father who sent Me” (NKJV Jn.5:30), reflect the unity whereby two of three wills, are perfectly united in purpose, desire and want. Jesus exemplifies this in his words, “For this reason the Father loves me, because I lay down my life that I may take it up again. No one takes it from me, but I lay it down of my own accord. I have authority to lay it down, and I have authority to take it up again. This charge I have received from my Father” (ESV Jn.10:17-18). Jesus demonstrates absolute authority over Himself as to what He does with his life. The charge or commandment of the Father is to this autonomous exercise of will, from his own source. This textual understanding indicates that Jesus is not in obedience to the Father’s will but is exercising will from his own autonomous Self. When he says, “My food is to do the will of My Father … Father not My will but yours,” He is reflecting a conscious uniting of His will with the Father’s to such perfection that it becomes as one.

The second argument is from the exercising of will in the context of His ‘πέμπω’ apostolic sending. Peter’s apostolic witness states, “Men Israelites hear these words Jesus the

58 Mt.11:26-28; Jn.5:21.
59 See also Col.1:27.
60 Ep.1:5, 9, 11.
61 ‘Θέλημα’ defined as an active, emotive volitional act; and ‘βουλή’ of purpose or counsel deliberated and reasoned in resolve application.
62 Jn.3:8; 1Co.12:11.
63 Jn.4:34; Mt.26:39, 42; Lk.22:42.
Nazarene man resourced from God having been authenticated to you [in] inherent power, and miracles and signs which he produced through Him this God in the middle of you just as you also, you have perceived this [One] the purpose having been ordained and [by the] foreknowledge of God given over …”64 (TLT Ac.2:22-23). The emphasis is upon the inseparable relationship between the two, whereby Jesus says, “I came to do the will of Him who sent Me.”65 What is expressed in autonomy, from the one who has his own will, is not that his will is annulled but the oneness of will, desire and purpose is demonstrated, whereby the hypostatic will of the person of the Son unites perfectly indivisibly to the will of the Father, as one manifest operationally by united collaboration in autonomy. This is the theological and ontological reading of Christ’s will in ministry and in the garden of Gethseman.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided an overview of the historical development of pivotal understanding of the Trinitarian reality especially in the Patristic period resulting in the separation of the Eastern church over the double procession. Added to that are the later Reformation affirmations of the orthodox theology and Modern developments with special reference to the subordination theory of Trinity. The ontological primacy has been restored and expounded to demonstrate the consubstantiality, the relationality and unity as foundation for comprehending the reciprocity, mutuality, and oneness of the ontological and operational Trinity. This is a valid distinction in the light of the ontological relationship which defines the nature in operations of the persons of the Trinity.

This section has sought to demonstrate through these six principles the ontological relationship in Trinity and has sought to establish the consubstantial and hypostatic Trinity in relationship and in operation. The six principles are interwoven expressly through John’s Gospel, read independently they will give credence to a subordinate, authority-submission hierarchy beginning economically but redefining the ontological Trinity. However, as this section has argued, the primacy of the ontological Trinity in equality, eternity, substance, and relationship, provides the cohesive basis for

64 See also Heb.6:13, 17; 1Co.15:38; Gal.1:4.
65 Jn.4:34; 5:30; 6:38.
interpretation of the Gospel texts of the Father-Son-Spirit being and operating. The principal discourses of the Gospel will demonstrate repeatedly a balanced tension between several if not all the six principles that is resolved through restoration of the ontological primacy in interpretation of Scripture.

Where Trinity manifests a collaboration: complicity among Perfects; believers demonstrate complementarity towards perfection; entire dependency becomes the choice of origins from which life will be defined and experienced; the omniscient revelation through friendship is shown in intimacy with Godhead, where increasing yet partial revelation is experienced; where unity, equality and honour become beneficiary, participatory and perfecting to the believer; where Trinitarian delegation becomes the source and measure of divine life to be received; where autonomy is demonstrated by the incarnate measure of the Tri-Unity.

The significance established by this vision of Trinity directly defines the theological understanding of the believer as Christ witnesses to union in the Father and in the Son and in the Spirit, an inclusion into Trinitarian divine life and relationship and an extension of that life. The consubstantiation of the Trinity is reflected in reciprocal union of the believer; in this the foundational aspects of the Father-Son relationship are communicated apostolically into the believer. The following chapter addresses the theological, ontological and functional dimensions of this definition of Trinitarian life of the believer upon the principles of the ontological Trinity proposal in this chapter.
Chapter Three: ONTOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN THE BELIEVER

Introduction

This chapter begins by examining criteria for religious belief and life leading to a critical analysis in the light of the ontology of Christ in Trinity. The second section further develops the traditional contrasted with the ontological definitions of humankind in the varies ‘states’ of existence to establish the new order in Christ. The third section considers the significance of incarnation and union in Christ which elucidates human existence in Christ in Trinity. The purpose of the chapter is to define a representation of the ‘πνευματικός’ believer in union in Christ, existing in Trinity.

RELIGIOUS AND EXISTENTIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Introduction

To fully conceive the significance of an ontological understanding of the believer in Trinitarian relationship, it is important to identify principles from a religious perspective and the contrasting existential viewpoint. Consideration is given to the meaning of religion and religious experience; the commonality and distinctions with Christianity and the implications of Jesus Christ in continuity and discontinuity with traditional religious principles and disposition.

Criteria for religion and religious belief

What religion is remains a complex question to answer. “… The word “religion” cannot stand for any single principle or essence, but is rather a collective name” (James 24). The different sciences also develop distinct viewpoints of religion. Collins dictionary definition is, “belief in or worship of a supernatural power or powers considered to be divine or to have control of human destiny.”¹ Le Robert dictionary adds “… resulting in intellectual and moral attitudes.”² To be ‘religious’ describes “… the relationship between human beings and a supernatural power; who believes in a religion, practices a religion,

devotes to religion, to God by vows. That which represents the characteristics of religious sentiment or conduct."

Here is religious fear, religious love, religious awe, religious joy, and so forth. But religious love is only man’s natural emotion of love directed to a religious object and similarly of all the various sentiments which may be called into play in the lives of religious persons ... there thus seems to be no one elementary religious emotion, but only a common storehouse of emotions upon which religious objects may draw (James 25).

Many theories, philosophies, psychologies of religion exist, however the differing ordinary, extraordinary and supernatural manifestations of the divine should be considered as an integral part of the natural order of existence rather than some other-worldly experience. The argument to deny the spiritual experience is to deny human experience. However, William James, cited above, clearly conceives religious sentiment in a context of natural responsiveness to a religious object, God or otherwise. He speaks of religious definition as “what he considers the divine,” we must interpret the term “divine” very broadly, as denoting any object that is god—LIKE” (29). The first sentiment or emotion is not human response to God, rather it is the self-revelation of his person and his nature.

Others underline the sociological factors: “[Religion is] a system of belief and worship, held by a community who may express their religion through shared myths, doctrines, ethical teachings, rituals or the remembrance of special experiences” (Dowley et al. 424). Christopher Patridge quotes Lactantius (240-320) tracing the word back to ‘religare’, meaning “that which binds communities of people to each other and to their gods” (Partridge et al. 59). Emile Durkheim (1858-1917), Sociologist, writing in ‘The Elementary Forms of Religious Life’ states, “… man merely seems to believe in and speak to God, while really talking about his own social group without realising it” (quoted in Beaver et al. 14). From a sociological and functional perspective, Bronislaw Malinowski (1887-1942), “… believed that there were scientific laws of culture and that they could also be applied to religion. The individual biological needs of food, shelter, sex and security could also be viewed as social needs which people provide for
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corporately through economic, political, kinship and religious institutions” (quoted in Dowley 13).

One of the principal arguments to have influenced ‘religion’ comes from the Evolutionist and Anthropologic disciplines. At the same time Charles Darwin (1809-1882) published ‘The Origin of the Species’ (1859), the eminent anthropologist Edward Burnett Tylor (1832-1917), ‘the father of anthropology’ who defined the term ‘animism’ (Richardson 50) developed a theory of natural evolution of religion rather than its supernatural or divine origin. Sir James Fraser (1854-1941) a renowned anthropologist and peer likewise purported an evolutionist theory of religion. The latter promoted a three-age theory from ‘the age of magic’ to ‘the age of religion’ to ‘the age of science’. This, while abandoned by most, does sit in the wider evolutionary context,

… and is thus destined to become obsolete. Hence religion is not a response to a transcendent reality; it is rather an immature stage in human cultural and intellectual evolution … Often religion was said to cease to be significant once science replaced it as a stage in human thought⁴ (quoted in Beaver et al. 13).

The evolutionary and anthropological theory is summarized by Don Richardson,

… Just as all complex biological forms come from, according to Darwin and his interpreters, from an initial cell formed by chance in the alluvium of ancient times, and so all complex religious notions found in the world find their origin- according to Tyler - not in divine and/or demonic interventions in history, but rather from one religious thought planted in the mind of some savages (Richardson 50).

Richardson in his book “Eternity in Their Hearts” exposes evidence from the ancient and modern worlds which establishes factually that an evolution of religion is discredited through the primitive existence of monotheistic beliefs and practices. One such example is taken from the Incas and their king Pachacuti who believed in the God of Light (Inti), and through personal seeking to worship the creator rather than creation, re-established the long-held belief in the Creator of all things ‘Viracocha’ (33-36). Likewise, the Chinese and Korean’s in the pre1000 BC era worshiped ‘The Lord of the Heavens’ (Shang Ti) and the Koreans, ‘He who is Great’ (Hananim) (71). The Karen people of Burma, who

⁴“Religion (Definitions)” Dictionary of Contemporary Religion in the Western World. 2002
worshipped ‘Y’wa’, the Supreme God, from a book lost by their ancestors, which would be restored to them by a ‘white brother’ (Ibid 71). The Naga Indian people practiced “customs that are extraordinarily biblical” (97) or the Dayak people of Borneo (119).

Many young anthropologists began asking deeper questions and soon began to discover that “90% of tribal religions in the world are impregnated with monotheist suppositions” (49).

… in the large majority of these religions [tribal religions of the world], as Wilhelm Schmidt and others have proven, is found the belief in one unique Supreme God, which is in contradiction with Tylor, which supposes that the monotheist principle could not only appear in some more evolved religions (57).

The weight of evidence would support Monotheistic worship and practices from antiquity onwards. The correlation in principles seen in the forms and practices is difficult to question.

Richardson based on the biblical text from Genesis 20:6 establishes seven principles of religious expression in all prior religious revelations (138):

i. The reality of the existence of God
ii. The creation
iii. The rebellion, the fall of man
iv. The necessity of a sacrifice to appease God and crafty strategies of demons to push men to turn towards them.
v. The Great Flood
vi. The sudden appearance of multiple languages and the consequential dispersion in numerous people groups.
vii. Finally, man’s conscience of the need of another revelation, which will seal the new in a blessed relationship with God.

Howard Marshall in his article ‘Christian Beliefs’5 establishes six principles that are taught in the OT to Jews and which corroborate with the above (Beaver et al. 349-356):

i. Belief in the existence of one God, (Creator, Lord, Sovereign)
ii. Belief… that man is made in the image of God, but has rebelled…
iii. Belief that God… righteous judge, is also gracious and merciful
iv. Belief that God revealed Himself to the nation of Israel.
v. Belief that God would someday establish his rule in a sinful world
vi. The practice of a moral life under the guidance of the Law (in OT)

In attempting to formulate a definition of religion the agnostic Ninian Smart identifies nine ‘dimensional definitions’ (63):

i. Ritual or Practical
ii. Doctrinal or Philosophical
iii. Mythic or Narrative
iv. Experiential or Emotional
v. Ethical or Legal
vi. Organizational or Social
vii. Material or Artistic
viii. Political
ix. Economic

William James in his summarising of the characteristics of religious life provides five points (366-367):

i. That the visible world is part of a more spiritual universe from which it draws its chief significance;
ii. That union or harmonious relation with that higher universe is our true end;
iii. That prayer or inner communion with the spirit thereof— be that spirit “God” or “law”—is a process wherein work is really done, and spiritual energy flows in and produces effects, psychological or material, within the phenomenal world.
iv. Religion includes also the following psychological characteristics:
v. A new zest which adds itself like a gift to life, and takes the form either of lyrical enchantment or of appeal to earnestness and heroism.
vi. An assurance of safety and a temper of peace, and, in relation to others, a preponderance of loving affections.

In establishing the unequivocal antique and historical reality of One God, Creator, Revealer, Sustainer, the construct for religion as monotheist and therefore polytheism as a degenerate deviation rather than an evolutionary development can be identified. William James concludes the contrary, “I think, in fact, that a final philosophy of religion will have to consider the pluralistic hypothesis more seriously than it has hitherto been willing to consider it” (398). The relationship that the One Supreme God seeks after with humanity is universally evidenced. Likewise, across centuries, the unanimous searching of diverse people groups, each with their own identifiable culture, to meet and commune with the One God, sets a universal innate principle that is, by definition, transcultural and accultural. Jung the psychoanalyst confirms, all religions have their psychological roots in what he called the ‘collective unconscious’ of the human race (Atkinson and Field 708). It is also suggested that religion is formed in community, whereas biblical understanding demonstrates that God creates community, Father, Son and Spirit, and invites into His family, rather than the contrary. The historical human stories do not define God nor his intended religious relationship, they reflect partial revelation and understanding. However, the unanimity of ascendancy to perceive the One True God, must be noted. The similarities in practices in terms of religious conception will be discussed.

**Forms and Practices**

In attempting to define religion Christopher Partridge quotes Cicero (106-43 BC JC), who refers to the Latin term ‘religio’ which in turn finds its root in ‘relegere’ meaning to reread. He claims that ‘religio’ should be understood as ‘tradition’ that is handed down from generation to generation (Partridge 59). Lactantius’ has already been referred to for the religious definition of community. Both aspects are reflected in religion and religious communities. The internal religious life and external religious life is often distinguished and should be, to perceive the ontological from the religious tradition. Partridge draws this parallel in referring to Williams James focus on the internal, experiential aspect of
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belief with Emile Durkheim (1858-1917), who centres on the external institution and organization (Partridge 62).

In the 1950’s

[attention turns] … More to the role of religion as an expression of the structure of the ideas, values and beliefs of society. This structuralist approach draws attention to the organization of human thought, and to the way man brings an ordered pattern to this complex world (Beaver et al. 13-14).

The movement from internal or spiritual experiences to external constructs of organization and function develop rapidly; the religious focus also shifts to the external sign, symbol or ritual. This movement of transition increases from existential and ontological to external ritual tradition and so, the meaning, the reason, and the reality are often obscured or lost. The structuralist tendency is not a modernist phenomenon, as its roots are antiquity, more importantly in human nature as mankind seeks out some manifestation of the spiritual religious experience and how to order it. Even though Freud perceived religion as an illusion, M.A. Jeeves comments,

…religion had served a useful purpose in providing a sense of security for humanity…at the same time providing an important reservoir for the ethical standards as civilization had developed. He believed however, that the time had come when such a basis could no longer usefully serve the needs of modern people, who must find some more rational grounds for living a civilized life”7 (Atkinson and Field 707-710).

Quoting G.F Spinks (1903-78), Jeeves relates, “For Freud religion was an obsessional neurosis … For Jung it was the absence of religion that was the chief cause of adult psychological disorders” (708). It can be deducted from Freud’s aversion to religious belief or experience that he perceived the security and the ethical standards provided by religious experience as transitory. His overriding perception seems to be one of substitution, whereby mankind substitutes ‘god’ for his inadequate sense of security, belonging, moral conscience and guidance or direction. Jung on the other hand, while specializing in the same field of psychoanalysis, identifies the universal correlation of
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human condition with spiritual or religious experience at personal internal and societal levels: “the ‘collective unconscious’ of the human race” (707). This corroborates with Richardson’s demonstrating the collective and cultural innate religious awareness, experience and quest in primitive tribal religions.

In addressing both the personal and collective, the internal and external aspects of religion, attention does turn to practices that sustain these. William James, while not treating the institutional and organizational dimensions of religion does clearly draw stark comparisons between the personal and the collective. In doing so, the implicit distinction is between personal experience and collective construct, between the primary and secondary. The first identifying man’s personal internal search for spiritual reality within the complexities of his being and existence; the latter clearly being identified with traditions, structuration, institutionalization, etc.

Worship and sacrifice, procedures for working on the dispositions of the deity, theology and ceremony and ecclesiastical organization, are the essentials of religion in the institutional branch. Were we to limit our view to it, we should have to define religion as an external art, the art of winning the favor of the gods. In the more personal branch of religion it is on the contrary the inner dispositions of man himself which form the center of interest, his conscience, his deserts, his helplessness, his incompleteness … yet the acts to which this sort of religion prompts are personal not ritual acts, the individual transacts the business by himself alone, and the ecclesiastical organization, with its priests and sacraments and other go-betweens, sinks to an altogether secondary place. The relation goes direct from heart to heart, from soul to soul, between man and his maker (James 26).

Some principles can be identified as common to the majority of religious forms and practices. Robert Brow comments,

It appears that the association of animal sacrifice as their normal way of approaching God, (Semites of Babylonia, Assyria, Syria, and Phoenicia) reflecting the Genesis account, the patriarchal practices, and the Exodus desert formation of God’s people. Song and chant too are identifiable religious practices across religious expressions (quoted in Beaver et al. 32).
Richardson also identifies several religious practices specifically in the Naga Indian ethnic group.

Dozo claims that the Naga culture contains customs that are extraordinarily biblical, such as edification of commemorative stones in certain places, first fruits offerings, blood offering, sacred animal sacrifices, unleavened bread, ear piercing, permanent maintenance of sacred fire, a particular interest in the number seven, feast of harvest and the sounding of trumpets after the harvest. They did not represent Chepo-Thuru by an idol (97).

Similarly, among the Dayak people of Borneo, who have an annual day of atonement or expiation, symbolically expressed through ceremony comprising two chicks, a lantern and a boat (119).

Sacrifice for expiation (atonement) or propitiation (reconciliation, peace-making) is a common practice and innate expression of worship or veneration of God or gods. In Greco-Roman polytheistic culture the practice was the same. It is true to say that the sacrificial appeasement is intensified in polytheism uniquely because of the multiplicity of gods, with their own temples and priesthoods.

The OT texts supply insights into the religious practices of the people of Israel, and the practices of the surrounding nations, (Moab, Ammon, Canaan, Edom, Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, etc.). The first text that carries the notion of atonement or expiation of Adam and Eve’s sin sets the principle and meaning of sacrifice to God, “And the LORD God made for Adam and for his wife garments of skins and clothed them” (ESV Ge.3:21).

Similar examples in the pre-Mosaic Covenant period are found in the Passover in Egypt where the blood of the Passover lamb had a propitiatory effect. Contextually, one notes that this action moved from its immediate deliverance context to one of ‘tradition’ whereby ritual remembrance, re-enactment, and recounting perpetuate the original event. In the ‘new covenant’ with Noah, the whole burnt offering marked an appeasement with God after the flood. It also declares a new beginning in a new order: “I will never again
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curse the ground because of man … While the earth remains, seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night shall not cease” (ESV Ge.8:21-22). Similarly, in the prophecy of the ‘Righteous Branch’ anticipating the Davidic King–Priest-Messiah and the establishing of a new beginning and new order.\(^{11}\) Sacrifice symbolizes forgiveness for man aware of guilt in his nature and wrong-doing in actions and without capacity to resolve these problems within himself and of his own resource. To appease God therefore becomes vital and by consequence to pacify man in relationship to Himself. This principle is individual and internal, collective and external.

The primitive witness found among the Karen tribe to ‘Y’wa’, found expression through many songs evoking his eternity, his attributes, his creatorship… (Richardson 84-85). With song came story-telling. The lyrical character is a reminder of the prophets who employed song or lyric to speak many of their prophecies.\(^{12}\) In Judaism the focal point of the calendar and seasons were the feasts: Unleavened Bread and Passover\(^{13}\); Firstfruits\(^{14}\); Weeks\(^{15}\); Tabernacles or Booths\(^{16}\); Trumpets.\(^{17}\) These in particular, were joyful, festive, celebratory occasions\(^{18}\). When Jerusalem became the religious centre with the Davidic temple built by Solomon, the Songs of Ascent (Psalms 120-134) refer to the pilgrim’s journey to Jerusalem for the major feasts, telling the stories in lyric and song. In oral traditions that existed, these literary mechanisms enabled the remembering and transmission of the fundamental truths of God. Their application is often collective rather than personal. This practice endeavours to maintain the collective memory that gives meaning to belief. However, it does not bridge the generational gap whereby the shared

\(^{11}\) The link between Messianic covenant accomplishment, a new order and the natural order ‘day and night’, ‘heaven and earth’ or is also confirmed in Jer.33:19-21, 25-26.

\(^{12}\) E.g., Ge.49-Jacob; Dt.32-33-Moses; The Servant Songs of Isaiah (Is.42, 49, 50, 52-53) The Conqueror Songs (Is.59, 61:1-3; 61:10-62:7; 63:1-6); Jeremiah’s New Covenant Ch.31. Some modern Bible translations set these lyrical or canticle passages in prose style to identify them, (e.g., ESV).

\(^{13}\) Ex.12:8-20; Lev.23:4-8; 2Ch.30:21.

\(^{14}\) Ex.34:22; Lev.23:9-14.

\(^{15}\) Lev.23:15-22; Num.28:26-31; Dt.16:9-12 also called Pentecost.

\(^{16}\) Lev.23:33-44; Num.29:12-40; Dt.16:13-17.

\(^{17}\) Lev.23:23-25; Num.29:1-6.

\(^{18}\) Lev.23:39-41; Dt.16:11, 14; 2Ch.30:21; Ez.6:22; Ne.8:26-17.
memory finds its origin in shared experiences. This being so, the second and following generations reply upon borrowed experiences and therefore beliefs.

Melchizedek stands as an example of a Canaanite high priest and king.\(^{19}\) His blessing identifies him as a believer in the Supreme, Unique, Creator or Possessor God.\(^ {20}\) In considering the concept of priest, the Mbaka tribe from Yablanga village (Democratic Republic of Congo), reflected ‘rites of passage’ with Judaeo-Christian parallels (Richardson 66), Don Richardson relates an example of priesthood,

… The men of Yablanga village were considered as ‘guardians of the knowledge of Koro’ a sort of Levitical clan within the tribe. According to Eugene [Rosenau] the Mbakas of Yablanga accepted so completely the Gospel that with surprise in 1950 75-80% of all the African pastors trained by Eugene came from one village, Yablanga. (66).

Here can be found reflections of the Levitical tribe for ritual acts of worship\(^ {21}\) and teaching Levitical priests in OT Judaism.\(^ {22}\) By definition they are to stand before the Lord and minister to Him,\(^ {23}\) to minister to the tabernacle itself, as the dwelling of God among the people.\(^ {24}\) According to the Davidic temple era firstly, workers [up-keepers] and overseers of the house of the Lord;\(^ {25}\) secondly, there were taskmaster, elders, overseers relating to management of the people,\(^ {26}\) sometimes distinct from elders\(^ {27}\) and sometimes synonymous,\(^ {28}\) or again directly related to the Levites\(^ {29}\) and judges, just as with the

\(^{19}\) Ge.14:18.

\(^{20}\) Ge.14:19-20, 22.

\(^{21}\) Num.8:19.

\(^{22}\) Dt.24:8; 2Ch.17:7-9; 31:4; Ez.7:1-6, 10, 25-26.

\(^{23}\) Dt.10:8; 18:5, 7.

\(^{24}\) Num.16:9; 1Ch.6:48.

\(^{25}\) 1Ch.23:4; 2Kg.22:5 “mela’kah” a generic term for work of all types, applied to God in creation.

\(^{26}\) Ex.5:14; Num.11:16; Dt.16:18; 20:5, 8, 9.

\(^{27}\) Dt.29:10; Jos.8:33.

\(^{28}\) Num.11:16.

\(^{29}\) 2Ch.19:11; 34:13.
seventy Moses chose\textsuperscript{30} distinct from the Levites and priests\textsuperscript{31} described as Charismatic Liberators in Judges;\textsuperscript{32} although in this text the task is combined with the elder overseers.\textsuperscript{33} A third category of ‘keepers’ kept watch over the city, temple or tabernacle, the ark, the storerooms which included money, precious objects, grain, wine, oil, etc.\textsuperscript{34}

And finally, the worshippers: singers and musicians, \textsuperscript{35} while part of the same priestly family, the ritual functions fell to the Aaronic family.\textsuperscript{36} The centralizing effect of David’s desire to build a temple for God in Jerusalem also meant convergence of ministry not only in one place geographically but also in one tribal grouping, that denotes a process of professionalization.

It is necessary to consider the intentions of God in the light of the preceding constructs. Three key texts will clarify these intentions: “He [Lord] said, But I will be with you, and this shall be the sign for you that I have sent you: when you have brought the people out of Egypt, you shall serve God on this mountain” (ESV Ex.3:12)

The first concept is found in the word serve (“‘abad”) which does not only apply to common work but to a priestly service\textsuperscript{37} (Baker and Carpenter 795). The objective is that all the people are called to priestly service on Mount Sinai. There is an identifiable divine intention, which is further corroborated by Exodus 19:5,

\begin{quote}
Now therefore, if you will indeed obey my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my treasured possession among all peoples, for all the earth is mine; ‘And you shall be to Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.’ These are the words which you shall speak to the children of Israel (ESV Ex.19:5; NKJV Ex.19:6).
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{30} Ex.18:13-26.

\textsuperscript{31} Jos.8:33.

\textsuperscript{32} ‘shaphat’.Jg.2:16, 18; 3:10; 13:24-25; 1Sa.7:15, 19-21.

\textsuperscript{33} 1Ch.23:4.

\textsuperscript{34} 1Ch.9:21; 15:24; Ne.12:25; 13:5 “show’er”.

\textsuperscript{35} 1Ch.23:5; 15:16; 2Ch.7:6.

\textsuperscript{36} 2Ch.13:10.

\textsuperscript{37} ***‘abad” BDBHEL 2017. See also Ex.12:31.
The kingdom of priests also finds affirmation in the Apostle Peter’s choice of language, “… a holy priesthood to offer spiritual sacrifices … a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for his own possession …” (ESV 1Pe.2:4-9). Both texts reinforce an individual and collective call to exercise priesthood. The texts bind together kingship and priesthood, a reflection on God’s original intentions and on the work and ministry of Jesus Christ.  

An example of this intention is found in the Passover texts.

Then the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it at twilight. ‘And they shall take some of the blood and put it on the two doorposts and on the lintel of the houses where they eat it … ‘Now the blood shall be a sign for you on the houses where you are. And when I see the blood, I will pass over you … (NKJV Ex.12:6-7, 13).

Every man, for every household, performs the priestly sacrifice of a lamb, as Robert Brow also observes (quoted in Beaver et al. 36). He performs an efficacious priestly act of atonement by substitution. Its effectiveness reflects its authentication and legitimate acceptance by God in the ‘passing over’. The following two biblical citations, give some indication as to why the priesthood altered.

And the LORD said to Moses, "Behold, I come to you in the thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with you, and believe you forever." So Moses told the words of the people to the LORD … For on the third day the LORD will come down upon Mount Sinai in the sight of all the people…on the third day, in the morning, that there were thunderings and lightnings, and a thick cloud on the mountain; and the sound of the trumpet was very loud, so that all the people who were in the camp trembled. And Moses brought the people out of the camp to meet with God, and they stood at the foot of the mountain. And when the blast of the trumpet sounded long and became louder and louder, Moses spoke, and God answered him by voice (NKJV Ex.19:9, 11, 17, 19).

God’s choice was for all inclusively to be close enough to hear his voice and to see him descend upon the mountains visibly, through a symbolic manifestation of clouds, fire,

---

38 Heb.6:20; 7:22, 27; 8:1.

thunder, shaking, lightning and the trumpet sound of His voice. This manifestation encapsulates the divine intention to draw the people to Himself in self-revelation, to give foundation to their priesthood with personal direct experience.

Now when all the people saw the thunder and the flashes of lightning and the sound of the trumpet and the mountain smoking, the people were afraid and trembled, and they stood far off and said to Moses, “You speak to us, and we will listen; but do not let God speak to us, lest we die.” Moses said to the people, “Do not fear, for God has come to test you, that the fear of him may be before you, that you may not sin.” The people stood far off, while Moses drew near to the thick darkness where God was (ESV Ex.20:18 -21).

The text describes the fatal decision of the people, to retreat, rather than to approach. The people, in pronouncing the words of verse nineteen, seal their own fate by desiring a mediator other than God Himself. As the intention and the response of the people is understood, one cannot fail to perceive the significance of the lost direct priestly relationship with God. It is not God’s transcendence that is the issue, it is his desire for immanence which has caused the people to withdraw. A simple observation of religious patterns in general shows that under the impulsion to organize another priest emerges and thereafter a priesthood caste or tribe. Subsequently, an increase of ritual acts: offerings, sacrifices, ceremonies, in all forms of signs and symbols in order to bridge the gap of divine immanence offered. Mystery can be contained in transcendence and somehow not knowing, or not being in intimate relationship and in direct priesthood, may ease the conscience of some. However, the greater mystery of immanence lost, was precursor to the greater reality of Jesus Christ. Christians predominantly have still not recovered the immanence of direct priesthood.

**The emergence of ‘priest-craft’**

In the words of Brow, “the regular priesthood was inevitable … there is nothing wrong, in having a full-time or even a hereditary priesthood” appealing to the growth of cities, permanent places or spaces, facilitating worship and of the authority of royal courts. He further emphasizes, “where there were no prophets, priesthood and temple, worship always degenerated into the ugliness of priest-craft”40 (Beaver et al. 37). “The essence of

---

priest-craft is the rise of a group of people who claim to control access to God, and who suggest that the offering of sacrifice is a meritorious act which forces God to grant favours” (Ibid 38). The issue raised is not that of natural evolutionary development but of an estrangement from the demonstration of God’s revealed intentions, (the meaning of the precursory and the fulfilment (‘τελέω’) will be developed further on). The greater the settling, the greater the tendency to separate and professionalize the priesthood. The priesthood specializations structured further the function. The rise in political and spiritual power of the priesthood, could be seen in Babylon (2500BC), and in Egypt (2400-1570), the priesthood of Re the sun god. This ‘priest-craft’ was one principal reason for the global shaking of religious order and the emergence of new world religions or philosophies. In the tribal religions similar priestly patterns are observed. Richardson refers to the hostility of the priests of “Initi” god of Light. The fear of mass uprising, caused King Pachacutí to reserve this worship for the king and the governing caste (36-37). The import of this is that the mass population relegated and excluded, resulted in exalted castes of special priests. The historical observation shows that such priesthoods do not endure. Andrew Lang, an evolutionist, quoted by Don Richardson says “… mankind moves gradually from fetishes to hierarchized gods, then to gods of nature and polytheism in general in order to reach the conception of a Supreme Being” (47). The inference can be reinterpreted in the converse manner which would concur with understanding of the Supreme God, transcendent and immanent, calling for a people of priests. What Lang calls ‘fetishized religion’ whereby the focus is decentred from the Person of God to the symbol or representation, demonstrates how easily priest-craft, ritual practices and beliefs become established.

William James, rightly speaks categorically about the primacy of the personal direct experience or encounter,

---

41 Documents of Sumer, Ur, Nippon.

42 The source like many other universal events is difficult to identify but India’s corrupt Brahím priesthood conceded to Jainism’s good works and ethics, and Buddhism; in China, Confucianism, Taoism; Zoroaster in Persia; Judaism as exiles return from Babylonian-Persian captivity; and Mohammed’s rejection by the Jews incited him to found Islam (42).
The acts to which this sort of religion prompts are personal not ritual acts, the individual transacts the business by himself alone, and the ecclesiastical organization, with its priests and sacraments and other go-betweens, sinks to an altogether secondary place. The relation goes direct from heart to heart, from soul to soul, between man and his maker (26).

A survey of history shows us that, as a rule, religious geniuses attract disciples, and produce groups of sympathizers. When these groups get strong enough to “organize” themselves, they become ecclesiastical institutions with corporate ambitions of their own. The spirit of politics and the lust of dogmatic rule are then apt to enter and to contaminate the originally innocent thing (255).

James emphasizes the detachment from the essential primary or original intention. One underlying principle worthy of mention is that of irresponsibility engendered by the delegation of spiritual responsibility upon other mediators. He so vividly describes the rapid, unconscious or conscious process whereby a genuine spiritual beginning can so easily end up remote and unrecognizable in terms of the original intention.

Rather than the immanence and immediacy of the direct encounter and relationship with God, this brief historical sketch demonstrates, by these examples, the frustration that a humanistic religious development engenders, however well clothed it be in religious jargon and symbolism.

Judaism during the inter-testamental period multiplied exponentially ritual regulations, together with folklore embellishments, practical legal questions and intricate details of ritual, (Archer 64). The ‘Mishnah’ a codification of sub-rules from four centuries of ‘Torah’ interpretation, combined in nineteen volumes are called the ‘Talmud’. Archer describes it as “a digest of all the oral laws (supposedly communicated by word of mouth from Moses to his seventy elders), traditions and explanations of Scripture” (Ibid.). To this, the ‘Gamara’ is added combining rabbinical discussions compiled over the following five centuries (Beaver et al. 289-290). Archer describes it as “a supplement to be attached to each of the sixty-three tractates by way of expanded commentary upon the Mishnah” (64). It is easy to see how there is remoteness from the Sacred Scriptures imposed upon the non-specialist oral listener. This creation of a gulf makes room for a ‘class of priest’ to create a mediation. Jesus warns the specialists,
You search the Scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that bear witness about me … If you believed Moses, you would believe me; for he wrote of me. But if you do not believe his writings, how will you believe my words? (ESV Jn.5:39).

He directly points to the confusion between origin or source and mediation. The Jews made explanation of and obedience to the OT mediation for spiritual or eternal life. Jesus clearly challenges that by putting a mediating role in Scripture that leads to Himself the source and origin of life. He further exposes the dilemma they face between their firm belief in Torah, (especially referring to the Pentateuch or Law (‘tôrâh’) which held primary place), followed then by the Prophets, and the lesser importance to the Writings (poetical books, etc.) and this particularly in the time of Jesus in Palestine (Clements 16). James identifies two fundamental obstacles: the ‘spirit of corporate dominion’ and the ‘spirit of dogmatic dominion’ summarising the ‘ecclesiastical spirit’ (257). This spirit is contrasted with “genuine first hand religious experience,” the refusal to suffocate “spontaneous religious spirit,” and the ability to “adopt new movements of the spirit …” (256-257). His observation easily transfers to the spirit of Judaism in the time of Jesus.

“If we study the facts of the past, it appears that the strategy of the Devil has always been to impose formal religion upon tribal religions, before the Gospel arrives, with the only purpose of preventing the latter from playing their extraordinary role to ally the Gospel” (Richardson 111), clearly recognizing the same religious markers that suffocate authentic religious experience.

James quoting Leuba coins a maxim “in this way: GOD IS NOT KNOWN, HE IS NOT UNDERSTOOD; HE IS USED” (James 384). The underlying principle communicated is the departure from divine original intention whereby God becomes what a person wants Him to be. We withdraw from His self-revelation and in doing so from His revelation of human identity and purpose, both ontologically and functionally.

**Historical lessons**

Much more writing is available on the subject of Religion. The purpose of this short cursus is to distinguish some of the major influences that constitute a religious approach and draw out the consequences that most affect the ontology of the believer in God. In summarising the major trends several concepts are highlighted.
**Distanciation**

As with the Israelites before Mount Sinai, the effect of withdrawal from revelation and encounter, (‘hear my voice…see Me’) of God, resulted immediately in ‘distanciation’ in contrast to the original divine intention to approach. The loss through fear is considerable, in the light of humanity’s innate spiritual need.

Historical movements which have tried try to purge the innate human need of religion or spirituality in people groups (‘distancing in extremis’), have not succeeded, rather their attempts have resulted in intensified spiritual searching and encounter: Communism of ex-Russian USSR, and reports from people such as brother Andrew⁴⁴ or Richard and Sabine Wurmbrand⁴⁵ in communist Romania; in China in the Boxer wave (1900) and other waves of Communist revolutions (1911-1912; 1921-1927s; and further waves till WWII broke in 1938);⁴⁶ current day examples in the Muslim world can be taken from Iran’s 800 000 Christians;⁴⁷ or still among the Kabyle Berber people in Algeria⁴⁸. These few examples serve to reinforce that when the ‘direct’ of God’s intentions is honoured, no human movement can stop it.

Other religious groups or individuals, have accepted distanciation as in the case of tribal religions, already cited. The innate but partial comprehension of the revelation of God and his intentions is the precursory principle, however, partiality in unfulfilled revelation creates distance as human religiosity fills the void. When transcendence stands isolated

---

⁴³ ‘Distanciation’ describes the time-space gap between people, events, understanding and action. In this context it is employed throughout to designate the gap where proximity and intimacy were intended by God with his people.


from immanence, understanding of the Supreme Creator God engenders distanciation. As in polytheistic religions the Greek gods for example were too far removed (transcendent) to be concerned or involved in human affairs. The lesser gods, identified with spheres of nature or life responded to the quest for divine approbation, who would occupy themselves with this task.

**Representation**

The relationship of Law (Judaism) and Spirit can be clearly understood through Paul’s argument in his letter to the Galatian Christians. He defines one function of the Law as ‘παιδαγωγός’ (‘pedagogue’), (ESV Gal.3:24). The inference is etymological, from the root word ‘παῖς’ meaning child, boy or girl, while a generic term does infer ‘young’. The Law, (‘νόμος’) defines any law or tradition, religious, social or cultural, is related by Paul to infancy and if not left behind becomes infantile because it is by nature only precursory. The ‘παιδαγωγος’ stewards, manages, administrates or supervises, as typically in a Greco-Roman household (Zodhiates 1088). It is therefore more than a pupil-teacher or disciple-philosopher teaching or following relationship. When distanciation occurs, the compounded effect is that of representation and mediation. Paul conceives that it is possible for the Law as an entity and indicative of a certain disposition to hold this infantile mediatory role as precursor to something perfected in Christ Jesus. Therefore the ‘νόμος’ can only conform to its fundamental nature and function. The Christian seeking to live an ontological and direct relational communion with God will be required to leave law as a form of representation and of mediation. It is the necessary passage from childlike to Christ-like, otherwise childlike becomes childish. Representation inevitably becomes mediation, something which Jesus addresses concerning the Jews in John chapter five. The resulting conclusion, from an ontological point of view, is that human beings in principle demonstrate acculturation: filling the gap caused by distanciation, seeking representation and by consequence, creating mediation, notwithstanding the divine desire for immanence, “I will be your God, you will be my people.”49 The golden calf of Exodus thirty two exemplifies the principle,

---

49 Ex.6:7; 25:8; 29:45; 34:9; Lév.26:12; Ruth 1:16; Es.52:6; 63:11; Jer.7:23; 11:4; 13:11; 24:7; 30 :22; 31:1, 33; 32:28; Ez.14:11; 34:20; 36:28; 37:23, 27; 39:7; Jl.2:27; Hg.2:5; Ze.2:5, 10, 11; 8:8; 2Co.6:16; Heb.8:10.
And he received the gold from their hand and fashioned it with a graving tool and made a golden calf. And they said, “These are your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of the land of Egypt!” and they said, When Aaron saw this, he built an altar before it. And Aaron made proclamation and said, “Tomorrow shall be a feast to the LORD.” And they rose up early the next day and offered burnt offerings and brought peace offerings. And the people sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play (ESV Ex.32:4-6).

This text demonstrates the principles under consideration. The distanciation phenomenon: rather than focus on the mountain listening and seeing God in covenant through an invitation to immanence, they consciously created the gap and fill it with representation and mediation: the golden calf deified, intimates a transfer of divine attribution, ‘who led them out of Egypt’. The expiatory and propitiatory sacrifices accompanied by a covenant feast and festivities, are representations and mediations but they also relate to authentication, the third principle under consideration.

The Church of England, to which the Protestant Episcopal Church in these States is indebted, under God, for her first foundation and a long continuance of nursing care and protection, hath, in the Preface of her Book of Common Prayer, laid it down as a rule, that The particular Forms of Divine Worship, and the Rites and Ceremonies appointed to be used therein. Our general aim therefore … the procuring of Reverence, and exciting of Piety and Devotion in the Publick Worship of God; and the cutting off occasion from them that seek occasion of cavil or quarrel against the Liturgy of the Church.

This short exert from the, Church of England and Protestant Episcopal Church of USA, Book of Common Prayer, gives an incline as to the extent by which the rule and order of the established church has filled the distanciation gap with rule of ritual ordonnances. The deduction is that rather than ‘immediacy and immanence’ which become redemptively

---

50 E.g., Israel’s demand for a king 1Sa.8:5-9; 12:12.


possible in Jesus Christ, filling the space with objects, symbols, signs, rituals, ceremony, rite and song that while appearing to ‘approach’ religiously the believer to God, in fact only maintains distanciation.

This fear of immanency and immediacy has created a vacuum whereby the space is also filled with mediating people: priests, guardians, charismatic personalities, or “religious geniuses filled with infectious ‘over-belief’,” to employ James’ terminology (389). The identification of this category of person is self-evident. However, the critical question lies in this second area of concern of ‘Representation and Mediation’. This aspect, likened to the latter ritual consideration, can be equated to idolatry. The simple fact of a spiritual or religious leader in the wrong place, filling the gap created by distanciation, equates to idolatry through representation and mediation. The believer is therefore limited to mediating experience of what could be called “second-hand syndrome” (James 256).

In one sense at least the personal religion will prove itself more fundamental than either theology or ecclesiasticism. Churches, when once established, live at second-hand upon tradition; but the FOUNDERS of every church owed their power originally to the fact of their direct personal communion with the divine. Not only the superhuman founders, the Christ, the Buddha, Mahomet, but all the originators of Christian sects have been in this case; so personal religion should still seem the primordial thing (James 27).

**Authentication**

Authentication is the natural consequence of representation and mediation. When someone or something fills the gap becoming a representation of God, a secondary or indirect means of communing with God. Consequently, the authentication of genuine and acceptable acts of: relationship, worship, allegiance, consecration and service by that representative or mediator, become necessity. The question asked may be ‘what then is an acceptable action on the believer’s part?’ The text from the Exodus narrative\(^{53}\) connects the three principles together. In terms of ‘authentication’, the sacrifices offered symbolized expiation for sin and communion or relationship with God and the feast in

\(^{53}\) Ex.32:4-6.
Scripture often signifying covenant,\textsuperscript{54} are ‘representations’ because stepping away from God and his encounter, the gap exists and is immediately filled. The sacrifices to ‘gods’ bear witness to some common shared cultic understanding. As discussed in this section, the innate consciousness is manifest, but quickly deviates to another object or means. This is exemplified notably by the attribution of the deliverance from Egypt to other gods, underlining the rapidity and ease at which the move from direct immanent relationship to deified representations and mediations divert from the unique object of true worship. The irony of a God desiring immanence, refused by the people, is then recreated pseudonymously.

The Book of Leviticus is a necessity for Israel because of distanciation, representation and mediation. Acceptability to God, is its primary focus: by means of: sacrifices and offerings, priests, and of the worshippers.\textsuperscript{55} Laws of hygiene and purity relied upon the authentication of the priest,\textsuperscript{56} as in the time of Jesus.\textsuperscript{57} The principle climaxes in confrontation of the high priestly office with Jesus. A reading of this relationship through the optic of acceptability reveals the diametrical opposition and hatred for Jesus, the absolute of unacceptability.\textsuperscript{58}

The individual is held in the uncertainty of his own acceptation and that of his offerings, unless the representative mediator validates or authenticates. Jesus speaks accusingly to the Pharisees and scribes regarding this very question,

\begin{quote}
For they bind heavy burdens, hard to bear, and lay them on men’s shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers. But woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you shut up the kingdom of heaven against men; for you neither go in yourselves, nor do you allow those who are entering to go in. Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you travel land and sea to
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{54} Abrahamic Ex.2:23-25; Passover – Ex.12; Harvest become Pentecost and the covenant of the Spirit; Lk.15:23-24, 27 – the prodigal son; Lk.22:15-20 – Last Supper; Kingdom reign.

\textsuperscript{55} Lev.1:3-4; 6:9; 19:5; 22:21, 29.

\textsuperscript{56} E.g., The Leprosy Law: Lev.13:6, 8, 11, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22-23, 25, 27-28, 30, 34, 37, 44.

\textsuperscript{57} Mc.1:44.

\textsuperscript{58} Mt.16:21; Mc.11:18, 14:55; Mt.26:63-68; Lk.23:10.
win one proselyte, and when he is won, you make him twice as much a son of hell as yourselves. (NKJV Mt.23:4, 13, 15).

His condemnation is one of the strongest in the Gospels because he employs the term ‘curse’. His indignation refers directly to the problem of acceptability. Those who are in the place of representation and mediation, the Pharisees and scribes, have removed acceptability before God out of reach and substituted it with heavy burdens. Secondly, they have imposed upon men and women, weights they themselves are not prepared to carry. The third characteristic in addition to the impossibility, is that of exclusion or disqualification. The fourth characteristic is that of counterfeit substitution. Their disciple making is founded upon creating someone in their own image. They become pseudo-gods, in that their disciples become in their own likeness. The effect is compounded degeneracy. These are normal conclusions whereby representation and mediation lead to the need for authentication that induces subtle idolatry and the antipathy of unacceptability. The immanence of direct relationship with God is therein thwarted. The immanence of the representation and mediation of pseudo-god like figures inevitably leads them to claims of transcendence.

**Christianity as Religion**

In the previous chapter, religion was defined as: the identification of a deity in nature (identity), in work (function), who is the object of belief; defining how mankind relates or communes with the deity, and the worldview that emerges from these two criteria. The recurring concept of religion as community, a social entity, seems to be a consequence of the above rather than a defining criterion.

Christopher Lamb in his article\(^\text{59}\) states:

> The Christian claim is that Christ is unique: Christianity is not. Christianity can be classified under all the normal headings of a study of human society and religion… complex history, leading exponents, a massive literature, distinctive rituals and characteristic social form. All these can be paralleled by the communities of other world faiths… (Beaver et al. 357).

An exercise in comparative major religions (Christianity, Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism and Animism) will result in a synthesis of worldviews and shared criteria. This does not take into account philosophies, spiritualties or sects, which operate as worldviews and belief systems on a supposed non-religious basis, but which do require the exercise of faith. It is also acknowledged that within each major religion there are multiple strands: Christianity, Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, and Animism. Common beliefs are: in the spiritual and supernatural world, in one supreme god, even if he or she is god among other lesser gods; ritual practices and ceremonies that mark events in life individually and socially; a spiritual leader (guru, priest, healer or prophet figure); sacrifices and offerings; strong ancestral beliefs; expression in song and dance, and a relationship to the earth, or the land they possess. This synthesis expresses the religious construct of the innate religious consciousness in all humanity. The essential proposition concerns how the believer accesses and relates to God through which the effects of distanciation, representation, and authentication may be inherently exhibited.

Particular interest in Judaism, is on the basis of the OT response to this question because of the unique relationship of Christianity to Judaism: “Christianity has received from Judaism its basic understanding of God, his nature, his Law, his dealings with men and the standards he expects between man and man” (Beaver et al. 301).

---

60 Common thematics: A sacred book; God-deity identified; meaning of Mankind and the Universe; Salvation and Eternity (After Life); Morality and Deity worship.

61 Contains: Eastern Orthodox, Western and Roman Catholic, Protestant groups: Lutheran, Reformed, State (Presbyterian, Anglican, Episcopal), Evangelical, Pentecostal/Charismatic, and New Reformation.

62 Has two major strands: Theravada (strict) and Mahayana (liberal), further subgroups exist more along national or cultural lines, e.g., Lamaism from Tibet, Zen from China and Japan.

63 Or ‘Sanatana Dharma’ for indigenous Indians); Hinduism, tends to develop through ‘guru’ figures of one of the gods, (Agni, Indra and Varuna from the Vedic, earliest era, Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva, their three consorts from later period, then the ten avatars of Vishnu, including Krishna and Buddha). As an enlightened teacher rose to prominence a movement of followers would occur.

64 Divides into two major groups, Sunni and Shi’a.

65 In the modern era groups into Orthodox, Reformed (culturally through diaspora), Conservative (Zionist), Hasidim (ultra-orthodox).

66 Strands are difficult to identify as tribal or primal religions, is so diverse and numerous due to cultural, ethnic and geographical considerations.

The characteristic rites of the new faith, which parallel with the Jewish rite of circumcision and the festival of the Passover …, were baptism and the Lord’s Supper. Baptism was a ritual washing with water which signified cleansing from sin, the reception of God’s Spirit, and the dedication of the candidate to God and his entry into the new people of God\(^{68}\) (Beaver et al. 350-351).

**Religious construct of Judaism**

To identify the shared and the unique particularities to Christianity in continuity and discontinuity, it is essential to consider the principal tenets of Judaism.

“And the Lord God planted a garden … The tree of life was in the midst … And they heard the sound of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day …”\(^{69}\) is the first expression of a ‘centre’ for divine presence, found in the Garden of Eden. OT history shows the development: a garden, the whole earth,\(^{70}\) the tabernacle,\(^{71}\) the Jerusalem temple,\(^{72}\) the burning bush encounter with Moses\(^{73}\), reflect the same qualities and concept of divine presence and space. Through physical and geographical expressions of this presence, God is clearly exhibiting the divine desire for self-revelation and encounter with mankind.\(^{74}\) The dynamics are consistently God originated initiatives to which man is called to respond,\(^{75}\) a vital distinction from other world religions. It is important to recognize that physical places have no significance outside of the purpose of self-revelation. To define God by these places is erroneous because if the earth is his and all it contains, and this earth or creation is filled with the knowledge\(^{76}\) and glory\(^{77}\) of God,

---


\(^{69}\) Ge.2:8-9; 3:8; Dt.23:14.

\(^{70}\) Ps.74:12.

\(^{71}\) Ex.40:34-38; Ps.48:9.

\(^{72}\) 1Kg.8:10-11.

\(^{73}\) Ex.3:2-4.

\(^{74}\) Abraham Ge.15; Ge.35:9-15; Moses Ex.3:2-4; 34:29-35; David 1Sa.17:8; Jesus Is.52:10; Heb.1:1-4.

\(^{75}\) Dt.5:24-26.

\(^{76}\) Ps.19:1-6; Hab.2:14; Dt.10:14.

\(^{77}\) Ps.72:19; Is.6:3; Num.14:21.
His dwelling far exceeds the constraints of a physical place.\textsuperscript{78} This was Israel’s error of assumption that God’s dwelling is in heaven, but his permanent dwelling on earth is the Jerusalem temple. The assumption is disproved by the captivity and the seventy-year exile of Judah, (586-587 BC). It is prophetically disproved by Ezekiel who sees the ‘glory’ of the Lord that dwelt in the temple, leave the building.\textsuperscript{79} It was later disproved when the temple was violated by Epiphanes Antiochus IV (175-164) who consecrated a new altar to Zeus and offered pigs on the altar (145BC)\textsuperscript{80} (Josephus 327-328). The definitive destruction of Herod’s temple by Titus son of Emperor Vespasian, prophesied by Jesus, occurred in 70AD\textsuperscript{81} (Josephus 739-740). The significance of a ‘dwelling place’ is uniquely defined by the indwelling of the divine presence. God does not seem to be bound, (according to the texts referenced in the footnotes), to remain in his earthly dwelling when the people have abandoned His worship, introducing ‘other’ gods, forms, symbols, and rituals; that is to say, distanciation, representation, and authentication.

The focus on an authorized centre of worship, including sacrifices, offerings and feasts,\textsuperscript{82} is underlined in Deuteronomy,\textsuperscript{83} in contrast to the mobile tabernacle that is no longer heard of after Solomon’s coronation when David brings the ark to Jerusalem and builds another tent.\textsuperscript{84} The centrism this created endured until 70 AD. However, the point in question is the religious mind-set that this development engendered: the place where God dwells. Jesus’ relationship to the temple is not religious. He exorcises Jewish merchants from the temple space consecrated to the Gentiles in order that they meet God.\textsuperscript{85} When Jesus says, “I tell, you greater than the temple is here” (TLT Mt.12:6), this first indication announces a significant change. The Greek term for temple (‘ἱερόν’) literally translated

\textsuperscript{78} 1Kg.8:27; Is.66:1Jn.4:20-24.

\textsuperscript{79} Ez.8:4, 6; 9:3; 10:1, 3-5, 18-19; 11:22-23; Mal.2:10-11.

\textsuperscript{80} Mt.24:15; 1Maccabeus 1:41-61; Josephus The Antiquities of the Jews. Book 12, Chapter 7.6.

\textsuperscript{81} Josephus The Wars of the Jews. Book 6, Chapter 4.5-8.

\textsuperscript{82} Dt.14:22-29; 16:5-6.

\textsuperscript{83} Dt.12:5, 11, 14, 18, 21.

\textsuperscript{84} 1Ch.16:2, 39; 21:29; 2Ch.1:3, 13; Ch.1:4.

\textsuperscript{85} Mk.11:17; Is.56:7.
as ‘sacred,’ applies to the entire temple enclosure, implying a special, but formal external relationship with God. The NT always refers to Herod the Great’s temple (Zodhiates 761-762). The significance of Jesus words recorded by John, “[I will] … destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up… But he was speaking about the temple of his body” (NKJV Jn.2:19, 21) is found in the use of the word ‘ναὸν’ which refers to the Holy of Holies (Zodhiates 1004). This explicit reference to the divine presence is a word of accomplishment. It indicates that Jesus is the ‘τέλος’ of the physical temple building and clearly identifies his own person as the temple of the divine presence. Paul confirms this in Colossians “… that in Him is pleased and willingly all fullness dwells permanently” (TLT Col.1:19). This being so, there is migration from a religious to an existential and ontological understanding of the divine presence. Jesus words to the Samaritan woman demonstrate this fuller understanding for the believer in an ontological reality: “Jesus said to her, ‘Woman, believe me, the hour is coming when neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem will you worship the Father”’ (ESV Jn.4:21).

**Covenant**

The concept of covenant is interpreted both religiously and existentially. In seeking to define the nature and content of covenant, R.E. Clements explains three propositions (Clements 98-100):

i. ‘to make a solemn promise’ (quoting J.Begrich), with Canaanite cultural import from commercial agreements.

ii. a unilateral action, tantamount to meaning ‘to impose an obligation’ (quoting E.Kutsch) with the ideas of giving a promise or the binding of the other party…. A mutually conditioned covenant agreement…

iii. a political form of treaty a suzerain power granted a covenant to a subordinate (vassal) power… bilateral obligation was present (quoting G.E. Mendenhall)… [Distinguishing] vassal-treaty covenants from promissory covenants.

The structure of the Mosaic covenant does bear some resemblance in structure to the ‘Hammurabi Code’ or the Hittite Law, also representative of the Egyptian and Babylonian

---

86 ‘ἱερόν’ 2411 TGL 2016.
forms (Henderson *Ruth* 70-71). Biblical covenants between God and his people, Israel, were: promissory,\(^{87}\) always relationally bilateral,\(^{88}\) whether with one person, a family or a nation;\(^{89}\) they were unconditional\(^{90}\) and conditional,\(^{91}\) and transgenerational;\(^{92}\) they encompassed societal,\(^{93}\) sacerdotal,\(^{94}\) ritual,\(^{95}\) economic,\(^{96}\) moral,\(^{97}\) and legal\(^{98}\) rules.

Now this is the law\(^{99}\) (‘tôrâh’), which Moses set before the children of Israel. These are the testimonies\(^{100}\) (‘ēḏāh’), the statutes\(^{101}\) (‘hōq’), and the judgments\(^{102}\) (‘mišpāṯ’), which Moses spoke to the children of Israel after they came out of Egypt … Therefore, you shall keep the commandment\(^{103}\) (‘mišwāh’), the statutes, and the judgments which I command you today, to observe them (NKJV Dt.4:44-45; 7:11).

It is evident that the nature of covenant embraces a wide variety of content and function in relation to the people of Israel. There is an evolution from the primitive covenant with Abraham, for example, where the relational aspect of commitment is clearly identified.

---

\(^{87}\) Ge.12:1-3.

\(^{88}\) Dt.7:6-14; 14:2.

\(^{89}\) Ge.9:8-17; Ge.15; Num.25:12.

\(^{90}\) Ge.9:11; 2Sa.7:16.

\(^{91}\) Ex.19:5, 24:7; Dt.5:31-33.

\(^{92}\) Ge.26:3-4; Ge.28:10-17; 35:9-12; Ex.2:24; Lev.23:42, 45; Dt.4:9; 6:1-6.

\(^{93}\) Lev.11-15; 19; Num.15.

\(^{94}\) Ex.28; Lev.9-10; Num.3:12-13, 41; 8:10-11.

\(^{95}\) Feasts Ex.23, Lev.22-23; Lev.16; Offerings Lev.1-5.

\(^{96}\) Lev.25; 27.

\(^{97}\) Lev.17:9-13; Ex.22:5-22; Lev.5:16; Num.5:7-8.

\(^{98}\) Dt.4:44-45; 6:1-4; 29:21; Ps.78:10.

\(^{99}\) Instruction or law, referring to the whole law of legal, cultic or civil instructions, Baker and Carpenter p1220.

\(^{100}\) A witness to a fact or event, Baker and Carpenter p806.

\(^{101}\) Ritual or regulation prescribed by decree or custom, Baker and Carpenter p371.

\(^{102}\) A legal decision, Baker and Carpenter p687-688.

\(^{103}\) In the plural designates the entire corpus of divine law and instruction, Baker and Carpenter p654.
The whole of the historical OT rests upon the framework of the journey to fulfilment and the subsequent loss of the two founding promises: a numerous people and a land. Through the seventy years exile prophesied by Jeremiah, there was no remedy to the people’s infidelity to God and the covenant. God’s intention remained covenantal, ‘you will be my people and I will be your God’. The ministry of Ezra to the returning exiles was renewal of the Mosaic covenant, in sacrifices and feasts, and cultic offerings. The significance of the Mosaic covenant in its multiple facets remained the valid means of restoring relationship to God through covenantal obedience. The rebuilding of the temple and city were not the fruit of covenant renewal rather the divine decree under Cyrus, the Lord’s anointed, a messianic appellation. God renewing ‘my people, your God’ is the very heart of covenant relationship. The Mosaic covenant renewal is evidently the only way the people, priests and Levites, knew how to seek reconciliation on their part to God. Their self-understanding is apprehended by the uniqueness of covenant relationship between God and Israel.

For ask now concerning the days that are past, which were before you, since the day that God created man on the earth, and ask from one end of heaven to the other, whether any great thing like this has happened, or anything like it has been heard. "Did any people ever hear the voice of God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as you have heard, and live? "Or did God ever try to go and take for Himself a nation from the midst of another nation, by trials, by signs, by wonders, by war, by a mighty hand and an outstretched arm, and by great terrors, according to all that the LORD your God did for you in Egypt before your eyes? "To you it was shown, that

---

104 Ge.12:1-2; 15:5-7; Jos.21:42-45.
105 Jer.25:11; see also Dan.9:2, 24.
106 2Ch.36:14-16.
107 Jer.24:4-7.
108 Ne.10:28-29.
109 Ez.3:2-6; 6:16-22; Ne.8:1-3; 13-18.
112 Is.42:1; 49:5; Is.61:1; Ps.2:2.
you might know that the LORD Himself is God; there is none other besides Him. "Out of heaven He let you hear His voice, that He might instruct you; on earth He showed you His great fire, and you heard His words out of the midst of the fire. "And because He loved your fathers, therefore He chose their descendants after them; and He brought you out of Egypt with His Presence, with His mighty power, "driving out from before you nations greater and mightier than you, to bring you in, to give you their land as an inheritance, as it is this day. "Therefore, know this day, and consider it in your heart, that the LORD Himself is God in heaven above and on the earth beneath; there is no other (NKJV Dt.4:32-39).

In the full cycle of the OT to the post-exile period, the biblical text closes underlining the same old problems: infidelity, idolatry, and syncretism. Regardless of the covenant renewals, the prophetic recalls to the Lord and his ways, the inability of human nature to comply with the wider comprehension of covenant is unmistakable.

The presumption of Israel, ¹¹³ bred through the unconditional and promissory aspects of covenant are exemplified in the prophet Malachi’s writings. The dialectic dialogue forms around eleven questions ¹¹⁴ that challenge presumptuously the foundations of covenant relationship with God:

i. “How have you loved us?” Israel questions being the object of God’s love (ESV 1:2)

ii. “How have we despised your name?” Absence of honour or reverence (1:6)

iii. “How have we polluted you?” poorest or defective quality of offerings defiling the altar (1:7)

iv. “What a weariness this, and you snort at it…” Weariness of making offerings (1:13)

v. “Have we not all one father? Has not one God created us? Why then are we faithless… profaning the covenant…?” Claim to divine parenthood, yet faithless in relationships with God and each other (2:10)

¹¹³ Dt.17:13; Ne.9:16, 29.

¹¹⁴ Mal.1:2, 6, 7, 13; 2:10, 17; 3:7, 8, 13, 14.
vi. “Why does he not?” God will not accept offerings when marriage relationships are defiled with infidelity (2:14)

vii. “How have we wearied him?” The Lord surprisingly wearied by words of the evil doers perceived as good, acceptable before the Lord (2:17)

viii. “How shall we return?” Invitation to return yet incapable of knowing how and therefore unconscious of the Lord’s requirements and their wrongdoing (3:7)

ix. “How have we robbed you?” Robbing God of tithes and offerings at appointed feasts (3:8)

x. “How have we spoken against you?” Vanity of serving God not perceived as ‘against’ Him (3:13)

xi. “What is the profit…?” Keeping of commandments despised because of lacking benefit (3:14)

The purpose of this list is to underline the nature of the sin of presumption. The confusion concerns the unconditional offer of God in covenant ‘I will be your God, and you will be my people’ that stipulated ethical codes and divine commandments to Israel for cultic life. Israel’s presumption was to no longer consider these essential elements as conditional to covenant agreement. Performing the rite sufficed without regard for the meaning and purpose. To consider oneself a member of Israel was sufficient evidence to benefit from God’s unconditional covenant love (‘הֵסֶד’) and blessing albeit divorced from the stipulations or responsibilities. These become dogma and are relegated to intellectual ascent, rather than the disposition to “love God with all you heart, your soul, your strength.”115 The words of Isaiah resume well, “But the word of the LORD was to them, "Precept upon precept, precept upon precept, Line upon line, line upon line, Here a little, there a little," That they might go and fall backward, and be broken and snared and caught” (NKJV Is.28:10, 13).

The detachment or distanciation from meaning, significance and purpose leave only a void religious act. In terms of belief, a ‘positional or objective’ stance is all that remains, whereby the facts and ordonnances are known and comprehended but have no bearing

115 Dt.6:5.
upon the lives of the believers, insignificance, and alienation result. Understanding of covenant filial relationship of belonging and identification in the bond of ‘חֵסֶד’ covenant love, the positional and objective mind-set will not attain to this deeper purpose of covenant that reconciles mankind to his subjectivity. The point is well reflected in the portrait of the elder prodigal son in Luke fifteen. All the religious conventions of observance, obedience, conformity are present, in an objective or positional sense all seems right, yet the elder son is prodigal too because he is lacking and finds Himself with the impossibility of entering into the filial subjective relationship extended to him by the Father.¹¹⁶ This son is a type of religious Israel and religiosity in contrast to the younger prodigal who is the type of covenant filial relationship. Religiously, life is contained within the ritual act, rather than the act leading to an encounter with the One who is source of life. Furthermore, the resulting detachment leads to a presumptuous redefining of what constitutes a genuine act of worship. One is no longer concerned with conformity to God’s covenant statutes rather the invention of other means that are deemed to be acceptable substitutes, as reflected in the Malachi presumptions.

One further aspect of the presumption is the relationship to immanence which becomes assumed in that it is impossible to conceive that God would not be present. However, the fall of Judah clearly shows that God has no regard for Jerusalem nor its temple when it is not representative of genuine relationship and worship.¹¹⁷ God’s transcendence is manifest in dealing with the people of Israel and the nations at that time.¹¹⁸ God’s covenantal relationship, always holds together transcendence and immanence in tension.¹¹⁹ In moving on from religious considerations, the full demonstration of this tension is found in the person of Jesus Christ, God and Man who is the covenant.¹²⁰

¹¹⁶ Lk.15:25-32.
¹¹⁷ Jer.25:8-11.
¹¹⁸ Jer.25:11-14.
A New Covenant prophesied\textsuperscript{121}

In response to the religious construct, God inspires the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel to prophesy a new covenant. The three prophets from different geographical places and in different times concur:

"As for Me," says the LORD, "this is My covenant with them: My Spirit who is upon you, and My words which I have put in your mouth, shall not depart from your mouth, nor from the mouth of your descendants, nor from the mouth of your descendants’ descendants," says the LORD, "from this time and forevermore" (NKJV Is.59:21).

"Behold, the days are coming, says the LORD, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah—"not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, My covenant which they broke, though I was a husband to them, says the LORD But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith Jehovah: I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people (NKJV Jer.31:31-32, ASV 31:33)

And I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them a heart of flesh; "that they may walk in My statutes and keep My judgments and do them; and they shall be My people, and I will be their God. (ASV Ez.11:19, NKJV 11:20)

A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. "I will put My Spirit within you and cause you to walk in My statutes, and you will keep My judgments and do them (ASV Ez.36:26, NKJV 36:27).

A brief synthesis of ideas identifies the following:

\textsuperscript{121} Is.59:21; Jer.31:33; Ez.11:18; 36:26-27.
i. Isaiah and Jeremiah explicitly refer to covenant, Ezekiel does so indirectly indicating to statutes and judgments, reminiscent of the Mosaic covenant. Jeremiah distinctly refers to a new covenant.

ii. Isaiah calls to God’s words (‘dāḥār’),122 Jeremiah to his law (‘tôrâh’), and Ezekiel to his statutes (‘hōq’) and judgments (‘mišpāṯ’).

iii. Contextually, this prophecy is spoken over Israel and Judah. It clearly cannot apply to the post-exile period as we have demonstrated previously, the religious pattern and problem persist. It looks forward to a new era.

iv. The ‘new’ in this covenant refers to the words ‘in’ your mouth, (Is.59:21); my law ‘in’ your inward parts, your heart (Jer.31:33); a new heart and my Spirit ‘within’ (Ez.36:26-27). This contrasts with the Mosaic Covenant entreaty to hear, learn, keep, walk, love, obey, do and teach.123 Moses says, "For this commandment which I command you today is not too mysterious for you, nor is it far off… But the word is very near you, in your mouth and in your heart, that you may do it” (NKJV Dt.30:11, 14).

Isaiah refers several times in prophetic announcements to God doing a new thing124. He may point to historical events around the fall of Judah and the subsequent captivity and return; however, this ‘new’ thing takes precedence.

In relationship to covenant, which will be discussed further in the next section, Isaiah’s text distinguishes between Israel, “them” and the singular “you” in the following phrase. Alec Motyer comments, “Two things in this verse come without forewarning: the covenant which the Lord grants to them, and the covenant mediator, the singular you, through whom the promised blessings of the divine Spirit and word are secured for endless generations” (492). Additionally, attention is drawn to the Servant Songs where the covenant is no longer a legal, ethical, cultic, promissory tablet or book, but a person, “I, the LORD, have called You in righteousness, And will hold Your hand; I will keep

122 A generic term for word, speech, human and divine, of decrees, poetry, prophecy, the Decalogue. (Baker and Carpenter p223).


You and give You as a covenant to the people, As a light to the Gentiles …” (NKJV Is.42:6). And again, “Thus says the LORD: In an acceptable time I have heard You, And in the day of salvation I have helped You; I will preserve You and give You As a covenant to the people, To restore the earth, To cause them to inherit the desolate heritages…” (NKJV Is.49:8). The covenant concept of ‘tôrâh’ is confirmed in the same spirit, “Listen to Me, My people; And give ear to Me, O My nation: For law will proceed from Me, And I will make My justice rest As a light of the peoples” (NKJV Is.51:4).

For the purposes of comparing religion to ontological or existential experience, these texts introduce a significant development from ‘book’ to ‘person’. The incarnation of covenant and ‘tôrâh’ in the person of Messiah, Jesus Christ sets forth the nature and substance of the new covenant in Him. The commitment of this covenant engages God to operate this miraculous indwelling whereby human nature is directly transformed by the divine presence and nature.

The heralding of this new era inaugurated by the appearance of Jesus Christ, also announces a paradigmatic transition in how God operates His covenant in the believer. This development from religious ascent, adherence, and ritual to an existential reality whereby God Himself, His Spirit, Jesus Christ the τέλος, indwell the believer to accomplish covenant, is incontestable. All that religion can do serves to reinforce that it is the sum of its content, revelation, and practices, defined as the pedagogical and precursory to this new covenant existential reality. In this the original intentions are restored, distanciation, representation and authentication, “[this] religion [that] has been made for [the believer]… by others, communicated to him by tradition, determined to fixed forms by imitation, and retained by habit” (James 9), are rendered obsolete in the measure that the new covenant of ontological and existential reality operates in the believer.

**Christianity and Jesus Christ**

“The Christian claim is that Christ is unique: Christianity is not. Christianity can be classified under all the normal headings of a study of human society and religion” (Beaver et al. 357), is arguably a limited assertion to the true nature of Christianity and of Christ. This chapter seeks to demonstrate that Christianity is not religious but existential in nature on the basis of Christ and the New Covenant. The uniqueness is as much the nature of
Christ and more comprehensively of Trinitarian Godhead, as it is the ‘mode’ of the believer’s existence that is archetypal and prototypical according to Christ.

For Jesus came, not with a new ‘religion’, a new code or a new philosophy, but to meet human bankruptcy and rottenness with its pain and separation from God… He came also to initiate a new order, a completely new start for the human race, a new creation which began with his own resurrection from the dead^{125} (Beaver et al. 363).

If it were not for the uniqueness of Jesus Christ, Christianity would comfortably remain comparative of world religions without contention. In order to renew authentic Christianity, it’s definition and it’s substance has to recover ontologically and existentially from the person of Jesus Christ who is: the Originator, because he is Creator, Mediator by (‘διὰ’) whom all was made, the Definer of all existing things, the Raison d’être in that all things find purpose and meaning because these come from (‘ἐν’) Him and lead to (‘εἰς’) Him.^{126} If Christianity is abated to a comparative religious supposition that is to deny its existential and ontological foundations revealed in Jesus Christ.

**Philosophical influences**

The contemporary resurgence of ‘Monism’ compounds this effect by the depersonalization of Jesus Christ and subsequently human beings while retaining the ontological and existential experience of the ‘spiritual or divine’. The term ‘Monism’ was coined by German philosopher Christian Wolff (1679-1754) although the metaphysical theory of ‘oneness’ as the origin and substance of the universe emanating from ‘One’, can be dated back to Parmenides, (150 BC)^{127} (Atkinson and Field 603-604), and developed by the influential Neo-platonist Plotinus (205-270 BC).^{128}

“Everything is numerically one … Everything is of one kind … physical (naturalism and materialism) or immaterial and spiritual (idealism), or else neutral regarding the matter-

^{126} 1Co.8:6; Heb.1:2-3; 2:10; Col.1:15-16.
spirit distinction” (Wright and Ferguson et al. 442). In Brahmanism, “the seventh-century thinker Gaudapada, denied individuation and plurality.”

Ancient Gnosticism held that everything flows from one purely spiritual principle. The origins of matter were explained as a flaw in a long line of successive emanations from the ‘One’ principle. While matter is impure, its existence is temporary; Gnostic eschatology states that ultimately the original unity and purity will be restored. Gnostic sects include the Syrian school and the Alexandrian school (early second century).

God is therefore one manifestation of the all-inclusive Absolute Being, rather than Himself, the one eternal reality (Wright and Ferguson et al. 442). Others such as Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814) perceived God as the ‘All’ or the ‘One’ which was progress from some atheistic conceptions. One notable historical figure Johannes Scottus Eriugena (scholar to King Charles le Chauve, France around 845-875), in the Neo-platonic tradition, formulates a four-part cycle theory whereby the “multiplicity from the One … returns into the One … all things will return to their primordial causes and human beings…” His categories are:

i. That which creates and is not created, in reference to the nature of God

ii. That which creates and is created, primordial ideas from where God from all eternity created all species

iii. That which is created and does not create, referring to animal and plant life

iv. That which is neither created nor creates, in reference to God not as Creator but as ‘Ultimate Good’ towards which all things return. The problem of a transcendent God of the created universe is resolved by saying that God is the whole system, thereby conserving Monist integrity.

In contemporary times ‘Monism’ is a significant force that transcends religious, cultural, philosophical and psychological categories with a strong existential and ontological emphasis. One leading proponent, Steve Taylor confirms,

---

I began to detach the concept of spiritual awakening from religious and even spiritual traditions. I began to see it as a particular state of mind and being that could be interpreted in terms of spiritual traditions but didn’t necessarily belong to them … However, the shift into wakefulness can also occur…most often does…outside these traditions and so doesn’t have to be interpreted in religious or spiritual terms (Taylor 2-3).

His approach analyzes and synthesizes religions and philosophies in search of those experiencing spiritual awakening, harmonizing common themes such as: ethical behaviour, purification, renunciation, or detachment, serving others and meditation (82-87). This awakening to the ‘all-pervading spiritual force’ in the universe and in creation, is common to humanity, enables psychological ‘remoulding’ of our ‘self-system’ to attain ‘oneness’. The detachment from self and ego to find a truer self is a key part of the process. Everyone who engages in spiritual practice is instinctively moving in the same direction. They are not attempting to remodel their self-system according to their own independent agenda. They are developing essentially the same characteristics … the same type of new self-system that is forming inside them (Taylor 103).

It is a present-day movement to depersonalize religious experience. In the case of Christianity, it depersonalizes the Triune God, favouring the communion with the ‘One’ absorbed Creator-creature, so evident in Monism. It is the foundation for a ‘new religion’. Emile Durkheim\(^\text{130}\) saw this from far off when he said, “… individual religions are a very frequent occurrence in history, but some ask themselves today if these are not called to become the preeminent form of religious life and if one day will come when there will exist no other religion than that which each one practices freely in his or her inner life” (50).

**Existential Christianity**

The purpose of this section therefore is to draw clear distinctions between the criteria in religious constructs from which ontological Christianity requires untangling. This is done by defining clearly the ontology of the person of Jesus Christ from whom individuality and personhood draw their origins in an existential experience.

---

\(^{130}\) Quotation from the original French writings, translated wherever quoted by Erwin S Henderson.
This section of the chapter has set out historical and religious influences upon existential and ontological Christianity in the light of pluralistic religious understanding. Innate spiritual consciousness in every human being has been affirmed; seeking for expression of the tangible presence of the Supreme God. In that pursuit, three observations emerge: distanciation, representation and authentication which rather than give place to genuine direct personal interaction with God, create a pseudo-religious or spiritual experience because it has lost immanence and remains ‘παιδαγωγός’. The construction of external rituals, ceremonies, signs, and symbols rather than create immanence are the means of maintaining distanciation from the original divine intention. The paradigmatic shift that occurs in Jesus Christ requires new considerations to be taken into account, to reflect the unique character of Christianity whereby external ritual religious expression has been brought to fulfillment in Him. He thereby introduces believers into an ontological relationship with the Triune Godhead and a conception of spiritual existence rather than religious observation and ascent. Schaff perceived the Protestant reformation in similar terms,

It was a grand act of emancipation from the bondage of the mediaeval hierarchy, and an assertion of that freedom wherewith Christ has made us free. It inaugurated the era of manhood and the general priesthood of believers. It taught the direct communion of the believing soul with Christ. It removed the obstructions of legalism, sacerdotalism, and ceremonialism, which, like the traditions of the Pharisees of old, had obscured the genuine Gospel and made void the Word of God (History of the Creeds 204-205).

As he compares the Catholic religion with the Protestant construct certain criteria support the ontological construct from his analysis. The “religion of legalism, asceticism, sacerdotalism, and ceremonialism” has become Christianity “of evangelism and spiritual simplicity;” directing people to the “fountain-head of divine revelation, rather than “to the teaching priesthood.” It is a Christianity of “personal conviction and inward experience” rather than “outward institutions and sacramental observances, and obedience to authority.” It puts “Christ before the Church” rather than the “Church before Christ,” in a “church of the Christian people” rather than “the Church of priests.” While one is “conservative and traditional,” with the “danger of stagnation and mechanical and tyrannical uniformity,” the other is “progressive and independent, exposed to the danger
of radicalism and endless division” (Ibid. 206-209). History would recognize the values of such a reform and at the same time perceive how reform over time has become institutionalized. The restoration of ontological and existential Christianity similarly is the opportunity for reform but moves beyond that definition to offer a profound theological renewal and construct.

This crucial point constitutes the meeting of the ontological Trinitarian Godhead, as expounded in chapter two, with the divine intention of believers who are brought into the ontological and existential reality intended by God, in which immanence is perfectly fulfilled in the Godhead, individually and collectively in the believer.

This next section explores the definition of human kind and how the Godhead demonstrate the cohesion between humankind constituted in every part, in the image of God, and intended to be complete integrated spiritual human beings.
BEING HUMAN: IDENTITY AND TEN STATES OF MANKIND

Introduction

The task is to explore the biblical texts in order to compose an integral vision of humankind substantially. Consideration will be given to traditional theories after which an ontological proposal will be elaborated. Human identity is a vast subject for the sciences. In theology, traditional views of describing human nature generally follow a tripartite or bipartite principle which will now be examined.

Theories of trichotomy or dichotomy

The ‘tripartite’ tradition identifies the human being as divided into three distinct parts: the body, being physical, material or matter, the soul, as immaterial, mortal, principle of animal (lower) life, and the spirit as immaterial, immortal, rational (higher soul) and capable of spiritual communion. A typical view sets understanding, emotion and sensibility (Arno 10), or intellect, will and emotion in the soul that can sin (Grudem 472). The spirit of man is the ‘rational soul’ thereby uniting mind or intellect as the rational and therefore spiritual, whereby man communes with God, as held by the ‘Substantialist’ understanding of the image of God reflected in man (Atkinson and Field 23). The trichotomic vocabulary employs, regarding soul and spirit, the lower soul and higher soul.

When Adam disobeyed, sin separated his heart (lower soul) from his spirit (upper soul). In order for unsaved individuals to meet their temperament needs … they usually draw from the lower soul or use humanistic methods. A person who is saved, then, would meet his/her temperament needs by drawing from the higher soul or the spirit (Arno 9-10).

The danger with this statement with regards to a further dissection of humanity between believers and unbelievers, is that it infers that unbelievers either do not have spirit or upper soul, or that it is deactivated until conversion, which is untenable. As Grudem states, commenting on first Corinthians chapter three, on categorizing spiritual states, does not say that “Christians have a spirit whereas non-Christians do not, or that the spirit of a Christian is alive while the spirit of a non-Christian is not. Paul is not talking about

---

different parts of man at all…” (479). Berkhof observes that the Alexandrian fathers favoured the “crudest form of trichotomy… which takes the body for the material part of man’s nature, the soul as the principle of animal life, and the spirit as the God-related rational and immortal element in man” (191). The trichotomist concludes these are “designate component parts” (Ibid. 193) of human nature, distinguishable and separate but not divided. This being so, because of the nature of body, soul and spirit, internal dualistic conflicts oppose a sense of unity in nature. The internal conflict is well emphasized by W.D. Stacey in the following statement: “The persistence of sinful acts suggests a principle of sin in each man, a lower sinful nature; it was identified with the flesh. The flesh became synonym for the lower nature in general in contrast to the higher self …” (quoted in Ladd 515).

In attempting to explain the distinction between ‘soul’ (‘νεπες’ or ‘ψυχή’) and ‘spirit’ (rūah or ‘πνεῦμα’) “… ‘πνεῦμα’ representing humanity in its Godward side, while ‘ψυχή’ representing its human side” (Ladd 501),

Psyche and pneuma are not strictly interchangeable but refer to a person’s inner life viewed from two points of view. Pneuma is one’s inner self viewed in terms of relationship to God and to other people; psyche is the individual as a living being, as a human personality, the vitality of a person viewed from the point of view of her or his own body and flesh (Ladd 502).

While these conceptions give insight, it is still founded upon the premise of identifiable component parts or in the words of F.W. Bridger “atomistic individual images …”2 (Atkinson and Field 23). Underlying Bridger’s comment is the antipathy for the Substantialist’s rational dissection of human nature; the primacy of the rational faculty in the sphere of the spirit’s activity is dubious.

The dichotomist view, held “in the Latin Church” (Berkhof 192), is the recognition of the body as the material and the spirit as the immaterial and immortal, the two compositional parts of human nature. The ‘πνεῦμα’ “designates the spiritual element in man as the principle of life and action which controls the body” (Berkhof 194). The concept of ‘ψυχή’ is the appellation of the same element described by ‘πνεῦμα’, designating inner life. They are considered synonymous or interchangeable by dichotomists, who “… agree

that Scripture uses the word spirit (ruach) and the Greek pneuma more frequently when referring to relationship to God … The word soul is also used in all the ways that spirit can be used” (Grudem 472). The human “pneuma is a person’s true inner self … her or his self-consciousness as a willing and knowing self” (Ladd 504). “The spirit of the human being is the true ego, the better self, the spiritual nature in which that person is most kindred to God, that imperishable part which relates him or her to the eternal and imperishable world” (Ladd 512-513).

The quality of the ‘πνεῦμα’ is the essence of personal identity and the witness to personal existence. The distinction is drawn between the human ‘πνεῦμα’ and the Holy Spirit. In relation to the human spirit, various words express it: spirit, soul, heart and mind (Berkhof 193). Ladd confirms the distinction by saying, “It is because humans possess pneuma that they are capable of being related to God” (506), “… man has spirit but is soul …” (Berkhof 194), tries to underline the constitution of man, which is reductionist if soul is related to man’s subjective inner experience. Man is spiritual because he is formed of ‘πνεῦμα’, to be distinguished from God who is Spirit.3

The body on the other hand, is the material part, inseparable from the spirit. It is the place where spiritual and human life is experienced. Bultmann makes the statement, “Man does not have a soma, he is soma”4 (Quoted in Ladd 506) thereby emphasizing the constitutional nature of the body to mankind, and the place of the indwelling spirit and the Holy Spirit. The common error, derived from Greek philosophy, is the confusion between body (‘σῶμα’) and flesh (‘σάρξ’). The ‘σῶμα’ is never spoken of negatively in the NT as by its definition refers to the entity of body and is temple of the Spirit.5 ‘σάρξ’ has a diversity of meanings in Scripture, from the basic constitution of physical flesh and bone, to an entity that is subject to the power of sin.6 Despite the declarations of the dichotomist position of unity of body and spirit in one, tradition and history in theology clearly show the strong influence of dualism between spirit and flesh, between Holy Spirit

---

3 Jn.4:2.

4 Quoting Theology of the NT 1:194, R. Bultmann.

5 1Co.6:19.

6 Ro.8:3-5; Gal.5:16-24.
and flesh, which compounds the effect of dualism between body (‘σῶμα’) and flesh (‘σάρξ’).

**Origins and Influences**

In order to clarify, a critique of tradition in the light of the biblical data is necessary.

**Antiquity**

John H. Walton found, in the ‘Epic of Atrahasis’ in Mesopotamian literature, that the flesh of the god gave the human ghost (‘etemmu’), the blood provided human intellect, self or soul, (‘temu’). The body was shaped from clay; there is an interesting symbolism in comparison with the ‘dust’ of which Adam was formed. The distinction is that from clay something could be modelled, but from dust, as a basic material, nothing could be formed. The point is that Adam was created from the inconceivable. In antiquity, his creation would be understood as ‘ex-nihilo.’ A tripartite composition of spirit, soul (immaterial) and body (material) seems to emerge (210).

In Egyptian thought, mankind was formed of a body (‘djet’), in addition to which three parts existed: ‘ka’, ‘ba’, and ‘akh’. ‘Ka’ refers to the aspect of human nature that is linked to the supernatural, translating as identity and temperament, as a reflection of the inclusive whole of a human. ‘Ba’ is identified with cognition and mental capacity, and is the representation or appearance of self, portrayed in the public realm. Some would identify this as personality (from the Latin ‘personata’ meaning mask). If this is part of the meaning, then it is not necessarily an authentic public representation of the true self. ‘Ba’ is perceived as independent from the body and is immortal, continuing to exist after death. ‘Akh’ is often translated as spirit and survives death in a ghost form. A person’s ‘akh’ in life or death had moral and volitional capacity to do good or evil. So, in Egyptian thought a person is composed of a physical body, an internal cognitive immortal sense of identity, of self and an external projection of self, and immortal spirit existing in a disembodied form after death (Walton 211-212).

**Hebrew thought**

Walton, in leading towards Hebrew conceptions, finds that the terminology above does not correspond. In the OT Hebrew scriptures, the predominant term to describe the nature
of mankind is ‘nepeš’ which is more prominent than references defining the body. There is distinction between ‘nepeš’ (principle of vitality) and ‘bāšār’ (body of inert substance), but it is not to be confused with the dualism of Greek philosophy or of the resulting Western thinking. The soul is portrayed as: activity, character, consciousness, intellect, emotional and physical cravings. “In the metaphysical realm, the nephesh is that which experiences life and represents living” (Walton 214). The ‘rūah’ or often ‘spirit’ refers to vitality in the physical body, a divine gift, manifested in external powers or activities to the body. Where the ‘nephesh’ is sensorial, (feel, sense, awareness, perception), the ‘rūah’ is consciousness and vitality. It is difficult to demonstrate that a person has his/her own ‘rūah’. Rather, each person has God’s ‘rūah’. The ‘rūah’ of all creatures returns to God because it is his (Walton 214). It sometimes equates to an external force that acts in the human body and intellect. The prophets of the OT exemplify this phenomenon. The nature and action of the ‘rūah’ of God in Ezekiel chapter thirty-seven, typifies the OT anticipation of a unique work of the Spirit of God. The ‘rūah’ in this text is translated ‘breath’ or synonymously ‘Spirit’. The meaning is that the breath causes life, reflective of the breath of God into Adam making him a living ‘nepeš’. The body originated with the parents while the spirit, life and/or soul are attributed to God, according to the Palestinian Talmud. The Talmudic Judaism considers the soul as a supernatural entity created and bestowed by God enjoined to a physical body. The soul is seen as an active element and therefore responsible for sin in the body, the body being considered only as a means. Urbach observes that in Talmudic Judaism the ethical duality of the soul is expressed in: impulses, choices, or decisions for good or bad, self-centeredness or generosity, and envy. This duality is not eradicated but is to be mastered. Urbach argues that the pre-existence of souls dates from after the third century and is a later development, while according to Talmudic writings, the soul was considered immortal.

7 ‘nepeš’ 753 times in the OT; ‘bāšār’ 368 times.


9 Life, ‘nephesh,’ is in the blood, blood is the nephesh Lev.17:11; Dt.12:23.

10 Num.11:25-29 70 Elders of Israel; Jud.14:6, 19; 15:14; Samson; 1Sa.10:5-6; 19:20-24 Saul; Jer.1:4-11; Ez.2:1-2; Am.7:14-15.

11 Ge.2:7.
leaving the body at death and re-joining it at the resurrection. The later developments of Judaism succumb to strong Platonic and Aristotelian Greek philosophical influences, as observed in the writings of Issac Husik (1916). Yitshaq Yisra’eli (850-950) is deeply Platonic distinguishing: i. The rational soul (with wisdom and moral discernment faculties); ii. The animal soul, (perception, movement, appearances as in animals) ; iii. The vegetative soul, (nutritive, growth, reproduction) “These distinctions, with major and minor variations, were to become common in Jewish as well as in Muslim and Christian writings.” Mosheh ben Maimon (1135-1204) expanded on the nature of the soul by developing five aspects of the complete soul:

i. Nutritive, ii. Sensorial or Sensitive, iii. Imaginative, iv. Appetites (desires and emotions), v. Rationality or Intellect. Maimonidean’s Intellectual approach was deemed a danger and was countered in the fourteenth century by Hasdai Crescas. His rejection concerned some of the Greek influences: the separation of soul and body for a unified vision; that the intellect took primacy in the conception and functioning of the soul, arguing that the will and emotions were fundamental components sharing primacy in human nature (Fig.VI).12

One last important consideration is the Qabbalistic school.

Kabbalah refers to Jewish mysticism dating back to the time of the second Temple, approximately four hundred years before Jesus Christ. For many years, the Kaballah religion existed as a carefully guarded oral tradition before it became systematized and dispersed in the Middle Ages.13

There are ten ‘Sefirot’14 attributes of God emanating from God through creation of the universe. “They exist as the backbone of the spiritual realm that exists somehow between

---


14 “What is Kabbalah?” The Kabbalah Centre. Accessed: 30 December 2018. https://kabbalah.com/en/about-us The 10 Sefirot: keter (divine crown), binah (understanding), hesed (loving-kindness), malkhut (kingdom or kingship), tif’eret (grandeur or beauty), hokhmah (wisdom), din (justice or strength), nezah (eternity), hod (glory or splendour), yesod (foundation), shekinah (God’s presence in the world).
God's essence and our reality … in particular describes how God runs the universe, which is a much more powerful and more revealing glimpse of God's actual self…” In relating to soul there are three parts in this philosophy: i. ‘nephesh’ vital life, orders physical and psychological, entering the body at birth and hovers over the dead person for a while; ii. ‘rūaḥ’ comes into being when a person can overcome the body and its desires, an ethical dimension, at death it is assigned an earthly realm according to its level of virtue; iii. ‘neshamah’ the highest part of the soul, the divine spark, produced through study and application of the ‘Tôrâh’, awakening the higher centre and revealing God and the secrets of his creation; at death it returns to God, its residence.¹⁵ A table (Fig.VI) in the appendix contrasts the evolutions of Judaic beliefs about human nature.

In this synthesis of Hebraic beliefs concerning human nature and in particular the soul in comparison to the vision of human being in Christ presents several limitations: the soul or spirit being rendered synonymous with the mind or intellect is to follow a philosophical understanding that undermines the relationship of the Person of the Spirit to human nature. The reference to lower or animal soul as to the body is neutrally connotated as the entity of sin and its power determines the character of its manifestation; of itself soul is the vital life principle in a holistic sense. In response to the Kabbalah finer distinctions of higher life, the NT attributes indwelling and governance of the Spirit of God whereby all aspects of human nature are affected by divine life. As such there is no additional mysterious power to be had, the extent of the Spirit’s sphere of influence, which is in constant growth, will determine the nature of vital life, the power to see all of human nature aligned with the Spirit and the same Spirit as source of ultimate revelation of Godhead. The general acceptance that soul is a conscious sense of self agrees with the Scriptures.

Greek Philosophy

In apprehending fuller understanding of the NT, consideration of the Greek influences upon conception of human nature, is significant. The writings of Plato, expressing his primary focus on societal organization, relates that directly to the individual’s inner order,
‘Republic’ is no more than a series of attempts by man to put order or disorder in his societal life according to the intelligence that was given to him by god to raise up above the simple matter and that which distinguishes him from other animals. It is not possible for man to put his societal life in order if he cannot firstly put order in his own inner life. No one is apt to govern others as long as he is incapable of governing Himself (Plato 428-348).16

Plato’s conception of human nature comes from his perception of societal structure, “As the State was composed of three classes, traders, auxiliaries, counsellors.”17 (590) “… And so of the individual; we may assume that he has the same three principles in his own soul which are found in the State” (585). Plato’s reasoning leads him to the conclusion that justice of the state requires all three classes to work accordingly. Likewise, the just person, will experience the ordered working of the three parts that constitute his nature (591).

The one with which man reasons, we may call the rational principle of the soul, the other, with which he loves and hungers and thirsts and feels the flutterings of any other desire, may be termed the irrational or appetitive, the ally of sundry pleasures and satisfactions? (586).

In this description Plato resumes the interrelation of the three constituent parts of human nature, “… in whom the one ruling principle of reason, and the two subject ones of spirit and desire are equally agreed that reason ought to rule, and do not rebel?” (592). Rational mind holds primacy over the other parts, while the spirit seems to be exemplified by passion or vitality, and distinct from desire that includes love and appetites. Desire, especially strong sexual desire (‘concupiscence’), is in opposition to reason as the third element of the soul. Plato refers to the example of young children and to the education of the spirit determining the outcome for good or bad, “when corrupted by bad education is the natural auxiliary of reason” (590).


The just or ordered man, exercises mastery and control over the three principles within him, “for the just man does not permit the several elements within him to interfere with one another, or any of them to do the work of others, he sets in order his own inner life, and is his own master and his own law, and at peace with Himself” (592-593). Plato promotes a tripartite divided and separable non-communicative conception. It is the responsibility of man to bind together the three parts,

No longer many, but has become one entirely temperate and perfectly adjusted nature, then he proceeds to act always thinking and calling that which preserves and co-operates with this harmonious condition, just and good action, and the knowledge which presides over it (592-593).

In Plato the soul describes a part of the inner life, in which reason, spirit and desire exist distinctly and separately. He does not refer to the body in his conception and therefore the soul is not representative of a whole person only the inner part.

Spirit in contemporary psychological terms would relate to temperament. The integrity of a person’s soul is the result of binding the three separate elements together, presided by reason. In this light, it should always be kept in mind that Plato is firstly preoccupied with social order in his efforts to define human ontology. The weakness of disjointed separate parts, creates inner tensions of polarity and dualism opposing parts; the unity and integrity of human nature are at stake. The trichotomous view of human nature has found legitimacy under the profound influence of Platonic philosophy.

Aristotle (385-322)\(^\text{18}\) refers to the essential substance of animal, or any living being, as the concrete thing. Any ‘parts’ cannot have a sense of pre-existence because they are severed from the whole. In the same way he sees no immortality in the soul (Part 3 148). In other words, “the soul of each individual is the individual itself” (Aristotle Part 10 95). H.W Wolff commented that “man does not have [nephesh], he is [nephesh], he lives as [nephesh]” (quoted in Walton 213). It is logical for Aristotle therefore to affirm that the primary substance of man is the soul (potential) (Part 6 110), the “actuality” (Part 3 106) of the body that is matter or reason, desire or body itself (Part 5 149), the compound of

http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/metaphysics.mb.txt
both is taken universally (Part 11 97). Man, without soul or body is no longer man. He perceives reason to an integral part of soul (Part 1 32), the rational cohabiting alongside the non-rational, exemplified by creativity, originality such as the artist (Part 2 111), and where life resides (Part 18 74, Part 8 118).

Aristotle’s principle of unity, finds support in the Hebrew and NT. This stands in stark contrast to the Greek dualistic mind-set that pervaded that era. To what extent would he be influenced by the ascetic dominating of the ‘evil’ body, or by the non-intrinsic value of the body found in libertinism; or still the asexual extracorporeal forms of existence of Gnosticism?19 (Henderson Church and Sexuality 15-18). His ontological focus might have preserved him to some extent. His conception of pre-existence and immortality also finds some resonance with OT.

In summary Greek philosophy provides two theories, one of tripartite (Plato) and the other bipartite (Aristotle), distinguished by the polarity and unity tension between them. By developing human nature through consideration of these two key figures, it is enough to perceive how they have influenced Christian theology.

**Biblical perspectives**

An overview of Old and NTs raises awareness that etymologically while the Old employs ‘nepeš’, the New uses ‘πνεῦμα’ to describe human nature.20 Both Hebrew and Greek references to the corporeal concerning human composition are neutral in ethical terms, attributing in particular neither good nor evil. The OT emphasizes little the body (‘bāšār’)21 in ontological terms. In the Greek NT the body, once disentangled from the cultural influences, and distinguished from sin’s power and effect, is viewed with great dignity.

The first task is to bring definition to the notion of soul to human nature starting with the OT. God has or is ‘nepeš’,22 as an integral part of His being and perfection. God is

---

19 In reference to Stoic, Epicurean and Gnostic understanding of the body and the resulting practices.

20 Soul (‘ψυχή’) is employed 105 times in the NT.

21 ‘bāšār’ mentioned 368 times in the OT.

22 Ex.15:9; Lev.26:11, 30; Ju.10:16; Is.1:14; 42:1; 53:10-12; 61:10; Jer.4:19; 5:9, 29; 6:8; 9:9; 12:7; 13:17; 14:19; 15:1; 32:41; 51:14; Ez.23:18; Am.6:8; Mic.7:1; Zc.11:8.
therefore defined in part by what is expressed as soul. If human kind is created in the image and likeness of God, then the ‘soul’ reference must originate in God Himself. In OT consideration, Jesus the Christ-Messiah is also portrayed as having ‘nepeš’, confirmed in the NT.\(^{23}\)

Soul in relationship to God in the OT finds a wide spectrum of expressions:

i The expression of will, intent, and action with accomplishment or completion in view (Ex.15:9; Mic.7:11).

ii In covenant or oath God “swears” by Himself (Jer.51:14; Am.6:8; Heb.6:13, 18).\(^{24}\)

iii His impatience, weariness or literally shortness (‘qatsar’) (Jud.10:16; Is.1:14).

iv He hates vain rituals (Is.1:14), pride (Am.6:8).

v He expresses a moral sense of judgment and vengeance (Jer.5:9, 29; 9:9), with a strong sense of bilateral covenant agreement in the background.

vi He shows abandonment, rejection, despite, aversion and alienation (Lev.11:30; Jer.6:8; 12:7; 14:19; Ez.23:18; Zc.11:8).

vii There are very strong emotional expressions of grief, tears, writhing in pain and anguish of heart; silent yet turbulent (Jer.4:19; 13:17), an intensity of emotion that the English text is far from expressing, in language, in the repetition of phrases to add intensity to the intent. In both these texts the heart is synonymous with the soul by the use of parallelism. There is expression of joy, pleasure, delight, of great good (Is.42:1; 61:10; Jer.32:41).

There is perfect intent as God applies to Himself the covenant commitment that Moses insists upon in Deuteronomy (the repeating and renewing of covenant), “I will rejoice over them to do them good and will faithfully plant them in this land with all My heart and with all My soul” (NAS Jer.32:41). The same Hebrew term ‘köl’ (meaning the whole, entire, complete\(^{25}\) is employed for the enactment of covenant agreement whether by God

\(^{23}\) Is.53:10-12; 61:10; Mt.3:17; 12:18; 17:5; 26:38; Jn.10:17; Ac.2:27, 31 quoting Ps.16:10.

\(^{24}\) The Hebrews verses do not contain the term soul but do confirm the conception of oath making by the greater power. Nothing being more superior to God Himself. See also Mt.23:19-22.

\(^{25}\) ‘ὅλος’ in Greek has the same meaning.
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or Moses or the people of Israel. The prophetic announcement of Jesus Christ in Isaiah chapter forty-two is a Trinitarian passage. In relation to God and the soul, suggests that God identifies “My soul” (as in Jer.32:41), as an entity within, an integral part of His being. The usage of soul in the Song of the Suffering Servant (Is.52:13-53:12), refers to the whole person of Jesus Christ, both in humanity and in divinity. The terms ‘nepeš’ and ‘πνεῦμα’ therefore reflect a profound awareness of Christ’s conscious self or personhood in contrast to a specific designated part of human ontology. For example, to divide soul in the atonement of Christ, would only weaken the perfect nature and extent of his work. In God, soul is then eternal, immortal, and perfect, in addition to bearing His infinite attributes. Soul also finds correlation with the moral attributes of God, such as justice, love, goodness, truth, etc. The analysis demonstrates expressions of emotion, of will, and of mind. Divine action is always the natural outcome of the soul’s expression.

It is logical therefore to consider the ‘nepeš’ of humankind. An in-depth analysis provides some understanding as to the nature of soul. Etymologically, five categories have been suggested: i. Breath; ii. Inner Being; iii. Whole or complete person; iv. Animating force; v. Animal life (Baker and Carpenter 746). In surveying the OT writings, the following principles can be established.

The word occasionally refers to animal life. In the Genesis text,

… Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul … And out of the ground Jehovah God formed every beast of the field, and every bird of the heavens; and brought them unto the man to see what he would call them: and whatsoever the man called every living creature that was the name thereof. (NKJV Ge 2:7, 19).

26 Dt.4:29; 10:12; 11:13; 13:2; 26:16; 30:2; Jos.22:5. Dt.6:5; Mk.12:30 only add mind (‘διάνοια’ of moral thinking, emotion, will) and Jesus adds ‘strength’ according to the Evangelists, Mark (12:30) and Luke (10:27). ‘ἰσχύς’ is potential power uniquely of God as source).

27 Mt.27:50; Mk.2:8; 8:12; Lk.2:40; Lk.23:46; Jn.13:21.


30 Ge.2:19; Lev.24:17-18; Pr.12:10; Is.56:11; Ez.47:9.
It is noteworthy that animals and mankind were made from dust. As already mentioned in eastern antiquity, this creative act would be understood as ‘ex inihlio’. God has given soul or life to every creature. The word is used holistically or inclusively of people as whole entities, a human being, either individually or corporately.\(^{31}\) However, the text also makes it clear that Adam had a special relationship to ‘animal life’ and to God that animals did not share.

‘Nepeš’ is used of the living and also the dead.\(^{32}\) The dead are not separated from their souls, neither do these verses suggest that the soul lives on, rather the whole person is dead, “Their soul dies in youth, and their life ends among the Sodomites” (TLT Job 36:14), exemplifies soul and life as the same entity, to either live or die as an entity.\(^{33}\) The Elijah story of resurrecting the widow’s son, “and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived” (NKJV 1Kg.17:21-22), describes an act of resurrection whereby the whole person is restored miraculously to whole physical life. The resurrection is not regenerative but restorative to normal human life and function.

‘Nepeš’ is also directly related to the physical and particularly food.\(^{34}\) The general sense is that the soul experiences hunger and thirst and is therefore rooted in a physical, somatic reality as part of the whole. The condition of the other aspects, (spiritual, emotional, volitional and sense of self), of the soul are directly affected by the physical need, “There is nothing better for a man than that he should eat and drink, and make his soul enjoy good in his labor. This also I saw, that it is from the hand of God” (NKJV Ec. 2:24).

Hungry and thirsty, their soul fainted in them. Then they cried out to the LORD in their trouble, And He delivered them out of their distresses. Oh, that men would give thanks to the LORD for His goodness, And for His wonderful works to the children of men! For He satisfies the longing soul, And fills the hungry soul with goodness. (NKJV Ps.107:5-6, 8-9).

\(^{31}\) Ge.12:5; Ex.12:16; Jos.10:28; 1Kg.20:31; Ps.88:14; Jer.17:21.

\(^{32}\) Ge.35:18; Num.9:6, 7, 10; 19:13; 1Kg.17:21-22; Job 36:14; Ps.56:13; Is.53:12; Jo.4:3, 8; Hg.2:13.

\(^{33}\) Job 33:18, 22, Ps.78:50; Ps.88:3; Ps.1413:3; Lam.3:58.

\(^{34}\) Nu.11:6; Job 6:5-7; Ps.107:5, 9, 18; Pr.23:2; 25:25; 27:7; Ec.2:24; 4:8; 6:3, 6, 9; Is.29:8; 32:6; 55:2; 58:10; Lam.1:11, 19; Ez.7:19; Ho.9:4; Figurative use of physical representative of spiritual food: Ps.23:2-3: 63:1-5.
The succinct meaning of this key verse reinforces the unity and the significance of the body and the soul, “For the life (‘nepeš’) of the flesh (‘bāšār’) is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls for it is the blood that makes atonement for the soul” (NKJV Lev.17:11). Two principles can be drawn from the text: firstly, the blood in a human being contains life to the soul and the flesh; the secondly, the spiritual significance of the blood offering for sin, is restoring life to the soul and the flesh. Both the natural and spiritual orders therefore produce life to the soul and to flesh, the whole human being.

Another important dimension to ‘nepeš’ is concept of ‘self.’ The ‘inner man’ although borrowed from NT vocabulary could be helpful. The notion of ‘soul’ as ‘self’ considers dimensions of a distinct entity within ‘holistic self.’ The vocabulary of speaking in the first person and then referring to ‘my soul’ typifies the principle, “when my soul fainted within me, I remembered the LORD; and my prayer went up to You, Into Your holy temple” (NKJV Jo.2:7).

The thought communicated is the sense of inner self, distinct but not separate from the body or the whole self. The expression is of inner reactions to external circumstances: ‘inner man’s’ experience, reaction, despair, hope, longing, desire, remembrance, or bitterness. From the footnote cross references, David the psalmist, ministers as a whole person to his inner self. Jonah exemplifies the inner ministry of the ‘ősedom’ (covenant love of God), the inner collapse of his soul’s resource, to bring deliverance in ‘ősedom’.

The nature of the inner self relates to the emotional, to the volitional, in positive and negative ways. The inner sense of mastery or ability to centre inner man upon the person and promise of God is the common thread throughout the corresponding texts. This inner state of being is not self-enablement but ministry by self to the inner soul because of the Person and activity of God. No specific trait is attributed to the inner soul, it is presented

---

35 Also Dt.12:23; Dt.19:6 NAS ‘soul blood’.
36 See also Job 30:16; Ps 42:4, 131:2; La 3:20.
37 1Sa.1:10; 2:33; 2Kg.4:27; Job 7:11; Pr.14:10; Is.66:3.
38 Dt.14:26; Jud.5:21; 1Sa.22:22-23; 23:15; 2Sa.3:21; 1Kg.11:37; 2Kg.9:15; Job 23:13; Ps.10:3; 27:12; Pr.21:10.
as a whole living entity, with emphasizes on aspects that relate to the whole. The ‘inner soul’ cannot be attributed as a specific constituent parts of human nature for these reasons.

A second dimension is self-consciousness that relates to being alive and being experientially aware of that fact. It is not an inner force of animation, but something more deeply rooted in an ontological appreciation of self, of consciousness, of existence, of identity and temperament. Personality by definition is to be accentuated as relating to a persona, or mask and therefore not an authentic expression of self. As with God, and so with humankind, the soul expresses the breadth and depth of genuine human experience through every kind of circumstance.

Through Moses God appeals to the assimilation, written into their conscious selves as regards the alienation of their slavery in Egypt, “Also you shall not oppress a stranger, for you know the ‘soul’ of a stranger, because you were strangers in the land of Egypt” (NKJV Ex 23:9). It is not something learned, or respected as law, it is written into self-consciousness, in other words, ‘you know in yourselves, because it is written into your beings by experience, what it is to be alien’.

The sense of will in the phrase “I took my life in my own hands” (NKJV Jud 12:3), describes the strong volitional meaning that emerges concerning soul as embracing the whole person. Often ‘’avvah’ is translated ‘desire’ rather than alluding to emotion it is the will that is in view. The latter text underlines the autonomous nature of the will as a conscious part of self which decides freely for good or for evil.

There is a moral aspect of decision making and responsibility to the soul that emerges from scripture. Usage in Leviticus refers to the person and therefore ethical considerations are not separate or divisible from the whole person. The covenant language of Deuteronomy, “It shall come about, if you listen obediently to my commandments

39 See also 1Sa.28:21; Job 13:14; Ps.119:109.
40 Dt.12:15, 20, 21; 14:26; 23:24; Jud.5:21; 1Sa.23:20; Ps.10:3; 27:12; 41:2; 105:22; Pr.19:18; Ec.6:2.
41 See also Jer.44:7.
42 Ps.24:4; 25:20; 26:9; Pr.6:32; 8:36; 13:3; 16:17; 19:16; 21:10; Ec.7:28; Is.58:10; Ez.7:19; 14:14; Mic.6:7; 7:3; Hab.2:4.
43 Dt.6:4-5.
which I am commanding you today, to love the LORD your God and to serve Him with all your heart and all your soul,” (NAS Dt.11:13) serves firstly to maintain the bilateral covenant agreement of special relationship of love and belonging with the Lord God. The point of the ethical code in self-consciousness is that each person from within know and act in order to favour the special covenant relationship.

The ethical includes relationship to the ‘Tôrâh’, to ‘self’ as Psalm one hundred and nineteen describes specifically, whereby the intensity of inner man’s desire to be enlivened in the light of the natural condition, or to be fulfilled in the face of extenuated human resource. The Judaic and Qabbalist usage of the Tôrâh and Mishnah or Zohar, for the Qabbalists, herein is reflected.

The prophets demonstrate the moral question of receiving forgiveness for sin, “…to do justice, and to do ‘ḥesed’ and to walk humbly with your God” (ESV Mic.6:8). The context binds action to soul, to God’s ethical word and to acts again. The cycle runs throughout considerations of mankind’s inward predicament: in relation to evil or good, in the inner self or circumstantially, and describes in the language of the inner living man, this moral conflict. God in person, in word and in act, is the external source that untangles the cords of conflict and restores the integrity of inner man, conscious self and whole person. This encounter recentres ‘inner’ and ‘self’ within moral expression of who he or she truly is. God herein, restores His integrity of being, speaking and doing to mankind through understanding soul as conscious self. While the moral aspect and its relationship to Tôrâh is explanatory, the relationship to the soul enables us to affirm that moral consciousness is within self. It is teachable, it is capable of evil and good, it can be influenced by God

44 Ps.1
45 Ps.119:20.
46 Ps.119:28.
47 Mic.6:7.
48 Jer.26:19; 42:20; Mic.7:3; Hab.2:4.
49 Ez.14:14.
50 Mic.7:3; Is.58:10-11.
or another, its natural disposition is insufficient, and therein requires relationship with God and His moral code.

**Soul, spirit, heart, mind, life and flesh in Old Testament**

Hebrew parallelism accounts for the synonymous expressions of soul and is hermeneutically important to establish the ontological relationships intended through the use of these terms.

**Soul** (‘נֶפֶשׁ’nēšāmāh⁵¹, ‘nepeš’) and **spirit** (‘רֻחַ’rūah’)⁵²  
“In his hand is the life (‘nepeš’) of every living thing (‘chay’) and the breath (‘rūah’) of all mankind (‘bāšār’)” (ESV Job 12:10). Job, using parallelism, refers to his ‘soul’ and God’s ‘spirit’ both within him.⁵³ He later inverses to say there is ‘spirit’ in man and ‘soul’ in God that He gives him.⁵⁴ He speaks of Creator God ‘Spirit’ and Creator Life Giver ‘Soul’.⁵⁵ The parallelism expresses the entity of man, soul or spirit, the term is employed for him seeking after God.⁵⁶ This is only the reflected image of God Himself; however, God is clearly identified as the origin of soul and/or spirit.⁵⁷

The synonymous actions of soul or spirit expressed in parallelism reinforce the unity of the person in: pouring out to God,⁵⁸ and modelled upon God,⁵⁹ seeking after God:⁶⁰ soul, heart and flesh.⁶¹ The only distinguishing feature would be the references to character,

---

⁵¹ Feminine noun.  
⁵² Ps.142:3-4; 143:3-4, Job 7:11; 12:10; 14:22; Is.26:9.  
⁵³ Job 27:3.  
⁵⁴ Job 32:8.  
⁵⁵ Job.33:4.  
⁵⁶ Is.26:9.  
⁵⁷ Is.42:5; 57:16; Job 12:10.  
⁵⁸ 1Sa.1:15; Ps.77:2-3; 143:6-7; Job 7:11; Pr.29:11; Is.38:15-17.  
⁵⁹ Ps.11:5-6.  
⁶⁰ Ps.143:6-7, 10-11; Is.26:9.  
⁶¹ Ps.84:2.
good and bad that are attributed to the spirit\textsuperscript{62}. They are perceived as an integral part of soul\textsuperscript{63}.

**Soul** (‘nepeš’) and **heart** (‘lebab’) \textsuperscript{64}

Covenant relational commitment is a reciprocal one “Only take heed to yourself, and diligently keep yourself, lest you forget the things your eyes have seen, and lest they depart from your heart all the days of your life. And teach them to your children and your grandchildren” (NKJV Dt.4:9), God requiring only what He is giving of Himself, with all (‘kol’ whole, entire, complete, equivalent to ‘ὁλος’ in the NT) His heart and soul.\textsuperscript{65} The response of mankind is nothing less than the same.\textsuperscript{66} Deuteronomy chapter six contains the unique exception to the ‘all your heart and all your soul’ by adding ‘all your strength’. The notion of strength is secondary as it draws significance from the total commitment of the heart and soul. The use of ‘m\textsuperscript{od}’ does not support trichotomy but reinforces ‘kol’ of heart and soul homogeneously, thereby intensifying the commitment. The heart and soul can be interpreted in two ways: one is through parallelism, in the form of a typical Hebraism, reinforcing by repetition the one and the same entity, the whole person. This covenant of heart and soul is therefore primarily an ontological reality. The second way identifies two component parts that together are necessary to make such a covenant commitment. The dilemma is that mind, conscience, will, and spirit are not specifically considered unless the incorporation of these distinct parts is assumed.

Synonymously, the revulsion of the heart is found in the soul of God and that of man:\textsuperscript{67}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[i] of grief\textsuperscript{68},
  \item[ii] the melting or fainting of heart and soul,\textsuperscript{69}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{62} Pr.16:18, 19; 25:14, 23; 29:11, 23; Is.66:2.

\textsuperscript{63} Pr.16:17; 29:10.

\textsuperscript{64} Dt.4:9; 1Ch.22:19; 28:9; Ps.13:2; 31:9; 35:25.

\textsuperscript{65} Jer.32:41.

\textsuperscript{66} Dt.4:2; 11:13; 13:3; 26:16; 1Ch.22:19; 28:9; 2Ch.6:38; 15:12.

\textsuperscript{67} Lev.19:17; Lev.26:30; Ps.13:2; Jer.14:19; Zc.11:8.

\textsuperscript{68} Jer.4:19; 1Sa.30:6; Job 30:25; Dt.15:10.

\textsuperscript{69} Jos.2:11; Jo.2:7; Ps.84:2; 107:26; Job.12:3; Is.1:5; 7:4; 13:7; 15:4; 21:4; 53:11; 1Sa.1:8; Ps.73:21.
the joy,\textsuperscript{70} the centre of knowing, (‘yada’ notably intimate, experiential), and perception\textsuperscript{71}. The same call to understand (‘biyn’) is addressed to spirit, soul and heart,\textsuperscript{72} just as thinking up a plan.\textsuperscript{73}

the squeezing of affliction affecting is common to God, soul and heart\textsuperscript{74}.

in will, wanting, desiring, choosing, and deciding which inevitably lead to action.\textsuperscript{75}

pride\textsuperscript{76}, truth and faithfulness also find an indivisible reality uniting soul and heart\textsuperscript{77}, heart and soul share righteousness or justice and uprightness.\textsuperscript{78}

Mentioned in the previous comparative discussion of the attributes of soul and spirit, was that character and moral aspects seemed to be attributed to spirit, but this present comparison shows these same qualities between heart and soul.

with a sense of uprightness comes integrity\textsuperscript{79} and loyalty.\textsuperscript{80} A warning against hypocrisy of action because the word (‘dabar’) has not taken root in the heart, the opposite of integrity.\textsuperscript{81}

\textsuperscript{70} Ps.31:7; 35:9; Is.61:10; Jer.32:41; Is.30:29; 60:5; Jer.15:16; Jer.51:46.

\textsuperscript{71} Jos.23:14; Ps.139:14; Ps.31:7; Pr.24:14; Is.53:11 (self-knowledge); Ps.95:10.

\textsuperscript{72} 1Ch.28:9; Is.6:10; 32:4; Job.32:8; Ps.90:12Pr.2:10; 24:12.

\textsuperscript{73} 2Sa.14:14; Is.10:7.

\textsuperscript{74} Is.1:14; Ps.25:17; Ps.6:3; 88:3.

\textsuperscript{75} 1Sa.13:14; 1Sa.14:7; 1Kg.14:8; 2Ch.25:22:9; 29:10; 31:21.

\textsuperscript{76} Jer.13:17; Ps.123:4; Is.9:9; 1Sa.17:28; Hab.2:4; Dt.8:14.

\textsuperscript{77} 1Sa.12:2; 1Kg.2:4; 3:6; 2Kg.20:3; Pr.25:3; Ne.9:8, Ps.15:2.

\textsuperscript{78} Dt.9:4; 1Kg.3:6; Ps.94:21; 143:11; Ez.14:20.

\textsuperscript{79} Ge.20:6; 1Kg.9:4; Hab.2:4; Ps.78:72; 2Kg.10:15; 1Ch.29:17.

\textsuperscript{80} 1Kg.15:3, 14; 1Sa.2:35; 2Kg.10:30-31; 2Ch.16:9.

\textsuperscript{81} Dt.29:19.
ix circumcision of heart, not the soul but by the Spirit⁸². In OT, is to enable living in the whole heart and soul commitment. In the NT, to the circumcision of hardened hearts is the circumcision of sin in the flesh⁸³ by union with Christ.

A sense of self⁸⁴ is the realization of self in exile, a consciousness of circumstances and responsibilities in relationship to the worship of God alone as opposed to ‘other gods’, set in a context of conscious choice of the heart in the inner man. The act is preceded by an exercise of will, which in turn is preceded by this conscious ‘self’ or heart choice.⁸⁵ The context concerning man in relationship to Himself and to God and his covenantal activity, is analogous with ‘soul’. Similarly, the warning against pride, arrogance and hypocrisy when the conscious self as ‘heart’ turns away from God, underlines the capacity of the heart to choose for good and blessing or to choose for evil and harm. This egocentrism of self leads to deification.⁸⁶ The place for true conscious self-heart is only found in a genuine relationship to God. A corporeal perspective where the heart is ‘fed’ correlates with the physical view of soul.⁸⁷ The relationship to the spoken word (‘dabar’), God’s ‘dabar’,⁸⁸ is important to heart just as Tôrâh in Psalm one hundred and nineteen was to soul in terms of revelation and hearing,⁸⁹ the word being near and in the people,⁹⁰ received into the heart because of a tender, humble and joyful attitude.⁹¹

---

⁸² Dt.30:6; Dt.10:16; Jer.4:4; Ac.7:51; Ro.2:28-29.

⁸³ Col.2:11, 13.

⁸⁴ 2Ch.6:37; 2Ch.20:33.

⁸⁵ 2Ch.32:31.

⁸⁶ Dt.15:9; Job 17:11; Is.14:13; Ez.28:6; 38:10; Dn.8:25; 11:12, 27-28; Zp.1:12; 2:15; Zc.7:10; 8:17.

⁸⁷ Ps.104:15.

⁸⁸ Jos.23:14; 1Kg.2:4; Ne.9:8.

⁸⁹ Ez.3:10.

⁹⁰ Dt.30:14; Pr.4:21; 2Ch.34:31; Dt.29:19.

⁹¹ Dt.32:46; 2Ch.34:27; Jer.15:16.
In summary the relationship between ‘soul’ and ‘heart’ is a synonymous one as the above discussion as proven through the parallelism and the extensive common experiences as the etymological meaning of ‘leb’ or ‘lebab’ suggests,

[Being] … translated heart … has extensive meaning; some aspect of the immaterial inner self or being … the seat of one’s inner nature as well as one of its components. The primary usage of this word describes the entire disposition of the inner person that God can discern. It also describes the place where the rational, thinking process occurs (Baker and Carpenter 536-537).

It is most credible to believe in the synonymous meaning of ‘heart’ and ‘soul’ as both reflect the same characteristics and functions of the whole person.

**Soul** (‘nepeš’) and **life** (‘chay’) 92

‘Chay’ means: living or alive, lively or active, or reviving; the sustenance or maintenance of life, or people; a living creature, animal or human. The verb ‘chayah’ is translated as: to live, to revive or enliven, (from physical and emotional or inner man experiences). In the Piel and Hiphil forms: to preserve, give, revive, restore, quicken, refresh, or grow life. 93 The relationship to ‘soul’ is important to the developing argument.

The use of ‘living souls’ is a common OT term referring inclusively to all animals and humans 94 created by God from dust. The breath (‘nᵉšmah’, ‘nepeš’, ‘ruaḥ’), in this specific context is qualified as living, life-giving. It is God’s breath that contains life that becomes life of the soul or the person, “though it was granted to Adam when God breathed into him (Ge.2:7), it is not a “piece” of the divine, but only finds its source there” (Walton 213). This raises the issue of the divine and the living soul, the NT record clearly states, in later development, we are ‘participants of the divine nature’ (“γενησθε θειας κοινωνοι φυσεως”) (TR, WH 2Pe.1:4). ‘Θειας’ uniquely refers to the Divine Nature. 95 The texts from Job previously quoted 96 provide OT concordance that my soul, my spirit is

---

92 111 occurrences of soul (‘nepeš’) and life (‘chay’ adjective, noun and ‘chayah’ the verb) in the OT.

93 ‘chay’ and ‘chayah’ *BDBHEL.* 2017.

94 Ge.1:30; 2:7, 19; 9:12.

95 Ac.17:29; 2Pe.1:3, 4.

96 Job.26:4; 27:3; 32
synonymous with the soul and spirit of God inbreathed thereby making man a living being, (according to the argument so far, soul, or heart, or spirit). It is difficult regardless of the complexities raised, to deny that man becomes a soul that is brought alive by the divine life being breathed into him. This, in the Scriptural metanarrative, is not only a question of origin but of "κοινωνος". The fear of deifying man, immediately echoes the Garden of Eden, the tower of Babel, the Decalogue, and of kings.  The appellation 'gods' has been applied to Moses and to Aaron, to Pharaoh, to God's people. Jesus quotes Psalm eighty-two in John ten verses thirty-four to thirty-six applying this appellation to the Jews of the day, and to demonstrate his divinity as 'Son of God'. Moses is clearly not God incarnate, but he is given as a communicator of divine words, and in his person the relationship to Pharaoh bears the reflection of God. A measure of the divine is manifest in and through Moses. The particularly awkward texts of the Psalms have been explained in several ways applying the term 'gods' to:

... before the princes, as Jarchi; before the kings, as the Syriac version; or before the judges, as the Targum, Aben Ezra, Kimchi, and Ben Melech; ... or civil magistrates, who are sometimes called gods, (Ps.82:1,6) and they are the powers ordained of God, and represent him on earth; or the sanhedrin, as the Midrash; or before the gods of the Gentiles, or rather before the ark, the symbol of the presence of the true God; or, as Gussetius interprets it, "before thee, O God, will I sing praise"; or I will sing praise to thee, the Son the Messiah, one divine Person before another; the Son before God the Father, and it may be added before God the Holy Spirit, the two other divine Persons; the Septuagint, Vulgate Latin, Ethiopic, and Arabic versions, render it, "before the angels," who are sometimes called gods ... (Ps.8:5; 97:7) (Gill @24190).

Psalm 82 transliterates,

---

97 Ge.3:22; 11:4-6; Ex.20:3-6; Is.14:14; Ez.28:6, 9.

98 Ex.4:16.

99 Ex.7:1.

100 Ps.82:1, 6, 7, and possibly Ps.138:1.

101 John Gill’s commentary from Psalm 138:1.
God (‘elohim’) standing in the congregation of gods (‘el’); He judges among the gods … I have said, you are gods; and the sons of the Most High. But as men you shall die … For who in the sky be ranked with Jehovah, who is likened to Jehovah among the sons of the gods? God is to be greatly feared in the council of the saints … (TLT Ps.82:1, 6-7; 89:6-7).

Several factors of explication can be given: The distinction of the Lord God in all his perfection is not diminished. That men be qualified as ‘gods’ does not elevate them out of their humanity. It therefore must refer to a quality of life and relationship, rather than the deification of man. In NT language, the distinction between “divine” and “spiritual” eases the tension and represents fairly the biblical texts. Man, therefore does not, in these texts, reflect the infinite attributes of God, he does however reflect the divine nature, character, and filial relationship, in the same way that Jesus Christ affirms his identity as divinely God and Son. Jesus’ use of this text suggests a teleological reading whereby he is the accomplishment or the perfect realization of this verse. It could relate to his complete accomplishment of the Law and the Prophets,102 thus being perfect103 something that was evidently impossible for human kind. As Ladd points out, “… the individual is conceived of as possessing rû(a)h, inbreathed from God, as an element in his or her personality” (500). This breath of God in temperament and identity is of the creational order, an inbreathing to natural life. The NT regenerative order evidently introduces a deeper union that is unknown in the OT era.

Oaths and covenant employ particular phrases that connect soul and life such as, “your souls shall live”104 additionally, “As the Lord lives …”105 “Incline your ear, and come to Me. Hear, and your soul shall live; And I will make an everlasting covenant with you- The sure mercies of David” (NKJV Is.55:3). The phrase clearly connects a definite action that will ensure life to the soul, whereby the inbreathed life to the whole person by God is sustained or maintained, for it is His image as ‘life’ that is in view.

102 Mt.5:18; Lk.18:31; 19:28; 24:44; Jn.19:28.

103 Jn.17:4; 1Co.1:30; Ro.10:4; Heb.2:10; 5:8; 7:28; Ep.4:13.

104 1Sa.1:26; 20:3; Jer.38:17, 20.

105 2Sa.4:9; 1Kg.1:29; 2Kg.2:2-6; Jer.38:16.
Parallel forms demonstrate the synonymous relationship in the biblical writers between the concept of ‘soul’ and of ‘life’.\textsuperscript{106} circumstances that lead to a conflict of death and life,\textsuperscript{107} demonstrate the experiences, emotions, the effect of the word of God, and covenant, that have already been mentioned in the previous treatment, find parallels in the relationship of ‘life’ and ‘soul’. To be alive is to be soul, to have and be soul is to be alive.

It is appropriate in this context to consider the origin of soul.

**Creationism**

“The theory of creationism holds that God creates a new soul at the birth of every individual …” (Berkhof 196), “God creates a new soul for each person and sends it to that person’s body sometime between conception and birth” (Grudem 484). Realistic dualism asserts that the body and soul are created entirely by God resulting in ever increasing individualization of humanity (Berkhof 196); although others view the spiritual soul as originated in God’s creative act and the body as originated in the father and mother creative conception.

**Traducianism**

Traducianism follows a line of reasoning based on transmission rather than creation, equally so, the sinful nature. The soul and the body find their origins in the generation of a child by a father and mother through transmission. They, “are inherited from the baby’s mother and father at the time of conception” (Grudem 197). One argument would be that God’s creative acts ended on the seventh day of creation and thereafter works providentially with mankind.

**Pre-existentialism**

Pre-existentialism, considered in the Greek Philosophy section of this paper, believes in a pre-human conception soul life in heaven, (the soul being eternal, immortal, and distinct from body). The soul moves from pre-existent in eternity past to “re”-incarnate into a

\textsuperscript{106} Ps.78:50.

\textsuperscript{107} Job 33:18, 28; Ps.26:9; 88:3; 119:25.
human material existence, at death the soul returns to God in its immortal eternal state. (Berkhof 196 and Grudem 484-485).

**Dualism**

Dualism, like the preceding theories, has raised further polarization whereby attempts to determine the relationship of body to soul have concluded by affirming three principal theories. (Berkhof 195):

i. Opposition (Catresius occasionalism), wherein there is no possibility of joint action, the incompatibility of natures sets material against immaterial.

ii. Correspondence (Leibnitz’s parallelism), where the body corresponds to the soul while being distinct and incapable of interaction, so in every thought, decision or action there are two equalled but distinct and separate responses.

iii. Union (or Realistic Dualism), suggesting interaction, one on the other reciprocally and organically, although the mechanisms for that remain mysterious.

From the biblical texts, the following can be established: The body and soul of man are one creative act of God breathing a measure of the essence of His life into man, causally making him alive;\(^\text{108}\) this life was to his soul and to his body. The concept of human transmission of soul is countered as God gives spirit and soul to humanity in all generations,\(^\text{109}\) the biblical image of Creator, who is also Sustainer of all of life (from beginning to end).\(^\text{110}\) In creation, God ‘creates’ (‘asah’) and constitutes’ (‘kuwn’) the human being.\(^\text{111}\) In creation, the term ‘bara’ describes the act of creating, forming; ‘yatsar’ to form or fashion, and ‘asah’ to produce or make. Isaiah forty three verse seven in Hebrew thought, while the terms etymologically overlap, the threefold repetition serves to add emphatic weight to the first assertion; the threefold can be interpreted as absolute or ultimate; just as in Holy, holy, holy is the Lord.\(^\text{112}\) In this case the Creator creates

---

108 Ge.2:7.
109 Jer.38:16; Is.42:5; 57:16.
110 Is.46:3-4; Ps.71:6.
111 Job 31:15.
112 Is.6:3; Rev.4:8. 
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originally and individually, He constitutes and forms the whole human person. The natural and spiritual destiny are also in the Creator before conception, in the counsel of God. Psalm one hundred and thirty-nine provides explicit insight (some would call it revelatory or prophetic) into the conception of a human being. Verse thirteen describes the original creating of the centre – soul or heart, woven together by God in the womb; David states that his conscious self, witnesses in and of itself to this reality. Verse fifteen portrays the creation of the bones, referring to the earth, recalls Adam’s creation from dust. It equally suggests God at work in the foetal conception and development. Verse sixteen describes God’s unashamed gaze upon his creation of a foetus. The text infers that God already saw identity, destiny and duration of life. God is then, creator of the physical, material and immaterial. The creation of a person, living in identity is a tripartite action of mother, father and God. This passage makes evident this universal principle applied to all human beings coming into the world. While there is no evidence to support a pre-existence of the soul, there is predetermination in genetics, identity and temperament, physical and non-physical characteristics encompassed in a unique creative and divine act that has a determined beginning. The particular attribution of soul is misplaced according to Scripture, the foregoing texts demonstrate that God is active in the human creation process not just the creation event.

Beyond the resurrection act, the soul and body together die, there is no concept of separation neither of immortality. Job does say “And after my skin is destroyed, this I know, that in my flesh I shall see God …” (NKJV Job 19:26). Jesus says “… I am the resurrection and the life; he who believes in Me will live even if he dies, and everyone who lives and believes in Me will never die. Do you believe this?” (NAS Jn.11:25-26). Only because of Jesus resurrection and his word, can whole man believe that at death there is a whole man transition to a resurrection state with a perfected physical and spiritual body and ‘inner man’. “If He should set His heart on it, If He should gather to Himself His Spirit and His breath” (NKJV Job 34:14), confirms the origin, but suggests that His soul and His breath, return to Him, which in turn suggests that there is separation

113 Is.49:1; Jer.1:5; Gal.1:15.
114 Ps.78:39; 89:48.
115 2Co.5:4; 1Co.15:49, 53; Ph.3:20-21; Heb.12:23; Col.1:27-28.
and immortality apart from the body. This should be read in the wider revelation whereby, the New Covenant promises prophesy that God will put His Spirit within believers in the context of an eternal covenant.\textsuperscript{116} This reaffirms that there is no separation, rather it anticipates a new and definitive human constitutional reality that is ontological, teleological and soteriological.

**Spirit and flesh**

“… in whose hand is the soul (‘nepes’) of every life (‘chay’), and the spirit (‘rûaḥ’ ) of all human flesh (‘basar’)” (TLT Job 12:10) represents a contrast that is synonymous with the soul; that all flesh has the ‘rûaḥ’ of life,\textsuperscript{117} mortal life.\textsuperscript{118} References to the spirit lead to the anticipatory prophetic texts of a new heart of flesh and a new spirit, My Spirit.\textsuperscript{119} This latter announces a new original constitution that has not previously existed; a definite, permanent and eternal state of being, as an integral part of the new covenant that Christ would institute and inaugurate. This will be developed in the next section.

**Spirit and heart**

Spirit and heart are described through poetical parallelism as synonymous in experience: hardening,\textsuperscript{120} melting or being moved,\textsuperscript{121} in meditation,\textsuperscript{122} brokenness or distress\textsuperscript{123}; restoring or reviving\textsuperscript{124}. The parallelism demonstrates the inseparable unity of spirit with heart. As with spirit and flesh, there is the heralding reference to the new covenant and to the new state that human kind experiences.\textsuperscript{125} The Son of the Servant in Isaiah chapter

\textsuperscript{116} Is.59:21; Jer.31:31-33; Ez.36:26-27.

\textsuperscript{117} Ge.6:17; 7:15; Nu.16:22; 27:16.

\textsuperscript{118} Ps.78:39.

\textsuperscript{119} Ez.11:19; 36:26; 37:6, 8; Joel 2:28.

\textsuperscript{120} Dt.2:30; Zc.7:12; Ps.78:8.

\textsuperscript{121} Jos.2:11; 5:1; Ex.35:21.

\textsuperscript{122} Ps.77:6.

\textsuperscript{123} Ps.34:18; 51:17; 143:4; Pr.15:13; Is.65:14.

\textsuperscript{124} Ps.51:10; Is.57:15.

\textsuperscript{125} Ez.11:19; 18:31; 21:7; 36:26.
sixty-one verse one, prophesies Jesus the Messiah accompanied by the Holy Spirit sent to heal the broken hearted, that Jesus declares fulfilled by Himself in Luke chapter four verse twenty-one. A divine model emerges from Christ as the person of the Spirit is in perfect unity with Jesus Christ, in full measure.\(^\text{126}\) As pale reflection is found, when God puts a spirit of wisdom into gifted hearts,\(^\text{127}\) which evidently was a spiritual enabling through an additional measure of the Spirit of God, who is a spirit of wisdom.\(^\text{128}\) Unlike the new covenant, it was temporary, task based, and therefore measured, limited, and selective, which contrasts with the permanence of the New Covenant existence.

**Heart and Mind**

In analysing the OT texts a distinction must be drawn between translation and interpretation. Several verses have been subject to interpretation rather than translation, thereby altering the intended meaning. Rather than translate ‘kilyah’ which means kidneys literally and refers to the centre or seat of human life, figuratively and notably of emotional life, in keeping with the vision of mankind, this term should have been translated accordingly by centre or seat, as it is synonymous with heart or soul rather than being distinct from it.\(^\text{129}\) Job chapter thirty-eight verse thirty-six employs the term ‘tuwach’ which bears a similar meaning, the inner hidden part. It portrays the centre, the heart as the dwelling place for wisdom and understanding. In these texts the testing, perceiving and afflicting reflected in the parallelism apparatus is uniquely synonymous with the heart. There is no ‘heart-mind’ distinction. Similarly, ‘mind’ should be translated as ‘nepes’\(^\text{130}\) and in context strengthens the personal unity, not through a determinate will\(^\text{131}\) but a desire, delight, pleasure based (‘chaphets’) disposition of soul. The ‘willing’ of this nature is found in the soul not in the mind. The remaining references apply to collective heart not mind, implicitly to will or desire, as the tribes gather around David to

\(^{126}\) Is.61:1; Jn.3:34.

\(^{127}\) Ex.28:3.

\(^{128}\) Is.11:2.

\(^{129}\) Ps.26:2; 73:21; Jer.11:20; 17:10; 20:12.

\(^{130}\) 1Sa.2:35; 1Ch.28:9.

\(^{131}\) 1Ch.28:9.
make him king, for example. Whole heartedness is compounded by one united heart, reflecting the strength of the verse. It can be affirmed therefore that ‘mind’ is not a separate entity and so, to conceive a trichotomy of mind as spirit (Arno 7 and Atkinson and Field 23) or as body, mind, and spirit (Atkinson and Field 24) cannot be justified in a Hebrew and ontological perspective. In this respect, the indivisible nature of the soul or heart, and the integrative nature of intellectual faculty within advocates how human nature should be understood. OT provides little evidence as to the mind, there is however, abundant evidence concerning the will in terms of heart or soul expression.

**Soul and flesh**

Scripture paints the picture of necessary unity or union, “For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you on the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood by reason of the life that makes atonement” (NAS Lev.17:11). The blood is identified as life in the ‘soul of flesh’ and is found in a context of atonement rather than creation. The principle of life blood poured out equates to death of a person or animal in a context of redemption and forgiveness, and is precursory to what Christ fulfilled in his atonement and resurrection. To put this verse in a creational context would raise difficulties, as the spirit and soul communicated from God as source of life, and consequently, the divine origin of soul and spirit. Spirit and soul are only life through the inbreathing of God. That the blood maintains mankind alive and functioning is without contest; that man’s origins be in his own blood is not conform to the wider vision of Scripture.

The inseparability of unity is also asserted through common human experiences. The Psalmist conveys the unity of the person through life experience; viewed as soul, as spirit or body in weariness (‘hand’) affecting the whole person. One reference in
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132 1 Ch. 12:38.
133 Ge. 9:4; Lev. 17:14.
135 Of thirsting and longing: Ps. 44:25; 63:1; 84:2; Is. 10:18; of grieving: Job 14:22; Ps. 31:9.
136 Ps. 77:2-3.
Ezekiel,\textsuperscript{137} in parallelism form, presents the unity of experience between heart, hands (body) and spirit. One kind of disunity does exist,\textsuperscript{138} should God desire to take back the spirit and soul that He has put in mankind.

\textbf{New Testament}

NT references confirm the creation of all living souls, a reflection of the Genesis account,\textsuperscript{139} referring also to human beings.\textsuperscript{140} The distinction between ‘soul’ (‘\(\psi ν\chi\eta\)’) and ‘self’, is also made clear,\textsuperscript{141} through terms such as the ‘inner man’ or ‘life or alive’ and the consciousness of ‘self’, although not explicitly stated could be suggestive of corporeal existence. This view of the unity of the whole is demonstrated in Jesus Christ giving life in redemption and salvation encompassing His whole person as the Gospel records.\textsuperscript{142}

Jesus repeats and extends the covenant loving relationship of God with all (‘\(\text{o}\lambda\text{o}\sigma\)’ NT equivalency to ‘kol’)\textsuperscript{143} by including ‘mind’ (‘\(\delta\text{\i\acute{n}}\nu\text{o}\alpha\)’ does have a holistic connotation of mind, will, heart)\textsuperscript{144} and ‘understanding’ (‘\(\sigma\nu\nu\varepsilon\sigma\iota\zeta\)’ adding to parts together in comprehension)\textsuperscript{145} and ‘strength’ (‘\(\iota\sigma\chi\omicron\omicron\varsigma\)’ of potential power).\textsuperscript{146} Textually, Matthew uses ‘\(\epsilon\nu\)’ (‘in’) throughout, ‘in the whole of your …’ as does Luke concerning soul, strength and mind, except for the heart. For heart, Luke follows Mark, who employs ‘\(\epsilon\kappa\)’ (‘out of’) ‘out of your whole …’ throughout. Hendriksen suggests, “The soul… here [is] probably the seat of man’s emotional activity; the mind is not only the seat and center of his purely intellectual life but also of his dispositions and attitudes” (\textit{Mark} 493). In referring to the additional words of the Gospel writers, he notes, “no essential difference is intended. We

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{137} Ez.21:7.
\item \textsuperscript{138} Job 34:14.
\item \textsuperscript{139} 1Co.15:45; Rev.8:9; 16:3.
\item \textsuperscript{140} Ac.2:41, 43; 7:14; 14:22; 27:37; 1Pe.3:20.
\item \textsuperscript{141} Mt.11:29; 16:26; Mk.8:36-37; Lk.2:35; 12:19-22; Ac.15:24; 20:10, 24; Ro.2:9; 2Co.1:23; 1Th.2:8.
\item \textsuperscript{142} Mk.10:45; Jn.10:11,15,17; 1Jn.3:16.
\item \textsuperscript{143} Mt.22:37; Mk.12:30-33; Lk.10:27; Ac.4:32.
\item \textsuperscript{144} ‘\(\delta\text{\i\acute{n}}\nu\text{o}\alpha\)’ occurs in Mt.22:37; Mk.12:33; Lk.10:27 not in Mk.12:33.
\item \textsuperscript{145} ‘\(\sigma\nu\nu\varepsilon\sigma\iota\zeta\)’ is employed in Mk.12:30 only rather than ‘\(\delta\text{\i\acute{n}}\nu\text{o}\alpha\)’.
\item \textsuperscript{146} ‘\(\iota\sigma\chi\omicron\omicron\varsigma\)’ is absent from Mt.22:37 and from Mk.12:33 in WH, IPNT, and NTIG, only TR quotes.
\end{itemize}
must not begin to over-analyse. What is meant in all these passages is that man should love God with all [his] faculties …?” (Ibid.). The essence is an all-embracing covenant love attachment to God. The etymological nuance of ‘ἐν’ draws attention to the substance of the inner life of a person, while ‘ἐκ’ emphasizes the origin, the source of what comes out from a person. The text cannot therefore serve to specify human constitution, as its primary purpose is to accentuate a person’s entire being. This text should be interpreted with the Hebraistic mindset due to its Old Testament origin where the compounding effect emphasizes the one whole person using different language. To suggest that each word applies specifically to a component part of human nature is to go too far in terms of Hebraic intention. At best, it might refer to approaching the whole from differing angles, the ‘whole’, being the sufficient response.

This understanding is necessary because one distinctive usage of ‘ψυχή’ by Jesus in the context of discipleship is, “He who loves his life will lose it, and he who hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life” (NKJV Jn.12:25).147 Jesus introduces his mediation into human understanding of life, in one’s self and in the world. As he declares in John chapter five, “… the Son also [has] … life in Himself … [and] gives life to whom he will …” (ESV Jn.5:26, 21). Jesus Christ becomes the origin, source, and mediation of eternal life to the whole person. Any relationship that denies this primacy is to lose life, whereas the primacy of Christ ensures life, the emphasis being on the whole person, the conscious self. The Hebraism ‘saving the soul’148 is employed uniquely by Jewish background Christians: Peter, James and the author of the epistle to the Hebrews. This does not imply that the soul is a singular entity that can be saved. In Hebrew thought the whole living person is in view.

The contribution to the ontology of a human being is significant in that the representation of the soul and the human spirit is synonymous with the OT revelation, as developed in this section. There are few verses that shed light on the nature of mankind’s composition.

147 Mt.10:39; Mk.8:35-37; Lk.14:26; 17:33; 21:19.

148 Heb.10:23; Jm.1:21; 5:20; 1Pe.1:9.
Heart
In the NT writings the heart can only be viewed as in the OT, as a holistic expression of a conscious person, due to the extent of expressions, characteristics, and qualities. In emotional terms, as with ‘leb’ and ‘lebab’, ‘nepes’ and ‘psuchē’, the spectrum of expressions are present: sorrow (grief, tears, brokenness, crushing), joy, (passion) purity, affliction (trouble, bitterness, envy), humility, gentleness, and faith. In the same way, the heart is capable of the opposite traits and actions: hardness or dulled, lust or craving desire, blindness, straying, betrayal, (deceit, lies), and doubt.

Jesus makes it clear that evil comes from (‘ἐκ’) the heart, what is in the heart: in nature, intent, desire or will, that manifests itself. Some may hold a view of man’s inherent sinfulness and incapacity for good,

… Bonnard points out that is not differentiating between an internal and an external form of piety … his teaching presupposes that man is not pure in himself; if that
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were the case he would only have to keep himself from the world’s impurities; but he is evil precisely in his interior, in his heart from which go out all his crimes … Jesus is drawing attention to the fact that wickedness takes its origin in our innermost being (Morris 400).

The reflection of a Hebraic thought would be, “… the Rabbis also taught … how the heart was alike the source of strength and of weakness, of good and of evil thoughts, loved and hated, envied, lusted and deceived, proving each statement from Scripture” (Edersheim 490). Jesus does not define the absolute origin of Evil, he makes it plain that the human heart holistically is capable of the greatest good\textsuperscript{164} in character and act, as it is of evil\textsuperscript{165} according to its disposition\textsuperscript{166} rather than predisposition. Edersheim points to Jesus’ attitude to religiosity as explanatory, “… [that Jesus] neither vindicated their conduct, nor apologised for their breach of Rabbinic ordinances, implied at least an attitude of indifference towards traditionalism” (485). The brief emotional portrait of Scripture in both Testaments makes clear that the heart is teachable and formative.\textsuperscript{167} The emphasis is evidently on the integrity of heart,\textsuperscript{168} which is in opposition to hypocrisy, literally ‘double faced’. Integrity is the ‘pure singularity’ void of duality and internal conflict, in the words of Paul, “Now may the Lord ‘make straight or straighten’ your hearts …” (TLT 2Th.3:5).

The heart encompasses will (obedience, desire, conviction, authority, judgment),\textsuperscript{169} and the sensorial.\textsuperscript{170} Several texts explicitly put words, thought, understanding within the sphere of heart.\textsuperscript{171} From the biblical data, ‘καρδία’ is a holistic representation of
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\textsuperscript{167} Lk.1:17; 21:34; Heb.3:12; 2Pe.2:14.
\textsuperscript{168} Mt.12:34-35; 15:8; Ac.8:21; Jm.1:26; 3:14; 2Co.5:12.
\textsuperscript{169} Ac.11:23; Ro.10:1; 2Co.9:7; Ro.6:17; 1Co.7:37; Ep.6:22; Rev.17:17.
\textsuperscript{170} Mt.5:8; Mt.13:15; Jn.12:40; Ac.28:27; 1Co.2:9.
\textsuperscript{171} Mk.2:8; Lk.1:51; 2:35; 3:15; 9:47; Ac.8:22; Ro.1:21; 2Co.4:6; Heb.4:12; 8:10; Jm.4:8; Rev.2:23; 17:17.
‘conscious self’ in emotion, character, will, understanding and moral conscience. With such a degree of concordance, it is noteworthy that the biblical writers employ a Hebraic literary device whereby through repetition, in parallelism or metonymy, the effect is to compound, intensify an emphatic holistic statement, (Soul and heart, soul and spirit). This accurately reflects the style of OT and NT writings with specific regard to the ontology of human kind.

**Body & Soul**

The primary reference is found in Luke’s record of Jesus death and resurrection, as accomplishment of the prophetic Psalm of David, “For you will not abandon my soul to Sheol, or let your holy one see corruption (‘shachath’ pit, destruction, grave)” (NKJV Ps.16:10). If read as a parallelism, Jesus is defined as soul and as body, one single entity. The place of the Spirit concerns the Person of the Spirit who, with God the Father, resurrected Jesus out of death and the grave.

Jesus establishes unity when He says, “Do not worry about your life … nor about the body … Life is more than food, and the body more than clothing” (NKJV Lk.12:22-23). The contrast is not body (‘σῶμα’) and soul (‘ψυχή’), but between the physical and the material; human unity and intrinsic value are in view. Likewise, Peter does not oppose body and soul, but perceives the passions of the ‘σαρκικῶν’, that is the person who has consciously given authority to uncontrolled impulsions of desire outside of God and Spirit life. It does not refer to the body and soul relationship but is a question of governance.

Jesus reference to those who can “… kill the body but cannot kill the soul … rather fear him who can destroy both soul and body in hell” (NKJV Mt.10:28), serves the purpose
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172 Mt.22:37; Mk.12:30, 33; Lk.10:27; Ac.4:32; 1Pe.1:22; 2Pe.2:14.
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177 See also Lk.21:18-19; Mt.10:29-31.
of addressing fear of those able to kill others physically. Jesus is not purporting the immortality of the soul, but the impossibility for a human being to kill the soul (inmaterial but not divisible). He is pointing listeners to God alone, or in reality to Himself,\textsuperscript{178} who has power to condemn in judgment the whole person to hell. Implicit is that God can also judge a ‘whole person’ to eternal life.\textsuperscript{179}

\textbf{Soul and spirit}

The majority of verses that identify soul and spirit do not apply to the human spirit but to the Person of the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{180} The exceptions relate to the whole person, to character or disposition,\textsuperscript{181} for example, “… that you are standing established in one spirit, one soul …”\textsuperscript{182} (TLT Ph.1:27). Paul’s text does not distinguish between one spirit and one soul; it is suggested that he is adding metonymically a layer by repetition. The second consideration is, in the light of the Spirit’s Person and ministry to the believer in the New Covenant, whether it is the Spirit that is in view or the human spirit, particularly in the context of unity.\textsuperscript{183} The contrasting references to ‘ψυχή’ refer to a living person.\textsuperscript{184} The comparison is no longer between the entity of ‘ψυχή’ and of ‘πνεῦμα’ as defining constituents of a person, but between a person as a living entity (‘self’) and the Spirit.

One final verse from Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians concerning resurrection states, “This first man Adam became a living soul this last Adam a living spirit” (TLT 1Co.15:45). The verse structure is threefold examples of one truth:

\begin{align*}
\text{i. First Adam a living soul} & \quad \text{last Adam a life-giving spirit} \\
\end{align*}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{178}Ac.10:42; Jn.5:22.
\item \textsuperscript{179}Jn.5:24; Ro.2:16; 14:10; 2Ti.4:1.
\item \textsuperscript{180}Lk.1:46-47; Mt.12:28; Ac.2:33; 2Co.1:22; 1Pe.1:2,11,22; 3:18.
\item \textsuperscript{181}Lk.9:55-56; Lk.1:46-47; Ph.1:27.
\item \textsuperscript{182}NKJV, ESV, and NAS versions translate as mind which is inaccurate and unnecessary.
\item \textsuperscript{183}Ep.4:3-4.
\item \textsuperscript{184}Ac.15:26; 20:24; 2Co.1:23; 1Pe.1:22; 3:20.
\end{itemize}
ii. Natural first\textsuperscript{185} spiritual after\textsuperscript{186}

iii. First man of the dust\textsuperscript{187} Second man of heaven\textsuperscript{188}

iv. As the earthly man those of the earth\textsuperscript{189} as the heavenly man those born of heaven

v. We, bear the likeness to the earthly man we, bear the likeness of the heavenly man

Fee suggests that verse forty-five is a further demonstration of the argument from the preceding verses, ‘σωμα ψυχικον’ contrasted with ‘σωμα πνευματικον’ which is not Christological (Fee 787). The verse read ontologically serves to reinforce the unity that forms a person in the natural order and in the spiritual order. The verse should be read in the light of Christ’s resurrection because the verse draws its meaning from the New Age inaugurated by Him and the Spirit’s coming. The effect upon the nature of humanity is radical transformation because of one’s relationship with the Person of the Spirit and in Christ. The form of ‘first Adam existence’ has been brought to ultimate fulfilment in Christ, ‘the second Adam’. The text does present one subtlety worthy of comment. The ‘living soul’ is not perceived here as capable of transmitting life, whereas Christ gives the Life-Giving Spirit, therefore enabling the believer to experience the New Order of resurrection life ontologically and experientially in Christ and in Spirit. The natural order does not disappear it is perfected in the spiritual order of resurrection, the resolution to the parallel or dualist tension.

**Spirit and body**

There exist spirit distinctions between: the ‘spirit’ of man, of evil spiritual beings,\textsuperscript{190} and the ‘Spirit’ who is God. Paul states that man in spirit and in flesh requires a purifying

\textsuperscript{185} Ro.5:12.

\textsuperscript{186} Ro.5:15.

\textsuperscript{187} Ge.2:7; 1Co.15:22.

\textsuperscript{188} Col.1:15, 18; 1Co.15:22.

\textsuperscript{189} Jn.3:3-6.

\textsuperscript{190} Ep.2:2; 1Co.12:10; 1Ti.4:1; 1Jn.4:1-3.
work. The ‘σωμα’ generally applies to the entity of the body and therefore does not hold a negative connotation. The call of Scripture concerns what is done in, with or to the body, in comparison to ‘σάρξ’ which, having a wide range of meanings from the physical substance of flesh to the inner life, is comparable to soul, heart and spirit, but generally with a negative connotation in conflict with the life of the Spirit. Jesus is portrayed as, “the son of David according to the ‘σάρξ’, and … Son of God … according to the ‘πνευμα’” (NKJV Ro.1:3-4). The unity of humanity and divinity is without contestation, whereas the natural man, body and spirit, is marked by an innately conflictual disposition between ‘σάρξ’ and ‘πνευμα’ God. The Age of the Spirit introduces an experience of the Spirit in such a way as to restore the believer to God’s intentions through the ‘σωμα’, ‘σάρξ’, and ‘πνευμα’ of Christ, through internal Trinitarian ministry. Unification of Christ’s humanity and divinity, becomes reconciliation to holistic bodily flesh and spirit life in a united whole person, conscious self.

Jesus at his death, “gave up his spirit” (NKJV Mt.27:50; Jn.19:30), James states that the body without spirit is dead. The spirit is clearly the life principle, the conscious self within Jesus, interchangeable with ‘soul’ and ‘heart’ as has been argued. Other references to the human spirit communicate a sense of identifying or unifying in the same
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thought, character or intent. The unifying of body and spirit as representative of the whole person is concordant too.

First Corinthians chapter five and verse five has created several heretical views of salvation of a person, in parts, rather than a whole, “… deliver this man to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, so that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord” (ESV). It is important to draw some coherent meaning in the light of the ontological construct of this chapter. Paul in chapter fifteen (see below), affirms the unity of body and spirit or soul as conform to Christ’s own death. A separatist interpretation would therefore contradict the wider Scriptural perspective. That excommunication be figuratively described is acceptable. Fee suggests that excommunication equates to delivering the person out of the sovereign authority and presence of God and therefore in the world under the authority of Satan, (208-213). If repentance does not occur then death will, not necessarily a judgment but a consequence of the situation. Paul reminds that sin is in the flesh (‘σάρξ’ a person void of God with natural instincts only) and causes death. The redemptive view of Paul perceives the possibility of salvation if the Spirit is allowed to perform convicting of righteousness in order that His law in Christ-Jesus frees from the power of law, sin and death. Bearing in mind Paul’s expression of sexual immorality as illegitimate union of body and spirit that in resurrection, uniquely belongs to the Lord, this text does not serve to distinguish body and spirit, but expresses the extreme dualism, as a breakdown in the unity of a person. The disunity of the person stands before salvation which has for purpose, the united entity of a person, the immaterial and material, forming one spiritual being.

202 1Co.5:3-4; 1Co.6:17; Gal.6:18; Ro.8:15.
203 1Co.7:34.
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205 Mt.18:17; 1Co.5:7, 9-11,13; 1Ti.1:19-20; 2Ti.2:17.
206 Ro.7:8-11.
207 Ro.8:2-4.
208 1Co.6:14-20.
Peter’s reference to soul and heart reflects parallel repetition, “Since you have purified your souls … love one another fervently with a pure heart” (NKJV 1Pe.1:22). TR includes the phrase ‘δια πνευματος’,209 an expression of the Holy Spirit’s ministry to the person. The addition is corroborated by the Pentecostal narrative, when the first disciples were gathered together because of Holy Spirit infilling, they were of “one heart and one soul” (NKJV Ac.4:31-32).

Soul, spirit, body, and heart

“Because living this word of God and operating effectively and sharper more than every double-edged sword and going through until division [of] both soul and spirit both joint and marrow also judging skilfully thinking and understanding [of the] heart” (TLT Heb.4:12).

Even if this verse is taken as defining human kind, the context is strictly a unifying one. Through three examples: ‘spirit and soul’, ‘joint and marrow’ and ‘thinking and understanding’, the text suggests what is humanly indivisible only the word of God, which is the sword of the Spirit,210 is effective enough to divide objectively, ‘dividing the indivisible’. The emphasis is upon subjective unity or oneness of a person. To be noted is the identification of intellectual faculty with heart harmoniously part of the whole. The purpose of distinguishing spheres of human nature is to reinforce the unity.

In the light of the overwhelming evidence to a holistic, conscious unified self, expressed through the terms considered, the trichotomist’s preferred reference to spirit soul and body,211 is difficult to interpret as defining ontologically a person. Paul’s emphasis echoes the covenant address previously considered by his use of ‘ολοτελεις’ (perfect, complete in all respects) and ‘ὁ λόκληρος’ a composite term from the adjective ‘ὁλος’ and ‘κλῆρος’ translated lot or portion, implicitly the whole or entire, meaning complete in all its parts and in all respects.212 It is preferable to conceive, even if Paul has imported a Platonic philosophical concept that was widely recognizable, that its meaning has to

---

209 WH, IPNT, and NTIG Greek texts do not include the phrase.
210 Ep.6:17.
211 1Th.5:23.
212 ‘ὁ λόκληρος’ T GEL 2016.
follow the overwhelming sense of the text that is holistic. The Hebraic mechanism of
adding layers to compound and strengthen the emphasis is etymologically legitimate. The
context of the verse is also that of doxology where Paul often rises to exultation in his
final blessings\textsuperscript{213} which serves to emphasize Paul’s intent rather than any secondary
constitutional interpretation which is forced upon the text.

**A New Constitutional Order**

The prophecies of Joel, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel all corroborate prophetically that a
new order was being announced, a New Covenant of God, in which the significance of
the Spirit of God takes preponderance. Covenant required death to abolish or fulfill it,
otherwise a new covenant could not be introduced. Jesus Christ’s atonement is not just
expiatory, propitiatory or redemptive in scope, it inaugurates a new ontology for
humanity. The old covenant being fulfilled, it is in Christ, both the Father and Jesus,
sending of the Spirit to indwell believers that a momentous ontological and existential
change is inaugurated.

The prophecies in question\textsuperscript{214} agree on the following:

- i. The Person of the Spirit is poured out on all believers
- ii. The Person of the Spirit is to indwell believers
- iii. Hearts of stone are transformed into hearts of flesh (‘basar’)
- iv. My Law, My words in believers’ hearts and mouths
- v. Covenant continuation “I will be your God and you will be My people”

The fulfilment of this prophecy is expressed in several ways. The nature of Christ’s
coming in ‘incarnation’ reflects the New Age. The incarnation of the Spirit, from Jesus
coming and Pentecost clearly define the new way. Christianity is from this time onwards
released from old covenant and introduced into the fullness of God in Trinity indwelling
the believer, producing the Divine presence and nature within whereby God’s words, his
laws through the fulfilment of Christ, are incarnate in the believer. No longer does human
effort, human ascension to right beliefs and thinking towards God suffice; no longer does

\textsuperscript{213} Ro.16:25-27; 2Co.13:14; Ph.4:19-20; 2Th.3:16; 1Ti.6:13-16.

\textsuperscript{214} Jl.1:28-32; Is.59:21; Jer.31:31-33; Ez.11:19-20; 36:26-27; 37:4-10, 14.
the dualistic conflict within ‘self’ satisfy because there is a new ontological existence in which Christ is the ‘πρωτότοκος’.

Fee describes the relationship between Spirit and human nature as, “the transformed body, therefore, is not composed of “spirit”; it is a body adapted to the eschatological existence that is under the ultimate domination of the Spirit” (786). But if human nature is regenerated and transformed by the incarnate dwelling of God in Trinity, then there is no necessity of domination of human nature because of the indwelling. The notion Paul describes is one of every aspect of human nature being indwelt and taking its origin from this internal source of divine life.

Paul referring to ‘σώμα ψυχικόν’ contrasted with ‘σώμα πνευματικόν’ in his letter to the Corinthians, uses phraseology that is unique to the NT. He exposes the nature and effects of the resurrection of Jesus Christ particularly in relation to the type of body. Its use in chapter ten is bound to being in Christ, the explanation is in the concept of the origins of one’s life. Paul’s unique understanding is that resurrection means a transformed bodily existence that is no longer ‘soul’ that could be interpreted as life fashioned for a purely earthly existence but ‘spiritual’ defined as a corporeal existence in Spirit fit for eternity and Kingdom reign. The scandal for the Corinthians under Greek influence would be the marriage of ‘σώμα’ and ‘πνεῦμα’ rather than a non-material existence. As Fee comments, “… this use of language must have had special shock value in Corinth, where the word pneumatikos is most likely what set them apart from Paul and was a catchword for their antisomatic understanding of Christian existence” (785). The strength of the argument is that neither in this present earthly life nor in the Age of eternity which has come and is to come does human existence compose of anything less than the integrity of body and Spirit. Pentecost, viewed as part of the New Covenant accomplishment, inaugurates however partially this New Age of Eternal Life. This explains the transition from OT to NT as: the external, sporadic, transitory, temporary and partial, in the context of ‘σώμα ψυχικόν’. With the coming of Christ and the Spirit, a New Age, a New Constitution, a New Humanity are founded upon ‘σώμα πνευματικόν’.

---
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216 πνευματικόν’ occurs 5 times Ro.1:11; 1Co.10:3-4; 15:44-45.
The relationship of God and the Spirit to the heart in the New Age, is one whereby the nature of the Spirit is being ministered into the believer’s heart: purifying, searching, examining and perceiving the mind, with revelation counsel and understanding, he writes a letter engraved upon hearts, caring earnestly and exhorting, circumcises, fills with the love of God, seals and straightens out.

This new ontological relationship with God involves incarnate ministry to the ‘heart’ or ‘soul’ or ‘self’ – the whole person.

The relationship of spirit and body in the New Age, is one whereby the body outside of the life of the Spirit is dead, to law in Christ through his death. It is only the Spirit who brings the quality of life that is of the New Age. ‘σάρξ’ is holistically prophesied over as the place for the ‘out and in-pouring’ of the Spirit. It refers to more than just the physical entity ‘σωμα’, it infers the substance and nature of human being. It implies the impregnation of ‘soul’, ‘heart’, ‘spirit’ and all that is expressed therein.

\[217\] Ac.15:9.
\[218\] Ac.16:14.
\[219\] Ro.8:27; 1Th.2:4; Rev.2:23.
\[220\] 1Co.2:9-10; 4:5; 14:25; Lk.21:13-15; Ac.5:3; 7:51.
\[221\] 2Co.2:2-3.
\[222\] 2Co.8:16; 2Th.2:17.
\[223\] Ro.2:29.
\[224\] Ro.5:5.
\[225\] 2Co.1:22.
\[226\] 2Th.3:5.
\[227\] Ro.7:24; Ro.8:10-13.
\[228\] Ro.7:4.
\[229\] Ro.8:10.
\[230\] Ro.7:6; 8:11.
\[231\] Jl.2:28-32; Ac.2:17-18.
In the Image of God

The argument so far makes evident the holistic appellations for a human being viewed from different perspectives. The synonymous nature of the frequently employed terms ‘nepeš’ or ‘ψυχή’; ‘rûa’ or ‘πνεῦμα’; ‘leb’, ‘lebab’ or ‘καρδία’, ‘σάρξ’ or ‘σωμα’, (the latter to a lesser extent), lead to the observation that none of the above are employed to define the constituent parts of human nature. They all communicate inseparability of human nature whether: material or immaterial, physical, volitional, moral, intellectual or spiritual, internal or external, whether for good or for evil. The conclusion is that they are different windows by which one can perceive the facets of the workings of a human person as a whole. If they have no defining quality regarding human being and nature, then a response to this ontological question should be found.

The image of God reflected in the creation of man and woman in His image has, historically, philosophically and culturally influenced theological and biblical perception. Each approach can be substantiated to some extent, though there are flagrant incoherencies such as the confusion between spirit and mind. It is when the various schools of thought are submitted to the holistic revelation of Scripture that they may find a place or not.

The principal emphasizes synthesized are:

i. God being logical and rational, man and woman are also made rational beings. It has been demonstrated that the tripartite view often leans to the rational amalgamation with the spirit. The preceding argument demonstrates that mind is integrally part of heart. The ‘Substantialists’ such as Ireneus, Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas emphasized rational, mind and reason (Atkinson and Field 23), as Augustine asserts, “For a great thing truly is man, made after the image and similitude of God, not as respects the mortal body in which he is clothed, but as respects the rational soul by which he is exalted in honour above the beasts”. (Augustine Four Books 15).

---

232 Ge.1 exemplified in the chronological order of creation.

ii. Mankind is distinguished from animals by his ability to experience communion with God.²³⁴

iii. God existing in Tri-unity, in eternal community of relationships of three Persons: Father, Jesus and Spirit, therefore creates Adam and Eve as fundamentally relational and social beings. Community is constituted.²³⁵ The ‘Relationists’ include Martin Luther, John Calvin, Karl Barth, and Emil Brunner. The latter had a strong social perspective of the love for God and for man, “Love for humanity is appropriately expressed as one recognizes the different orders of society …”²³⁶ (Ferguson et al. 110).

iv. God is sovereign, expressing absolute authority and governance over the created order, therefore man through Adamic covenant is to dominate, to exercise authority and governance over the created things on earth.²³⁷

Anthropomorphism as a fear whereby the image of God is reduced to the nature of man, must be overcome. That infinite God make man and woman in His image, should be received from God’s revelation of Himself, and be reconciled with the fact that humankind reflects His image in the creational order, but more so believers in the regenerative order of the New or Eschatological Age, “… being transformed into the same image from one degree of glory to another…” (ESV 2Co.3:18). The partial tending to fullness, the imperfection being perfected, the finite reflecting the infinite, the arbitrary formed by the absolute; this accepted, a believer is the reflected image of God in the substance of his being:

i  God is an intellectual Being: He reveals Himself, in thoughts and reasons. Nothing exists without God providing a reason, an explication, or a purpose.

ii  God is a moral Being establishing distinctions between good and evil, true and false, just and unjust, right and wrong, and recompense and judgment.

²³⁴ Ge.3:8.

²³⁵ Ge.2:18-23.


²³⁷ Ge.1:26-30.
iii God is an emotional Being. He reveals His heart and soul. He loves, hates, is angry, joyful, weeps, regrets…

iv God is a volitional Being. He wants, desires, delights, pleasures, projects, fulfills.

v God is a spiritual Being. God, the Spirit is a Person, Jesus Christ is perfectly spiritual. Spirit beyond the divine Person, is then an origin, a source, a quality of being impregnating every resulting action.

vi God is a relational Being. God in His perfection has need of no one, yet He is eternally in relationship with the Eternal Spirit and the Eternal Jesus. An eternal choice, as One Perfect joins with another Perfect, an infinite expression of unity, of collaboration, and of operation.

Human Constitution: Seven component parts

The answer to the ontological question as what the composite parts that form a complete human being are, particularly in the light of the New Age of the Spirit and the New Humanity inaugurated in the resurrected Christ, is the purpose of this section. The results of a biblical and ontological analysis produce the following illustration, (Fig.VII).

The ontological humanity in the image of God proposal is composed of seven dynamic interrelated and inseparable parts that define personhood and personal unity, as they are found in Godhead. The uniqueness of every individual identity is found in the diversity
of temperament characteristics expressed in each of these seven areas. These seven constituent parts of humanity will now be developed in the context of a human being in the New Age of incarnation in Godhead.

i. **Intelligence**

‘νοῦς’ in the Greek NT refers to the faculty for thinking, understanding, perceiving, and judging. The biblical texts portray ‘νοῦς’ as capable of evil thought processes which are explicitly connected to attitudes, emotions, intentions, and actions. These are an expression of the degenerate mind, which hardens the heart in ignorance and always leads to unacceptable and perverse behaviour. The mind of a believer can fall into pseudo-knowledge or belief; a corrupt change for the worst, also expressed as detachment from Christ. Paul’s recommendation is attachment to Christ the Head and Source, who nourishes and joins together the members causing divinely originated growth, which is the body (‘σῶμα’) of Christ in comparison to the shadow of other religious dogma. Paul explicitly differentiates between ‘νοῦς’ and ‘πνευματι’, the two components are described as capable of the same act of worship in different modes, both are equally spiritual, one expressing in a spiritual language, the other in a comprehensible language, plausibly the same spiritual truths in a united single act of worship. Spirit is not therefore mind. Moreover, Paul teaches that because we have Spirit, we have the ‘νοῦς’ of Christ, similarly, Jesus affected the disciple’s faculty to comprehend the Scriptures.

The faculty of the mind finds itself subordinate to Spirit in order to integrate and experience the mind of Christ. The mind in Christ causes transformation (‘ἀνανεῶ’)
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literally internal new birth) and complete restoration (‘ἀνακαίνωσις’) of the believer.\textsuperscript{246}

The translation of Ephesians four verse twenty-three has to be argued in light of the Spirit ministering this internal change to minds. It is possible that Paul employs a form of parallelism wherein the terms are synonymous, although the former is more consistent with the biblical witness.

There are seven principal terms to describe different kinds of intellectual processes which compose the ontology of a person in relation to the mind. These pedagogical concepts, viewed ontologically represent a diversity of expressions of intelligences.

i. ‘ḥokmāh’\textsuperscript{247} / ‘σοφία’\textsuperscript{248}

Wisdom: under Greek influence ‘σοφία’ of the ‘σοφός’ was highly philosophical, embracing the learned, rhetoricians, poets, antagonists, cynics, equivocators, and prevaricators (Zodhiates 1301 -1302 and Barrett 58-81),

The word sophist does not have a good reputation … the intellectual hair-splitter who desires to pay you with words. The sophist discourse at face value was the real truth that was worth a bounced cheque at the bank … swindler of aphorisms … their trade at a price was to teach to convince and to triumph using every thread of rhetoric and dialectic … they had their ideas about everything … it was not just the taste for upheaval of playful intellectual conduct besotted with anything new … they took the approach of … men speak … in order to say something useful … it has to be said the sophists were carried along by the breeze of the current ambiance (Jerphagnon 83-85).

The biblical evidence depicts the ‘σοφός’ as the man who puts into practice what he knows as demonstrating wisdom according to Scripture. This corroborates with the OT ‘ḥokmāh’ which retains the notion of skill\textsuperscript{249} (Rodgers 238). The ‘σοφία’ relates to: God’s

\textsuperscript{246} Ro.12:2; Ep.4:23.

\textsuperscript{247} 148 times mentioned in the OT.

\textsuperscript{248} 72 times mentioned including derivatives in the NT.

\textsuperscript{249} Ex.28:3; 31:3; 1Kg.4:29; 10:24; Ec.2:21; Da.1:17.
words,\textsuperscript{250} to pithy maxims,\textsuperscript{251} instructions or counsels.\textsuperscript{252} The source of all wisdom is God,\textsuperscript{253} Wisdom is personified, prophesied, and fulfilled in the person of Jesus Christ, who is Wisdom.\textsuperscript{254} ‘σοφία’ is contrasted with the ‘κόσμος’: the order or arrangement of the universe, the earth, inhabitants, human beings, the unbelieving or any distinct people grouping, the material, economic, social, political, religious or philosophical world system;\textsuperscript{255} the ‘τιόν’ in reference to the existing world in a specific era.\textsuperscript{256} This wisdom is qualified as: demonic, sensual and earthly,\textsuperscript{257} purely a human construct,\textsuperscript{258} of self-imposed religious observance\textsuperscript{259} and cunning fables,\textsuperscript{260} appearing as: mighty, noble, and wise, yet in spiritual terms being weak, shameful, and foolish.\textsuperscript{261} The biblical writers implicitly associate certain identifiable philosophical trends, for example, the aesthetic Stoics suggested by Paul’s reference to self-imposed religious do’s and don’ts.\textsuperscript{262} His writings to the Corinthians under early Gnostic influence by which, “the divine is something to be contemplated, not heard and believed, Gnosticism accepts the invisibility of God but believes that deification by gnosis brings the vision of God” (Kittel and Friedrich @559).\textsuperscript{263} Paul responds anchoring biblical sophism in the demonstration and tangible

\textsuperscript{250} Dt.4:6; Ps.111:10.
\textsuperscript{251} Pr.3:13; 14:33; 15:33.
\textsuperscript{252} Job 33:33, 36; Pr.4:11.
\textsuperscript{253} Pr.2:6; Ez.7:25; Jer.51:25; Ep.1:17.
\textsuperscript{254} Pr.8-9; Is.11:2; Mt.13:54; 1Co.1:24, 30.
\textsuperscript{255} 1Co.1:20, 21; 3:19; 2Co.1:12.
\textsuperscript{256} 1Co.1:20; 2:6, 7; Rev.7:2.
\textsuperscript{257} Jm.3:15-17.
\textsuperscript{258} 1Co.2:4; 2Co.1:12.
\textsuperscript{259} Col.2:23.
\textsuperscript{260} 2Pe.1:16.
\textsuperscript{261} Ro.1:22; 1Co.1:25-27; 3:18-19.
\textsuperscript{262} Col.2:23.
\textsuperscript{263} Col.2:8-10.
reality of the cross, the Person of Christ and the Spirit, as the foundation of his counter-argument.\textsuperscript{264} Likewise there is an existential argument of human philosophy where a person denies the inner witness to Creator God’s existence and works; this ‘σοφία’ rejects God and sets self in His place, man’s sufficiency in himself becoming his idolatry and so the divine and eternal in relationship is lost.\textsuperscript{265}

‘σοφία’ is characterized biblically as: originating in and imparted from heaven, pure, peaceable, gentle, acquiescent, full of mercy and good in fruits, conduct and action, discrete and prudent, impartial and without hypocrisy, gracious, simple, and sincere, perspicuous in scrutiny.\textsuperscript{266} In contrast to human ‘σοφία’ the believer demonstrates the indwelling Holy Spirit, His wisdom taught, and His inherent enabling, in faith, in the indwelling word of Christ, and His earthly ministry.\textsuperscript{267}

The perfect and infinite ‘σοφία’ is expressed in Trinity, where it finds its origin. This wisdom is manifest in believers not as a grace gift, but through in the indwelling of the Godhead. If Christ and the cross are the perfection and penultimate demonstration of ‘σοφία’,\textsuperscript{268} the ultimate purpose in wisdom is the Trinity indwelling manifesting their ‘σοφία’ in and through believers to the world. In the New Age of Christ and Spirit, wisdom is redefined by the person of Christ. OT ‘ḥokmāh’ finds prophetic accomplishment in Christ. He who has Christ abiding within will be the space where perfect divine wisdom is incarnate and demonstrated in being, thought, word and act.\textsuperscript{269}

\textsuperscript{264} 1Co.18-24, 30; 2:6-12.
\textsuperscript{265} Ro.1:18-23; Jm.3:15-17.
\textsuperscript{266} Jm.3:13, 15-7; 2Pe.3:15; 2Co.1:12; Ro.16:19; Ep.5:15; Col.4:5; 1Co.3:10; 6:5.
\textsuperscript{267} 1Co.2:4; 2:5, 7, 10; 2:13; 12:8; Col.3:16; 2Ti.3:15; 2Pe.1:16; Ps.19:7; 119:98.
\textsuperscript{268} Father: Ro.16:27; Ep.1:18; Col.1:9; 1Ti.1:17; Jm.1:5; Jude 1:25; Rev.7:12; Job 9:4; 1Kg.4:29; 10:24; Jesus: 1Co.1:24, 30; Col.1:28; 2:3; Rev.5:12; Pr.8:12, 14-16, 20-21, 22-31; 1Co.2:5; Spirit: Ep.1:17; 1Co.2:7, 10; 2:13; 12:8; Ex.31:3, 31.
\textsuperscript{269} 1Co.1:30.
The particularity of this wide spectrum term is that it is defined as, to know or to learn by personal experience (Zodhiates 1013). The preposition ‘ἐπι’ adds the dimension of upon or superimposition translated as in-depth, thorough knowledge by personal experience. ἐπιγινώσκω’ sometimes implies a special participation in the object known and gives greater weight … stressing participation in the truth, not simply believing (Zodhiates 373-374). Likewise, ‘ἐπίγνωσις’ is a thoroughly intensified participative experience of knowledge (624).

With reference to Jesus ministry, the Gospel texts record an aspect of prescience, insight into hearts, motivations, intentions, and actions. In some instances the experiential is explicit rather than implicit; the experiential principle distinctive to this term should be held as fundamental even in prescience. This prescient ‘γινώσκω’, particularly in the synoptic Gospels, leads to miracles, teaching and explaining, affirming Messiahship and Kingdom as an entity and as a core value.

’γνωρίζω’ a derivative of ‘γινώσκω’ means to make known or recognize thoroughly. The term is highly revelatory in nature, whether of angels, of God, of Christ, of the Spirit, and of Scripture. Paul uses this term among others to describe the origin and nature of the message he brings: the Gospel, the grace of God, of the church as revealed and a means of revelation.

---
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This experiential knowledge is expressed in Trinity.\textsuperscript{281} Jesus describes his reciprocal relationship with the Father as ‘γινώσκω’ and ‘ἐπιγινώσκω’. Where Luke uses the former, Matthew uses the latter, intensified experiential knowledge,\textsuperscript{282} whereby uniquely the Son knows the Father and chooses to whom He reveals Him. This concurs with Jesus expression of unity and equality with the Father when He says, “… if you had known me you would have known my Father also … I am in the Father and the Father is in me” (ESV Jn.14:7, 10), to know experientially ‘One’ is to know the ‘Other’. It is into this relationship that the believer enters with Jesus Christ,\textsuperscript{283} and in Him; and this same experiential knowledge enunciated in Trinity, is the same that is incarnate into believers, it is therefore a divine faculty.\textsuperscript{284} It is necessary to give prominence to ‘γινώσκω’ and ‘ἐπιγινώσκω’ as the terms accentuate that the believer is called to know God, Jesus and Spirit in an experiential manner because it is how they know each other. There is a distinction between the ‘γινώσκω’ of the Father and Jesus, and the ‘γινώσκω’ of a believer called into experiential knowledge of the Trinity. Zodhiates comments, “Man cannot know the Father experientially, but the Lord Jesus knows the Father intuitively because He and the Father are one, of the same essence” (374). However, his justification by using John chapter eight verse fifty-five must be reconciled with chapter fourteen verse seven, Christ being fully God, in eternal and perfect relationship united to the Father, sharing the same nature, experiences a unique relationship to the Father. However, the plain witness of Scripture cannot be denied, the believer is called to ‘κοινωνός’ in the divine nature in the same way that Christ experienced the fullness of human nature,\textsuperscript{285} in order that the believer know by personal experience the ‘κοινωνός’ with the Trinity.\textsuperscript{286} Paul clearly expounds the distinction for believers, “now at this time I know by experience out of the part assigned at this time, but I will know thoroughly by experience just as also I am
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thoroughly known by personal experience” (TLT 1Co.13:12). Paul sets out an argument against omniscience in favour of love, ‘


gινώσκω’ and ‘ἐπιγινώσκω’. ‘ἐκ μέρους’ in the text clearly intimates that the believer’s experience is an assigned part, a measure of the fullness, “… in Him dwells permanently all the fullness of Deity bodily; and you are in Him having been filled who is the source and head …” (TLT Col.2:10). The biblical texts references to ‘all’ concur to suggest that the believer exists ‘ἐκ’ the perfection of the Godhead. Therefore, it is imperative to establish this ‘


gινώσκω’ and ‘ἐπιγινώσκω’ relationship with the Trinity as foundational to the existential experience of a believer. This conception also reinforces the nature of knowing as not being uniquely an intellectual or rational exercise of acquired comprehension ‘about’ God, it is a personal experiential knowing that addresses every part of human composition and therein causes experiential knowing within the believer. Objectivity and subjectivity meet and are reconciled in this ‘


gινώσκω’ and ‘ἐπιγινώσκω’ in Trinity.

iii. ‘συνίημι’

‘συνίημι’ meaning: to set, bring or join together, to understand, referring also to innate insight by five senses. ‘


αἰσθάνομαι’ means to apprehend or perceive with body or mind and suggests understanding in a context where knowledge is being concealed from the person concerned, and is unique to Luke. Scripture employs the term in the context of the ability to connect the pieces, join them together to understanding. Jesus often asks this question during the dialogues with the disciples as he speaks figuratively or in parable. His appeal to Mary and Joseph is that they join up the prophetic and angelic words to them and understand as Jesus comes of age, he is giving Himself to His Father’s affairs; his ability to join things up is demonstrated through discussions with the religious leaders. The human understanding is often shown as deficient or contrary to the

287 See also Lk.10:22; 1Co.13:10, 11; 1Jn.3:2.

288 The same concept is confirmed in Jn.1:16; 1Co.1:30; 8:6; Ep.4:13; of the Spirit Jn.3:6, 8; Gal.6:8; 1Jn.3:24; 4:13; 1Jn.3:2; of Jesus Jn.3:34; 1Co.10:4, 17; 2Co.13:14; Col.2:19; 1Jn.5:1.

289 ‘συνίημι’ TGEL 2016; 25 times mentioned in the NT.

290 Lk.9:45 only mention in NT.

291 Lk.18:34; It is a Lukan variant on the synoptic readings of the third passion that stands alone.

292 Mt.16:12; 17:13; 10:12; Mk.8:17; Lk.18:31.

293 Lk.2:45, 50.
‘συνίημι’ that Jesus operates. Paul insists that there is a God given ‘σόνεσις’ of the Father and of Christ, the mystery now revealed, source of all wisdom and knowledge. Spirit given understanding, suggests that the Trinity become the perfect source of understanding, each ‘One’ revealing understanding of the ‘Other’ to the believer.

The condition of the heart is determinant as to the effectiveness of ‘συνίημι’, it is affected by the capacity to listen and hear accurately, to which Paul alludes, “… having the eyes of your hearts enlightened …” (ESV Ep.1:18). The term is sensorial through Jesus’ and Paul’s use of Isaiah six verses nine to ten, where the use of Hebrew, Septuagint and Greek texts all agree:

i. heavy weighted hearing, (‘kāḇēḏ’)
ii. seeing physically with smeared over vision (‘šā’a’) or shut eyes (‘καμμύω’)
iii. seeing with perception and discernment
iv. hearts, either emotional or inner person, as fat or heavy, pejoratively thick, stupid or callous (‘šāman’ figuratively self-satisfied, lazy; unreceptive or insensitive) (Baker and Carpenter 1166).

The faculty of ‘συνίημι’ is therefore obscured by a person’s own disposition, all the verbs are in the active voice which confirms. The verb in perfect tense suggests, returning of self to God because of His healing, requires the healing of understanding as anterior to the turning back to God. As Motyer comments on this text,

Isaiah taught with such simplicity and clarity that the sophisticates of his day scorned him as fit only to conduct a kindergarten … His task was to bring the Lord’s

---

294 Mt.13:15; Lk.24:45, 50; Ac.16:14; 1Co.1:19; 2Ti.2:7.
296 Mt.13:14-15; Mk.6:52; Ac.28:27.
297 Mt.13:13-15, 19, 23; 15:10; Mk.7:14; Ro.15:21; Lk.2:47.
299 It is noteworthy that Motyer comments on the dilution of intensity as the imperative in the Massoretic Text is translated as indicative in the Septuagint (Moter 78, footnote.7).
word with fresh, even unparalleled clarity, but in their response the people would reach the point of no return (79).

These texts corroborate with the NT evidence that Trinity are the source of ‘συνίημι’, thereby recovering its ontological place and subsequent function in a human being. In God ‘συνίημι’ is regenerative: hearing and joining revelation and truth together; seeing physically and perceiving the genuine meaning of people and events; an emotional inner centre that joins the internal with the external; the relational and the event connected in divine comprehension. As such, the clarity of Isaiah is surpassed by the perfection of Christ in whom the believer’s ‘συνίημι’ is found, intensifying, increasing and perfecting understanding of Godhead, of incarnate Trinitarian life, of self, of world environment, circumstances and people.

iv. ‘εἰδω’ or ‘οἶδα’
‘εἰδω’ is to see or perceive with the mind; a mechanical, passive or casual vision.300 ‘εἰδος’ a derivative only applies to outward or external appearance or form;301 is partially or loosely synonymous with ‘γινώσκω’ according to Kittel and Friedrich (@538).

The Greeks are a people of the eye, and seeing is important. It has strong significance in their religion, which is of vision. Quite early there is a transition from sensory to intellectual and spiritual perception. The divine is something to be contemplated, not heard and believed. Gnosticism accepts the invisibility of God but believes that deification by gnosis brings the vision of God (Kittel and Friedrich @559).

The significance for biblical theology and human ontology, is the recovery of sensory and perception in the context of human intelligence. The Bible texts correct the Gnostics extra-corporeal conception by restoring an incarnational and ontological definition in and through God, Christ and the Spirit.

300 ‘εἰδω’ TGEL 2016; SECB 2015; 370 times mentioned in the NT.
301 ‘εἰδος’ TGEL 2016. 5 times mentioned in the NT.
The biblical evidence can be regrouped in a few general categories for clarity in definition and usage:

i. A majority of usage translates in the physical and visible dimension, whether regarding people or actions or objects.\(^{302}\)

ii. One particular use is in reference to spiritual vision. The perception is revelatory, not of human origin but of divine, enabling a person to perceive spiritual realities in heaven and on earth.\(^{303}\)

iii. Another application is that of spiritual perception that discerns the inner or hidden condition or disposition behind a visible or physical person or circumstance, whereby a truth or accurate perception is the effect.\(^{304}\)

iv. The epistolary usage appeals to common prior knowledge fact base, historical events, or experiences that provide a basis for confirming, affirming or further exposition and development.\(^{305}\)

v. Reflected in Trinity and in particularly in Jesus words and actions, is the notion of omniscience, in that the biblical texts sometimes refer to past, present or future, and should be interpreted from this position. In this the Trinity’s ‘εἰδω’ is perfect and infinite in nature. Jesus dialogues with Jewish leaders in particular concerning their perception of him and of his relationship with the Father in the pursuit of recognition of his identity.\(^{306}\) This characteristic should not be confused with the references where the Gospel authors perceive His omniscience. Between being omniscient and exercising omniscience there is a distinction to be maintained that is not in conflict with

\(^{302}\) Mt.2:9; 5:16; 8:18; 23:39; Ac.4:20; 6:15; 13:12; 1Co.8:10; Gal.2:7.

\(^{303}\) Mt.3:16; Lk.1:12; Jn.1:48; Ac.7:55; 9:12, 27,10:3, 17; 16:10; and of demons Mk.1:24, 34; 9:20, 25; Lk.4:34, 41; see Revelation.

\(^{304}\) Mt.3:7; Lk.2:26, 30, 49; 7:22, 25, 26; 19:41; Mt.4:18, 21; 9:9, 2, 22; 20:22; Ac.11:23; 14:9.

\(^{305}\) Mt.20:25; Ac.10:37; 1Co.3:16; 6:2-3; 8:4; 1Th.2:1-2; Jn.4:4; 1Pe.5:9; 2Pe.1:12; 1Jn.3:14; 5:19.

\(^{306}\) Of the Father Mk.13:32; Lk.12:30; of Jesus Lk.23:34; Jn.1:47-50; 7:29; 8:14; 13:1, 3; of the Spirit Lk.2:26; Jn.3:8; Ac.7:55; Ro.8:26-27; 1Co.2:11.
the divine ontology. Likewise, ‘εἰδω’ along with other terms for intelligence, is reflected in the intra-Trinitarian relationship.

The believer of the New Age of the indwelling Christ and the Spirit, experiences ‘εἰδω’ in distinct ways. The believer is brought into intimate friendship with Jesus and the Father which is the place for revelation and subsequent perceiving. The distinction between Jesus and the believer, is that perception and knowledge of this kind, is ministered out of the Spirit who perceives the depths. The Spirit is omniscient, the believer on the other hand experiences increasing perception by divine revelation, thus presupposes a measure and a limit.

v. ‘ἐπίσταμαι’
This term is defined as, to fix one’s thoughts on, be acquainted with in order to understand by proximity. It is used to explain, prior, or shared, or common knowledge, or understanding of history or certain relevant facts to a particular context. Its limitations are expressed: in Abraham’s walk of faith; and God’s will in the face of the ephemeral nature of human life; in Apollos’ knowledge of John’s baptism. It is used of understanding associated with degenerate nature (‘φυσικῶς’). Both Peter and Paul employ the term to refer to commonly shared, and prior understanding i.e. that does not require further explanation. It can refer to learning and comprehending by first hand experience – a learning by doing intelligence.

308 Mt.9:6; Jn.4:10; 5:32; 7:29; 8:19, 55; 13:3; 19:28.
309 Heb.8:10-11.
310 Jn.15:15; Ac.20:22; 1Jn.3:1-2.
312 ‘ἐπίσταμαι’ TGEL 2016, SECB 2015; 14 times mentioned in the NT.
313 Heb.11:8; Jm.4:14; Ac.18:25.
‘θεωρέω’ also reflects the aspect of proximity: to observe with attention to details and with purpose. When applied in the context of human reaction, the term reflects observation: as looking on, in a physical sense, and also of perceiving meaning in something; of supernatural signs and miracles; in a spiritual context: where demons recognize Jesus, Son of God; where spiritual vision is the nature of observation, it is experienced as a physical phenomenon, yet pointing to a reality beyond the physical limitations. The physical observation is often moved beyond to provide a spiritual lesson or experience; and finally ‘θεωρέω’ is used to challenge disbelief, belief, and lessons in moving from sight to faith and to action.

The synonym ‘θεάομαι’ general perception of a casual observer; compared to ‘εἴδω’ carries a keener sense of continued inspection; referring to: eye witnesses to Jesus, his works, his glory incarnate, the Holy Spirit witnessing upon him, his burial and resurrection, his ascension and his second coming. These observations are teaching and forming truth within believers. It is not a simple observation for its own sake, it always leads to action. Jesus uses this ocular knowledge to nurture spiritual perception of times and circumstances – opportunities for the Gospel; belief and discipleship. This kind of intelligence corresponds to keen observation, as a means of knowing.

315 ‘θεωρέω’ TGEL 2016. 55 times mentioned in the NT.
316 Mt.27:55; 28:1; Lk.23:35; Jn.20:6, 14; 16:10; Ac.20:38; 25:24.
317 Mk.5:15; Jn.4:19; Ac.4:13; Ac.17:16, 22; 21:20; 27:10; 28:6; Heb.7:4.
318 Jn.2:23; 9:8; Ac.3:16; 8:13.
319 Mk.3:11; 5:15.
320 Lk.10:18; 24:37, 39; Jn.12:45; 14:17; Ac.7:56; 9:7; 10:11.
321 Mk.15:40; Lk.21:6; 23:35; Jn.8:51; 17:24.
322 Lk.24:37; Jn.4:19, 25; Jn.6:19; Mt.14:27, 31; Jn.6:40, 62.
323 ‘θεάομαι’ TGEL 2016, SECB 2015; 24 times mentioned in the NT.
324 Mk.16:11, 14; Lk.23:55; Jn.1:14, 32; 11:45; Ac.1:11; 1Jn.1:1; 4:14.
325 Mt.22:11; Jn.6:5; 8:10.
326 Jn.4:35; Mt.11:17; Jn.11:45; Jn.1:38.
vi. ‘νοιέω’

‘νοιέω’ is defined as: to perceive, understand, reflect, or consider; to exercise the mind through observation;\(^{327}\) to perceive with thought coming into consciousness as distinct from sensorial perception (Zodhiates 1013). This term is rarely used without correlation to the other genres of knowing. Jesus’ desire for ‘σύνεσις’ as the end result, is lacking in the disciples and so Jesus appeals to them to ‘νοιέω’, think or recall consciously about what he has said and done by intentionally going over again recent events with new thinking in order to reach ‘σύνεσις’. For the disciples that meant moving beyond their own literalist logic to another reading and comprehension of spiritual significance.\(^{328}\) Likewise, Paul sets out the universal reality of humankind’s innate knowledge made known by God and exhibited in them if ‘νοιέω’, conscious consideration, was given then they could look and thoroughly perceive the nature of God. Being consciously considered, leads to a clarity of perception of Creator God.\(^{329}\) In a similar manner, Paul begins with God disclosing revelation, making mystery known of Non-Jews as legitimate co-heirs and co-members of the body of Christ. His point is that the believers consider the ‘σύνεσις’. Paul has of this mystery, that is to say that what he communicates is to cause believers to think and consider or realize consciously the extent of his joined up understanding.\(^{330}\) The absence of this faculty signifies the nature of the pseudo-teachers, stressing the disconnection between great verbal declarations, detached from and tangibly lacking in the inner workings of ‘νοιέω’. This could be described as borrowed or second-hand learning, that is stark in the light of relationship with God who overwhelmingly exceeds a believer’s ‘νοιέω’ by the inherent ability of God in him or her.\(^{331}\)

‘κατανοέω’ to perceive, remark, observe, consider with eyes attentively,\(^{332}\) is an intensification of ‘νοιέω’ (Zodhiates 838), calling for a more profound appreciation of the

---

\(^{327}\) ‘νοιέω’ \textit{TGEL}. 2016; \textit{SECB}. 2015; 14 times mentioned in the NT.

\(^{328}\) Mt.15:10; 16:8.

\(^{329}\) Ro.1:20; see also Heb.11:3.

\(^{330}\) Ep.3:4; see also 2Ti.2:7.

\(^{331}\) 1Ti.1:7; Ep.3:20.

\(^{332}\) ‘κατανοέω’ \textit{TGEL}. 2016. 14 times mentioned in the NT
meaning or teaching of a figure or figurative statement. In doing so the purpose is to accentuate with poignancy. This deeper discernment of meaning applies to: the encounter with God, the model of Christ, to spiritual lessons that are applied personally out of: conscious understanding of self; being unhypocritical; knowing one’s intrinsic value; spiritually taught values; scrutiny of the hearts motivations. This intensification of the ‘νοιέω’ faculty underscores the internal connection of conscious consideration that in God brings true, accurate and profound meaning to people and events, and in particular to the believer’s relationship to Godhead.

vii. ‘διάνοια’

‘διάνοια’ is the activity of thinking, of reflective consciousness, of moral thinking and knowing, the intellectual organ of moral sentiment, or deep thought. The biblical evidence of moral thinking is emphasized by its ability to forge the inner state of a person. The biblical texts describe ‘διάνοια’ as shaped by pride from the heart, from the desires of the flesh and the mind through the degenerate nature (‘φύσις’), and obscured by hardened hearts. Jesus’ and Peter’s exhortations addressed loving with all your moral mind, enjoining Peter’s exhortations to positively gather up, like a long coat, the generative power of your moral thoughts, awakened by reminders of pure thoughts, literally, without pseudo mixture. The origin of good moral ‘διάνοια’ is found in the New Covenant accomplishment quoted in Hebrews, which maintains the ritual

333 Mt.7:3; Lk.12:24, 27; Ac.7:31-32; 11:6.
334 Ac.7:31-32; Heb.3:1.
335 Jm.1:23-24; Ro.4:19.
336 Mt.7:3.
337 Lk.12:24, 27.
338 Ac.11:6; Ro.4:29; Heb.10:24.
339 Lk.20:23.
340 ‘Διάνοια’ TGEI 2016; SECB 2015. 14 times mentioned in the NT.
341 Lk.1:51; Ep.2:3; 4:18.
342 Lk.10:27; IPe.1:13; 2Pe.3:1.
343 Heb.8:10; 10:16.
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emphasis, in contrast to the other prophetic announcements.\textsuperscript{344} The Hebrew text retains an emphasis on heart, inner centre; if the moral thought or mind is perceived as an integral part of that, then it could tenuously reflect the original intent. Attention should focus on the supernatural transmission of God in Spirit and regenerating the inner whole whereby the Spirit indwelling originating moral thought becomes normative. John underscores this regenerate thought, that leads to an experiential knowledge of Christ, the True, and God.\textsuperscript{345}

The term ‘Φρονέω’\textsuperscript{346} is in major part translated as ‘mind’ or ‘wise’ (‘φρόνιμος’) which theoretically puts the term in a category of intellect. However, the term is holistic that is better translated as ‘disposition’ as it encompasses mind, emotion and will of the whole person. In this sense it does not come under the category of intellect. The biblical texts are illuminated and empowered by this. For example, Paul’s parallelism comparing ‘setting their minds on the things of the flesh’ with ‘live according to the Spirit’\textsuperscript{347} is weak unless read as, ‘the disposition of the whole person set on flesh’ which respects more accurately the parallelism of living according to the Spirit which is to be understood as life in the Spirit. The preponderant question of governance in the text is strengthened particularly in this passage. The term is also employed to call for unity among believers\textsuperscript{348} which becomes intensified again beyond simple intellectual exercise of shared understanding, rather a holistic, personal and relational inner disposition of unity. The wise man building his house upon the rock is wise in disposition, whereas Peter’s correction of the Christ he confessed, is a lack of spiritual disposition.\textsuperscript{349} The meaning of this parable substantiates the holistic effect of the words of Jesus upon an entire person rather than intellectual ascent of ideas, truths, and principles. The practising of Jesus’ words creates a wise disposition. Intrinsically, ‘Φρονέω’ reveals the nature of the

\textsuperscript{344} Is.59:21 emphasizes the ‘word’ being accomplished; Ezekiel 36 refers to the ontological indwelling of the Spirit in contrast to Jeremiah’s emphasize on the inner whole person (’qereb’). The LXX translates to ‘διάνοια’ which does not convey the Hebrew meaning.

\textsuperscript{345} 1Jn.5:20.

\textsuperscript{346} ‘Φρονέω’ 42 times mentioned in the NT inc. derivatives.

\textsuperscript{347} Ro.8:5.

\textsuperscript{348} Ro.12:16; 15:5; 2Co.13:11; Gal.5:10; Ph.2:2; 3:15; 4:2.

\textsuperscript{349} Mt.7:24-7; Mt.16:23
Trinitarian unity individually in substance but also collectively, as one and united, in being and operation. The believer is in God, in Christ and in Spirit and therefore introduced into the divine disposition which through incarnation into that person, impregnated by the divine presence, Trinity will manifest divine Φρονέω ontologically and relationally, that believers experience the same ontological reality.

In intelligence the believer is introduced to the divine intelligence that present potentially in the creational order, becomes present experientially in that person, because Trinity indwells the believer in the ontological restoration of that faculty. The fullness of the image of God is expanded and restored to the believer in being. The conception of intelligence reveals a breadth of types: experiential, perceptive, observational, sensorial, moral, cognitive, manual and cohesive. These properties intended by God are intensified through the indwelling Godhead, thereby amplifying the diversity of means of learning.

ii. Will

The two NT terms that express conscious will are θέλω (including derivatives) and βούλομαι. The latter represents an exercise in cognition corresponding to a reasoned, deliberated determined choice or decision,350 more often the biblical evidence carries a strong sense of intent rather than determined, sure action.351 The former term expresses a sense of emotion in will, through desire, delight, want, etc., an active, engaged will, leading to action.352 This term is particularly applied to God and defines the nature and character of His will in relation to believers and the world. While focus is on post-Pentecost definition, it does feature extensively in the expression of ‘soul’ in the OT.

Will to be exercised is: wanting, choosing, deciding, liking or disliking, making and assuming choices. Will does develop through the stages of human development, the will of a child is not comparable with the will expressed in an adult. A baby is not without a will, expressed in oral but non-linguistic terms. The ‘terrible twos’ refer to the early stages of a process which lasts several years, centring on the struggle to find legitimate expression of will-power or authority over self and others, (a developmental form of

351 Mt.11:27; Ac.18:27; 2Pe.3:9; 1Co.4:5.
352 ‘θέλω’ TCEL 2016.
transient egoism). While the ‘power’ must be broken, the ‘will’ never should be. One of the three major revolutions in adolescence is the exercising of will autonomously. The extremes of altruism and egoism are not legitimate expressions of will; that one surrender his or her will often ends with a person: dispossessed of will; in denial, repression, suppression and refusal to exercise their own will; often out of fear of making mistakes or wrong decisions; or being strong-willed with regard to other people. These expressions of will demonstrate brokenness and result in negative consequences in act.

The primary focus is the ontology of the will in a person which requires to be anchored in the revelation of God’s will and that of Christ. It is the divine desire to reveal the ‘θέλω’ of God that believers know with certainty what is the object of this emotional and active desire, through the metamorphose and restoration of a transformed cognitive faculty. Paul’s desire and prayer is that believers be filled with in-depth, fulfilled, and full knowledge of His will. The question begs, “What is the will of God?”

Jesus unquestionably identifies that God’s will on earth finds its source in Him in heaven, where will is exercised, executed, and realized perfectly; this may be referred to as ‘uncreated will’ because it is a part of the eternal substance of God Himself and therefore has always existed and is one of the means of creation. Christ’s own will being ‘one’ is an integral part of the Godhead’s ‘θέλω’. This will on earth, in terms of execution or accomplishment, is subject to human nature, condition and circumstance. It remains the ultimate objective of God, restored through Christ, for believers, for church culminating in the ‘παρουσία’ of Christ.

---

353 Ro.2:18; Ep.5:17; 1:9; Heb.10:36; Ac.22:14.
354 Ro.12:2.
355 Col.1:9; 4:12; Ac.20:27.
356 Mt.6:10.
358 Rev.4:11.
359 1Co.4:5.
The determinist aspect of ‘βούλομαι’ (and derivatives) is difficult to assert with certainty. The examples only concern God and Jesus Christ: the assurance of Covenant promise,\textsuperscript{360} guaranteed by His character and oath in Himself; the crucifixion, burial and resurrection of Jesus for atonement;\textsuperscript{361} the delegation of all things by the Father to Jesus the Son, specifically referring to the nature of the Father-Son relationship of in-depth knowing by personal experience, (‘ἐπιγινώσκω’), revealing the Father by the Son to “anyone to whom the Son wills (‘βούλομαι’) to reveal Him” (NAS Mt.11:27). The choice of ‘will’ should be understood as intent; it might have overtones of ‘determination’ but that borders on forcing the text.\textsuperscript{362} The synoptic writers employ ‘θέλω’ to emphasize the emotive, active desiring of believers born of the word of truth, firstfruits of His will in Jesus Christ, born of God’s ‘θέλω’.\textsuperscript{363} God’s revealed will is: that everyone believing in Jesus may have eternal life, forgiveness of sins and deliverance,\textsuperscript{364} salvation and knowledge of the truth,\textsuperscript{365} adoption as sons and daughters in Jesus Christ,\textsuperscript{366} to obtain an inheritance according to the counsel (‘βουλή’) of his ‘θέλω’,\textsuperscript{367} your sanctification,\textsuperscript{368} giving thanks in all things,\textsuperscript{369} Christ in you, the hope of glory,\textsuperscript{370} to do good even if one suffers,\textsuperscript{371}

\textsuperscript{360} Heb.6:17.

\textsuperscript{361} Ac.2:23; 4:27-28.

\textsuperscript{362} Mt.11:27; Lk.10:22.

\textsuperscript{363} ἀποκυέω used twice only in James 1:15,18; Jn.1:13.

\textsuperscript{364} Jn.6:40; Gal.1:4.

\textsuperscript{365} 1Ti.2:4.

\textsuperscript{366} Ep.1:5.

\textsuperscript{367} Ep.1:11; Heb.10:36.

\textsuperscript{368} 1Th.4:3; Heb.10:10.

\textsuperscript{369} 1Th.5:18.

\textsuperscript{370} Col.1:27.

\textsuperscript{371} 1Pe.2:15; 3:17; 4:19; 2Ti.3:12; Gal.6:12.
abide forever,\(^{372}\) to be capable of asking, praying according to God’s comprehended will.\(^{373}\)

Jesus’ relationship to ‘\(θέλω\)’ serves as a model for the apostle Paul and does so for all believers. Jesus has free will-power,\(^{374}\) yet he witnesses to the fact that his choice is to unite his will to the Father’s will.\(^{375}\) (See Chapter two for further discussion of the ontological relationship between the Father and Jesus of equality and unity. This expression of will in no way suggests subordination). This is also a proof of legitimacy, to have two or three witnesses validate and authenticate, is the principle in view.\(^{376}\) Jesus ultimate choice, “My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as you will” (ESV Mt.26:39), explicitly demonstrates the only time Jesus exercised faith in the Father and the Spirit in regard to His resurrection from the dead on the third day. Jesus, fully God, chooses to unite to the Father’s will despite the immense suffering He is experiencing in the giving up of his life. Jesus-God, dies, is buried and according to the promise, and is resurrected. This ultimate example demonstrates the depth of emotion involved in decisions of the will of this preponderance.

God’s will is exercised from a place of freedom. He is under no constraint. This is revelatory of the nature and intentions of God. His motivations are transparent.\(^{377}\) Jesus expresses this same freedom in will.\(^{378}\) Similarly, a person’s relationship to ‘will’ begins in a God given context of freedom.\(^{379}\) Several aspects of Jesus’ ministry demonstrate this: the discipleship calls of Jesus use of the preposition ‘if’,\(^{380}\) implicitly measuring the

\(^{372}\) 1Jn.2:17.

\(^{373}\) 1Jn.5:14.

\(^{374}\) Jn.5:21, 30; 6:40; 10:17-18; Mt.20:15; 23:37.

\(^{375}\) Jn.4:34; 5:30; 6:38, 39; Heb.10:7, 9.

\(^{376}\) Jn.7:17.

\(^{377}\) Ro.9:16,18,22; 1Co.12:11, 18; 15:38.


\(^{379}\) Mt.20:21, 32; Phi.1:14.

\(^{380}\) Mt.7:12; 16:24-25; Mt.19:17, 21; Jn.7:17.
cost;\textsuperscript{381} in healing dialogues,\textsuperscript{382} in teaching and understanding,\textsuperscript{383} in answered prayer because of abiding.\textsuperscript{384} From the Gospel records, Jesus exercises will and authority over the elements of nature,\textsuperscript{385} and over sickness, demons and evil spirits.\textsuperscript{386} Jesus does not exercise authority over another person. The intention is in the form of an invitation\textsuperscript{387} indicative that will be free to decide\textsuperscript{388} for good or for bad.\textsuperscript{389}

The human predicament (‘σάρξ’ denoting the void or absence of God, Person and influence) results in a dualistic ‘knot’, in the summarized words of Paul, “I do what I will not to do … to will is present within me … the good that I will to do, I do not do … it is no longer I who do it, but sin that dwells within me …” (NKJV Ro.7:15-21). While will is exercised freely, it is not without source or influence. Paul describes the suffering\textsuperscript{390} of this tension expressed in human nature by the impotency of the will. Paul concludes that the law is powerless to bring change; it only reinforces the condemnation in acts;\textsuperscript{391} he identifies sin as a distinct entity with power to yield.\textsuperscript{392} He considers his ‘good’ nature\textsuperscript{393} and his will to do good in conflict with the bad nature,\textsuperscript{394} and concludes that he is incapable by will, nature or disposition of breaking the will of sin.\textsuperscript{395} The answer is a new

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{381} Lk.14:28, 31.
  \item \textsuperscript{382} Mt.8:2; Jn.5:6.
  \item \textsuperscript{383} Mt.11:4; Mk.10:35-36, 43-45.
  \item \textsuperscript{384} Jn.15:7.
  \item \textsuperscript{385} Mk.4:39, 41; Mt.14:19-21, 25-26.
  \item \textsuperscript{386} Mk.1:27, 32-24, 40-42; Lk.13:10-17.
  \item \textsuperscript{387} Jn.5:4; Rev.22:17.
  \item \textsuperscript{388} Mt.20:14-15; 1Co.16:12; Jn.6:67.
  \item \textsuperscript{389} Mt.17:12; 23:37; Mt.26:15; Lk.9:54-56; Jn.4:4; Mk.12:38; 14:7.
  \item \textsuperscript{390} Ro.7:5.
  \item \textsuperscript{391} Ro.7:6-7.
  \item \textsuperscript{392} Ro.7:13; 21-23; 8:3; 6:13.
  \item \textsuperscript{393} Ro.7:18 ‘ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μου ἁγαθὸν τὸ γὰρ θέλειν παρακείμενον μοί’.
  \item \textsuperscript{394} Ro.7:19 ‘οὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω ποιον ἁγαθὸν’.
  \item \textsuperscript{395} Ep.2:3; 1Pe.4:3.
\end{itemize}
‘law’ of the Spirit, life in Christ Jesus sets free from the origin\(^{396}\): law, sin and death, in order that the law of the Spirit fill up the believer in life, walk and conduct.\(^{397}\) The entity of will has therefore been released from the entity of sin and restored to the person. It is the end of the dualistic tension. Paul does not teach dualism, he teaches the restoration of will from impotency in order to be free to choose the law of the Spirit, who creates the disposition of the Spirit.\(^{398}\) When Paul says, “… because God operating in you … to take pleasure and to operate for the sake of His good pleasure” (TLT Ph.2:13), in salvation being accomplished or fashioned in the believer,\(^{399}\) the security of the believer’s will resides in this relationship of the Trinity at work within. That God reveals his will in concrete terms provides the life framework for the believer to exercise his or her will,\(^{400}\) to make mistakes and correct them.\(^{401}\) A survey of making plans reveals a providential rather than a sovereign determinist view. Questions of intentions, delays, being thwarted, and expectations all find their place in the directional leadings, particularly seen in Paul.\(^{402}\) One noteworthy example in Acts chapter sixteen describes Paul setting out on his second missionary journey. It could be said he is already walking in the will of God according to the mandate given to him,\(^{403}\) yet he is refused entry into Phrygia, Galatia, and Bithynia, finding himself without direction at Troas. From there, Paul receives a vision of the Lord’s particular direction, an echo of Paul’s original statement “Lord, what do You want me to do?” (NKJV Ac.9:6). Paul’s apostleship in Christ is perceived as by the will of God,\(^{404}\) the framework for life his and service. His intention is to bring the

---

\(^{396}\) Jn.8:44.

\(^{397}\) Ro.8:1-4.

\(^{398}\) Ro.8:5-13; Gal.5:17; 6:12-13.

\(^{399}\) Ph.2:12.

\(^{400}\) 2Co.8:5.

\(^{401}\) Mt.21:28-31.

\(^{402}\) Ro.1:10, 13; Ac.18:21; 21:14; Ro.15:32; 1Th.2:18.

\(^{403}\) Ac.9:15-16.

\(^{404}\) 1Co.1:1; 2Co.1:1; Ep.1:1; Col.1:1.
whole counsel of God⁴⁰⁵ and his teaching finds its impetus from this will.⁴⁰⁶ This seemingly contradictory scenario, serves to remove the incoherency of being in and out of a deterministic will, nurturing an ambivalent state of insecurity. Paul perceives his decision and movements as integral, flowing out from the framework of the divine will, as defined above. In this, his freedom to express will finds security and direction.

The will therefore, in the governance of the Spirit, restores the freedom to choose from within the framework of the will, desire, intention and pleasure of God. The freedom to choose repeatedly as Christ did to unite his will to the Father’s that His will be accomplished on earth as in heaven.

iii. Emotions

Divine emotionality is most evident in the biblical witness as a fundamental expression of who God is, and likewise of human identity. The historical rationalistic, and in that the masculine and authoritative approaches to God has created a religious philosophy and theological approach to God that has done much damage to the holistic experience of God. Yet the ‘wrath’ or ‘righteous anger’ of God as revealed through the Law and the Prophets is unequivocally emotional.⁴⁰⁷ Similarly, an understanding of God’s covenant relationship, binding two parties together, in the biblical case, is based on more than ‘Tôrâh’ adherence and compliance, it is a relationship commitment between two people or parties. The prophetic texts, in particular those Isaiah, capture that essence in an intensified emotional language: a husband with a wife in a love relationship,⁴⁰⁸ and a parent who yearns for his child⁴⁰⁹. In the Hosea reference, God distinguishes Himself from man, not in relationship to covenant affection and relationship attachment, but in terms of pouring out his just anger. It is not the possible confusion between man and God as the choice of emotional expression that is prominent in the text. The same care and protective

⁴⁰⁵ Ac.20:27.
⁴⁰⁶ Ro.16:19; 1Co.12:1; 14:5, 19, 35; Col.2:18; 1Th.4:13.
⁴⁰⁷ Ex.32:11; Num.11:33; Dt.9:8; Is.54:8; Nah.1:2; Zc.7:12.
⁴⁰⁸ Is.54:5-10; Jer.31:32.
⁴⁰⁹ Jer.31:20; Ho.11:1-9; Is.62:5.
figures are employed by God and synonymously by Jesus which have an implicit emotional reference.\footnote{Ez.16:8; Ps.17:8; 91:4; Mt.23:37; Lk.19:41-44.}

Anthropomorphism is the attribution of human characteristics or actions to God, (Zuck 151). Anthropopathism concerns figures of speech that attribute human emotions to God (152). Historically, due to Greek philosophical views on the corporeal and emotional or ‘soul life’, the Stoics, the Epicureans, the Gnostics to name but three, the Alexandrian fathers, explained away anthropomorphisms with an allegorical interpretation and in particular the concept of a transcendent God bearing ‘animal’ instincts and emotions, as they would have perceived it in the day (30). The example of Origen who became an extreme allegorist, “… saw a threefold meaning in Scripture-literal, moral and spiritual/allegorical … [as he] suggests in 1Thessalonians 5:23 by the body (literal), the soul (moral), and the spirit (allegorical)” (36).

Whatever there is in the word of God that cannot, when taken literally, be referred either to purity of life or soundness of doctrine, you may set down as figurative. Purity of life has reference to the love of God and one's neighbour; soundness of doctrine to the knowledge of God and one's neighbour. (Augustine \textit{Four Books} 56).

Interpreters may explain the use of such figures as humanly conceived concepts to express, in human and comprehensible terms, the intention of God. Judaism develops an aversion to anthropomorphic statements and carries the divine transcendence almost to the point of straining the link between God and the world except for a firm belief in providence (Kittel and Friedrich @220). The weakness of the argument is that the God of the OT is also perfectly manifest in Jesus Christ of the NT from where the emotion of Godhead and human kind in the divine image finds legitimacy from a human perspective. In Christ transcendence and immanence meet perfectly therefore reconciling the anthropomorphic tension.

Respecting and maintaining the Creator-creature distinction is imperative emotionally as with other dimensions of the image of God; where God is infinite, perfect, objective, unconditional, and absolute, human kind is finite, imperfect, subjective, conditional and
circumscribe. Yet the image of God has been imputed and finds reflection within this ontological framework.

Five basic emotions are expressed by God, Jesus Christ, and the Spirit which therefore lay a legitimate foundation for genuine emotion as a reflection of the image of God in humankind generally according to the creational order and specially in the regenerate order:

i. Joy\textsuperscript{411}

‘What is joy?’ requires some explanation albeit far from evident. The Bible does not so much define joy as describe causes, sources, reasons and characteristics of what makes for a joyful emotional disposition. A dictionary definition suggests “deep happiness and contentment”\textsuperscript{412} or “… a pleasurable, agreeable emotion, a conscious exultation within self … bound to a reason.”\textsuperscript{413} Secular Greek thought could express it as, “… a phenomenon or feeling, ‘joy’ is a culmination of being that raises no problems as such and that strains beyond itself.” Philosophically in NT era, joy came to mean pleasure, (‘ἡδονή’) Aristotle is said to have almost uniquely employed the term in his writings (Kittel and Friedrich @840). In the Bible the term ‘ἡδονή’ is employed uniquely in a pejorative sense,\textsuperscript{414} reflecting the writer’s awareness of the Greco-Roman culture. ‘Hedonism’ describes the pursuit of pleasure, particularly among Epicureans; because of the undermining value of the corporeal, any form of enjoyment was permissible if pleasure as the goal could be attained, (Fox 274). The Stoics could not entertain that the ‘λόγος’ had emotions, viewing them as defective judgment. They reduced joy to ‘good mood’. Philo, the eminent Alexandrian philosopher, “… relates joy to religious “intoxication.” Joy is a supreme “good mood.” It is the opposite of fear. Isaac [means laughter] is its OT symbol... Joy is native to God alone; we find it only in God” (Kittel and Friedrich @840). The Bible demonstrates that joy is not the fruit of one’s

\textsuperscript{411} Of God: Dt.30:9; Is.62:5; Zp.3:17; of Jesus: Lk.10:21; Jn.15:11; 17:13; of the Spirit: 1Th.1:6; Ro.14:17.


\textsuperscript{414} Lk.8:14; Tit.3:3; Jm.4:1,3; 2Pe.2:13.
circumstances rather it is independent from them in origin and is not limited to an emotional disposition\textsuperscript{415} (Atkinson and Field 512).

There are eight principal Hebrew expressions for joy, happiness\textsuperscript{416} and rejoicing. They all manifest varying degrees of intensity, from: a joyful, glad, happy state\textsuperscript{417} or responsive spirit,\textsuperscript{418} to jubilation\textsuperscript{419} and celebration with reason,\textsuperscript{420} to animated or agitated excitement,\textsuperscript{421} calling, crying, shouting and singing out joy.\textsuperscript{422} In the NT there are five principal root words concerned: the generic term expressing a state of gladness, happiness, and joy:\textsuperscript{423} the term ‘χάρις’ (grace) derives from ‘χαίρω’ and extends the meaning;\textsuperscript{424} there is ecstatic or exceeding joy also exhibited physically;\textsuperscript{425} a community expression;\textsuperscript{426} the cheerfulness of a healthy mind;\textsuperscript{427} and joy of boasting, glorying.\textsuperscript{428} The terms embrace the spectrum of expressions, intensities, affecting the whole person. The Hebrew and Greek terms are synonymous in meaning, manifested diversely in the Scriptural record.


\textsuperscript{416} “ešer’ includes satisfaction, pleasure, and euphoria.

\textsuperscript{417} ‘giyl’.

\textsuperscript{418} ‘hādāh’.

\textsuperscript{419} ‘ālāṣ’, ‘ālaz’.

\textsuperscript{420} ‘śūṣ’.

\textsuperscript{421} ‘sāmaḥ’.

\textsuperscript{422} ‘tērû’āh’, ‘rānan’.

\textsuperscript{423} ‘χαίρω’.

\textsuperscript{424} ‘χάρις’ including character traits of beauty, agreeable, goodness, delight, favour, honour, love, kindness, compassion.

\textsuperscript{425} ‘ἀγαλλίασ’.

\textsuperscript{426} ‘συγχαίρω’.

\textsuperscript{427} ‘εὐφραίνω’.

\textsuperscript{428} ‘καυχάομαι’.
Joy is authenticated by God’s expression of joy for his creation and works,\textsuperscript{429} in particular his loved covenant people, expressed through the husband and wife relationship\textsuperscript{430} and His Servant Jesus.\textsuperscript{431} The biblical distinction is that joy is not found within self but sourced in the person of God because it is His nature.\textsuperscript{432} The Psalmist encapsulates this theocentric source of joy,\textsuperscript{433} pre-empting the fullness of what Jesus would bring in fullness of joy found in Him, His joy in the believer through his indwelling.\textsuperscript{434} The NT presents a Trinitarian source and ministry of joy, full and constant, in the believer,\textsuperscript{435} “Joy is … to be indwelt by God through the Holy Spirit … because of His indwelling to be fully satisfied in spite of the afflictions of life” (Zodhiates 937-938).

Having extracted joy from circumstances, and from any natural disposition of temperament, the believer functions ontologically in a unique way in order to be joyful and express it.\textsuperscript{436} This being so, the biblical texts describe the characteristics and the actions that make for joy. The expression of true spiritual joy, is then founded upon the things that rejoice the Father in Godhead:

i. God’s deliverance and salvation,\textsuperscript{437} his redemption\textsuperscript{438}

ii. God’s [in]dwelling in the middle of His people, His Presence\textsuperscript{439}

iii. God’s help, shelter, comfort, care and covenant love\textsuperscript{440}

\textsuperscript{429} Ps.92:4; 104:31.

\textsuperscript{430} Dt.30:29; Jer.32:4; Ps.137:8; Is.62:5; 65:18-19; 66:10-14; Zp.3:17.

\textsuperscript{431} Is.42:1; Mt.3:17; 12:18; 17:5; 2Pe.1:17.

\textsuperscript{432} Ps.47:5-6; 149:2; Ze.9:9.

\textsuperscript{433} Ps.33:21; 35:9; 40:16; 89:16.

\textsuperscript{434} Jn.15:11; 16:22; 24; 17:13.

\textsuperscript{435} Of God Ro.15:13; of Jesus Jn.15:11; of the Spirit 1Th.1:6; Gal.5:22.

\textsuperscript{436} Ph.3:1; 4:4,10; 1Th.5:16; Lk.1:47; Heb.12:2.

\textsuperscript{437} Lk.15:7, 10; Ac.13:48; 15:3; 16:34; Ps.21:1; 9:14; 13:5; 20:5; 105:43; Is.61:10; Zp.3:17; Lk.10:20.

\textsuperscript{438} Ps.71:23; Is.44:23; 35:10; 51:11.

\textsuperscript{439} 1Sa.6:13; Ze.2:10; Ps.65:4; 84:2,4; 89:15; Pr.8:34; 114:15; Is.65:18-19; Zp.3:17.

\textsuperscript{440} Ps.28:7; 63:7; 146:5; 31:7; 90:14; Ez.3:11; Mt.5:3,7.
iv. Strength found in God

v. Seeking after Him

vi. Trust and love in God

vii. Forgiveness

viii. Through suffering, trials, tribulation and persecution

ix. Life, listen and walk in His ways and commands

x. Living and restoring righteousness, uprightness both God’s and a person’s

xi. Grace of God demonstrated

xii. Serving God

xiii. Steadfastness, watchful waiting on his return

xiv. Feasts, festivals, sacrifices and offerings (means of rejoicing in God)

xv. Resurrection hope

xvi. Inheritance of Kingdom and the earth

441 Ps.21:18; 4-5; Ps.107:30; Is.59:16; Zp.3:17.

442 1Ch.16:10; 2Ch.15:15; Ps.70:4; 119:2.

443 Ps.2:12; 34:8; 40:4; 84:12; Pr.16:20; Ps.5:11; 33:21; Jn.20:29.

444 Ps.32:1-2; Ro.4:7-8; 2Co.7:9.

445 Mt.5:10; Ac.5:41; 13:52; 2Co.7:4; 8:2; 1Th.1:6; 1Pe.1:6; 4:13; Col.1:24; Jm.1:2, 12.

446 Ps.19:8; 48:11; 94:12; 97:8; 112:1; 119:1, 2, 14; 128:1; Pr.29:18; Lk.11:28; Jn.13:17; Ac.20:35; 1Co.13:6; Col.2:5; Jn.1.25; 2Jn.1:4; 3Jn.1:3; Rev.1:3; 22:7, 11.

447 Job 33:26; Ps.51:14; 68:3; 67:4; 32:11; 85:6; 106:3; 132:9, 16; 145:7 Pr.11:10; 20:7; 28:12; 29:6; Mt.5:6; Rev.3:14; 4:14.

448 Ac.11:23.

449 Ps.2:11; Ac.20:24; Ph.2:17; Heb.13:17.

450 Lk.12:37; Tit.2:13; Rev.16:15; Ro.12:12.

451 Dt.16:14; Lev.23:9; Ps.27:6; 42:4; 107:22.

452 Is.26:19; Ro.14:13; Rev.20:16.

453 Mt.5:3, 5, 10; Lk.12:32.
This portrays the unique kind of joy that a believer is to experience because it is in God Himself and therefore in Him or her as a response to his joy and his joy in us, the cycle of joying is the normative Christian experience.

ii. Affection\textsuperscript{454} includes tenderness, compassion, love, goodness. “God is love”\textsuperscript{455} sets the foundation for affection. That God is love, requires an object of love, and therefore Christ from eternity is the object of the Father’s love. Likewise, the Holy Spirit is love\textsuperscript{456} and is part of the Trinitarian relationship that is love. Jesus witnesses freely and openly to their love relationship.\textsuperscript{457} It is upon this moral attribute in the nature of the three persons of the Trinity, a person is capable of affection as a reflection of the image of God. A believer is introduced into this divine triangle of perfect love and through loving relationship, the Father, Jesus and the Spirit indwell the believer.\textsuperscript{458} The human ability to love originates explicitly in the love that is demonstrated in the divine love relationship.\textsuperscript{459}

Affection includes the biblical definitions of love, all of which are found in Godhead and therefore an integral part of the image of God in human kind. The OT term for love ‘’āhab’’ is generic for human and divine love for people and material things, incorporating: the redeeming eternal love\textsuperscript{460} of God for his people because of his covenant with them,\textsuperscript{461} his Righteousness,\textsuperscript{462} King Solomon and the stranger,\textsuperscript{463} of Messiah,\textsuperscript{464} and His dwelling

\textsuperscript{454} Of God: Ex.34:6; Is.54:10; Jn.14:23; Mt.3:16; Ro.8:39; of Jesus: Jn.11:4-5; 13:1; Ro.8:39; of the Spirit: Ro.5:5; 15:30; Gal.5:22.
\textsuperscript{455} 1Jn.4:16.
\textsuperscript{456} Ro.15:30.
\textsuperscript{457} Jn.3:35; 5:20; 14:31; 15:9.
\textsuperscript{458} Jn.14:21, 23; Ro.5:5.
\textsuperscript{459} Jn.13:34.
\textsuperscript{460} Is.43:4; Dt.30:6; Jer.31:3; Ho.3:1; 14:4.
\textsuperscript{461} Dt.4:37; 7:13; 10:15; 23:5; Ps.47:4; 78:68; Is.48:4; Ho.11:1; Mal.1:2.
\textsuperscript{462} Ps.11:7; 146:8; Pr.15:9; Is.61:8.
\textsuperscript{463} 2Sa.12:24; Ne.13:26; Is.56:6.
\textsuperscript{464} Ps.45:7.
The term applies to: paternal and maternal, family relationships;\textsuperscript{466} it embraces the attraction between a man and a woman;\textsuperscript{467} husband and wife relations and the intimacy of sexual intercourse.\textsuperscript{468} The term equally applies to friendship with God and between humankind,\textsuperscript{469} man to man,\textsuperscript{470} and woman to woman.\textsuperscript{471} It also refers to dysfunctional,\textsuperscript{472} of injustice,\textsuperscript{473} rejection or abandon,\textsuperscript{474} and of incest.\textsuperscript{475} ‘āḥab’ is also a spiritual love in covenant relationship with God, and demonstrates the primacy of love as the basis for covenant compliance or obedience.\textsuperscript{476} The antithetical love refers to spiritual and physical prostitution. The tone of these passages carries the underlying covenant love relationship tension where betrayal, rejection and abandon are communicated alongside the righteousness of God in correction. These tumultuous texts reveal the pendulum swing in the ‘tug of love’ due to the infidelity of prostitution,\textsuperscript{477} expressed by the jealousy of God that is His desire for legitimately exclusive love relationship with His chosen people. The final spiritual expressions of this love are the qualities of a love response to God’s loving:

\textsuperscript{465} Ps.87:2.
\textsuperscript{466} Ge.22:2; 25:28; 37:3; Ruth 4:15.
\textsuperscript{467} Ge.29:18; Jud.16:4; 1Sa.18:20.
\textsuperscript{468} Ge.24:67; 29:30, 32; Jud.14:16; 16:15.
\textsuperscript{469} 2Ch.20:7; Is.41:8; Pr.17:17; 18:24; 8:17; 22:11; 27:6; Ps.38:11.
\textsuperscript{470} 1Sa.16:21; 18:1; 20:17; 1Kg.5:1.
\textsuperscript{471} SoS.1:3-4.
\textsuperscript{472} 1Kg.11:1-2.
\textsuperscript{473} Dt.21:15-16; Ps.4:2; 11:5; 52:3-4; 109:17; Pr.8:36; 17:19; 20:13; 21:17; Is.1:23; Am.5:15; Mic.3:2.
\textsuperscript{474} Job 19:19; Ps.38:11; 88:18; Zc.13:6.
\textsuperscript{475} Ge.34:3; 2Sa.13:4, 15.
\textsuperscript{476} Ex.20:6; Dt.6:5; 7:9, 13; 10:12; 11:1,13, 22; 13:3; 19:9, 30; 30:16, 20; Jos.22:5; 23:11; Ne.1:5; Dan.9:4.
\textsuperscript{477} Is.57:8; Jer.5:31; 8:2; 14:10; 22:20, 22; Lam.1:19; Ez.16:33, 36, 37; 23:5, 22; Ho.2:5, 7, 10, 12, 13; 4:1; 9:1, 10; Mal.2:11.
faithfulness, trust and joy, salvation, His Name, hate evil, the word and commandments, truth and peace.

Given the range of meaning, the NT terms encompass the breadth and nuance that will be considered. The Greek text allows for five forms of love to express the fullness and perfection of divine love: ‘ἀγαπάω’, ‘Φιλέω’, ‘φιλόστοργος’, ‘ycle’, and ‘έρως’.

‘ἀγαπάω’ is a love that is originated in God Himself and therefore finds definition in Godhead. Consideration has been given to the Trinitarian expression of love in the previous chapter. The present task is to define the nature of this ability to ‘ἀγαπάω’ in the believer on the grounds of Trinitarian relationship.

In the New Age of Christ and the Spirit, this love is firstly divine in origin, “… the model and dynamic of such radical loving are not to be dredged up from the depths of human nature. They pre-exist in the nature and activity of God” (Atkinson and Field 10). “God’s new relationship to us puts us in a new relationship to him and to one another” (Kittel and Friedrich @10). The ‘ἀγάπη’ relationship of which believers are objects, is eternal because God is eternal and is love, therefore they have been loved from before the foundation of the world, just as between the Father and the Son. This love’s impulsion is not circumstantial, it is therefore ontological as it seeks a person as object. It is without condition because, as the Father loves the Son, and the Son loves the Father, so

---

478 Ps.31:32.
479 Ps.5:11.
480 Ps.40:16.
481 Ps.69:36.
482 Ps.97:10; Am.5:15.
484 Zc.8:9.
485 1Jn.4:16; Ro.5:5.
488 Ro.5:8; 1Co.13:4; Mt.5:44-46.
the Son loves the believer as the Father does too. This ability to love is established upon the believer’s inclusion in the divine love triangle between Father, Jesus and Spirit. The source of this love is found in them and their indwelling in the believer thereby producing what they are, love. This love in nature is: inseparable, it is disinterested in purpose and motivation, unreciprocal by nature, that is not founded on what can be given in return. When Jesus, Paul and John exhort to love one another this is not an expression of reciprocal love but of individuals in the ‘ἀγάπη’ Trinitarian relationship, able to express this love to one another not because of command but because of the disinterested nature of the love that characterises the indwelling Trinity. This love is sacrificial or self-giving; it is a love that communicates value and worth because it creates an object of love and because of its volitional nature. This love introduces the believer into life in and through Christ, so by nature this love produces, communicates, builds up and establishes life, specifically the life of the Godhead. This love is entire, complete, and whole, as modelled in Christ, it characterizes the nature of the believer. It is expressed in: jealousy for exclusivity; it treasures so carefully the preciousness of love in Christ’s commands; ‘ἀγάπη’ love is exemplified by purity and innocence in motivation and expression. While it is true that love is expressed in action, the ontological importance underscores the nature of love and the ability to love in a person.

---

490 Jn.14:21-23; 1Jn.4:12, 16.
491 Ro.8:35, 39; 1Co.13:8,13.
492 Jn.13:34-35; 15:12; Gal.5:13; Ep.4:2; Ph.2:2; 1Jn.4:7.
493 Jn.10:17; 1Jn.4:9-10; Jn.3:16; 15:13; Ep.5:2; 1Jn.3:16.
494 Mk.10:21; Mt.3:16; 17:5; Jn.15:13; Lk.15:20-24; Jn.17:23; 1Co.13:1-3; 2Co.2:8; 1Th.5:8; 1Jn.3:1.
495 Jn.3:16; 1Jn.4:9.
496 Jn.12:25; Ro.8:28; 1Co.15:58; 2Co.12:19; Gal.2:20; Ep.3:17; 4:16; 1Jn.3:14; Jude 1:20.
497 Mt.22:37; Lk.7:47; Jn.12:25; 13:1; Gal.2:20; Ep.3:19; 5:2, 25; Col.2:2; 3:14; 1Th.2:8; 2Th.1:3; 1Ti.1:14; 1Jn.2:15; 3:16; 4:12, 17, 18.
498 Lk.16:13; Jn.21:15; 1Jn.2:15; 2Ti.2:22; 1Pe.2:11.
499 Jn.14:15, 21, 23; 15:10; 1Jn.2:5; 5:2-3.
500 2Co.7:1; Ep.1:4; 2Th.2:10; 1Ti.1:5; 4:12; 1Pe.1:22; 2Pe.3:14; Rev.1:5.
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Love for self, is worthy of comment in the context of the ‘ἀγάπη’ love. Jesus says,

“And you shall love the LORD your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind, and with all your strength. This is the first commandment. And the second, like it, is this: You shall love your neighbour as yourself. There is no other commandment greater than these” (NKJV Mk.12:30-31).

The dynamics in the wider context of love can be expressed as follows:

i. Loved by God, Father, Son and Spirit
ii. Loving Godhead because they have loved us
iii. Loving self
iv. Loving your neighbour

The founding Reformers, (Luther and Calvin), considered self-love antithetical with the discipleship call of Jesus, ‘if you lose your life you will find it’. The Thomist tradition suggests, “It is illogical to think that we can best love our Maker by hating what he has made … to deny the value of self which bears his likeness.” Modern era theologians such as Jack Dominion would take a similar line. The mystic monk Bernard de Clairvaux (1090-1153) in Loving God, providing a progressive illustration of love observes, “We begin by loving self for self’s sake (wrong); move on to loving God for self’s sake; climb another rung by learning how to love God for God’s sake and reach the top when we love self for God’s sake (right)” (Atkinson and Field 14). The writer sees a process or maturing in the experience of divine love to the perfected result. Paul also develops Jesus’ principle in explaining Christ’s love for the church from the example of a husband’s love for his wife, “In the same way husbands should love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves Himself. For no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, just as Christ does the church” (ESV Ep.5:28-29). The reference is loving the other as homogeneous with loving and caring for one’s self. Loving one’s wife in this way, as Paul succinctly summarizes, is to love oneself. The principle in view is that one cannot love another without being the object of love, in this case the Godhead’s, because one is the object of a love of this perfect nature; the love for self is a necessary and logical product. The text underlines, ‘in the same manner’ similarly expressed in Jesus words, whereby love for self is preserved from egocentrism because it is not originated within self but in God. Appeals are made to ‘φιλάυτος’ and ‘φιλήδονος’ in opposition to
"φιλόθεος" as justification for not loving self; these terms reflect behaviour and conduct that is systematically warned against in Scripture. However, if self-love was the end purpose ‘φιλαυτος’ would be an appropriate conclusion. Nevertheless, the self-love, originating in the Godhead, is not an end in itself, rather it enables a person to love another correctly and faithfully according to the divine attributes of ‘ἀγάπη’ because this love, is not of human origin but of divine; otherwise it is not the same love and therefore not of the same nature nor demonstration. Loving dysfunctionally or illegitimately will occur if self-love is not fully integrated into a human being in the image of God. Paul suggests it is ridiculous to think that someone could not love themselves. Psychologically, it is a common symptom to which God provides a spiritual solution, legitimizing self-love on the basis of His love for humankind and in particular for his adopted sons and daughters.

‘Φιλέω’, a friendship love that is selective, emotive, warm, compassionate, collaborative, reciprocal and mutual; in these characteristics it differs from ‘ἀγάπη’. The foundation for this emotion is found in the Trinity, as the Father loves the Son and the Son likewise, so the believer is loved by Christ and by the Father in ‘Φιλέω’. One shared principle is that friendship with God engenders revelation and understanding. The intimacy of friendship as reflected in the OT examples previously considered. The friendship intimacy is reflected in covenant relationship with Abraham, in the face-to-face encounter of God, with Moses and likewise for the disciples with Jesus and those who would still believe.

This love is characterized by a principle of acceptance or recognition, implicitly mutual although in the degrees of relationship, the selective must be discerned. Jesus being a friend of sinners and inviting the twelve to move from servanthood to revelatory friendship cannot be on the same scale. Little research has been done in this area, but the diagrams, Figures VIII and IX express the dynamics of stages of sharing and intimacy in friendship relationships and the degrees of proximity and frequency. This assists in

501 2Ti.3:2-4 ‘φιλαυτος’ lover of self; ‘φιλήδονος’ lover of pleasure; ‘φιλόθεος’ lover of God.
502 Ep.5:29.
504 Lk.7:34.
supporting that while several people may be in the sphere of experiencing ‘Φιλέω’ there exists a necessary distinction of stages and degrees as illustrated in the two examples given. A common cause creates friendship bonds of partnership, collaboration and indicates a knowledge of character and capacity which create complementarity or complicity. The discipleship call of Jesus reorders the bonds of ‘Φιλέω’ particularly in family where He seeks the primary relationship that mediates all others even the most intimate stage and degree.

‘Φιλέω’ is exhibited by the ‘holy kiss’ a greeting sign of acceptance, and affinity, a bond of friendship affection within the church community. The exceptions are: an act of adoration towards Jesus and Judas’ betrayal, the principle of hurt in ‘Φιλέω’. It is characterized by humility, generous spirited hospitality. This ‘Φιλέω’ with Godhead is often put in opposition, with money, the desires of the world, to hypocrisy, and to philosophy.

‘φιλόστοργος’ The composite term occurs only once in the Scriptures, “in brotherly/sisterly love (‘φιλαδελφία’) reciprocally to one another a family love (‘φιλόστοργος’) showing the worth this way mutually to one another” (TLT Ro.12:10). Paul appeals to Timothy to relate to the church in Ephesus as family and therefore with ‘φιλόστοργος’.

---
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A family love engenders a place and space for each member, as with the body of Christ, a sense of being self, reinforcing identity and value. Family is the place of acceptance and understanding of who you are, on good days or bad. It creates a consciousness of belonging that has been in God for eternity and demonstrated when He declares ‘… and you will be [special] My people’. ‘φιλόστοργος’ also nurtures a sentiment of security, a safe space, with safe ‘Φιλέω’ people through the absence of threat, of condemnation, being propitious to growth in maturity and to constructive correction.

‘חֶסֶד’ is covenant love although has a variety of meaning.

The term can be better translated as ‘faithful love’ even if that does not explain fully the meaning. We speak here of kindness, but more so of goodness with regard to a person. To this goodness, we would integrate an aspect of love and preserving a notion of constancy and therefore faithfulness … there is an accomplishment of the revelation of God’s love, in the OT: ‘חֶסֶד’ the faithful and compassionate love, of the NT, ‘ἀγαπάω’ the sacrificial love that encompasses forgiveness and reconciliation with God (Henderson Ruth 38-39, 47).

‘חֶסֶד’, beyond word meanings, is set in a mentality of covenant between God and mankind, comprehending this, the corresponding covenant vocabulary emerges, illustrated by the archetypal statement of God exercising ‘חֶסֶד’ is,

“The LORD, the LORD God, compassionate and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in lovingkindness and truth; who keeps lovingkindness for thousands [or a thousand generations], who forgives iniquity, transgression and sin; yet He will by no means leave the guilty unpunished, visiting the iniquity of fathers on the
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520 It is a difficult term to translate because of its depth of meaning. Translations such as NKJV, ESV, NAS use ‘lovingkindness’ (NKJV, NAS, DBY), ‘steadfast love’ (ESV), ‘mercy, goodness’ (NKJV), all of which express in part the meaning.
521 Quotation translated from French by Erwin Samuel Henderson.
522 Dt.7:6-11; 2Ch.6:12-17; Ne.1:5; Da.9:4.
children and on the grandchildren to the third and fourth generations.\textsuperscript{523} (NAS Ex.34:6-7).

The book of Deuteronomy, as the recalling and renewing of covenant by Moses in a context of establishing ‘Tôrâh’, binds the people’s expression of ‘\textit{\text{H}esed}’.\textsuperscript{524}

A conception of ‘\textit{\text{H}esed}’ begins with God and His nature. This covenant love is firstly seen as emanating from the throne of God in or above\textsuperscript{525} the heavens.\textsuperscript{526} “He shall send from heaven … For Your mercy ['\textit{\text{H}esed}'] reaches unto the heavens …” (NKJV Ps.59:3, 10). ‘\textit{\text{H}esed}’ is eternal because it is in God,\textsuperscript{527} preceding creation and the considered motivation behind the creative and marvellous works of God.\textsuperscript{528} It is upon this understanding that the Hebrew concept of ‘\textit{\text{H}esed}’ takes particular meaning. It is more than just love in relationship, it is a framework in which all of life is lived, the past is understood, the present is interpreted and the future is hoped.\textsuperscript{529} The Hebrews considered that ‘\textit{\text{H}esed}’ was a sphere, a constant unfailing influence\textsuperscript{530} in which his or her life was referenced;\textsuperscript{531} so the movement of life was perceived as a constant means of encountering God;\textsuperscript{532} and so the ability to stand and face circumstances,\textsuperscript{533} to understand that all one’s ways, were comprehended within ‘\textit{\text{H}esed}’.\textsuperscript{534} This covenant love could be compared to a field with boundaries permeated with ‘\textit{\text{H}esed}’, and within which the workings of this covenant love operate. When David committed adultery with Bathsheba and was
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confronted by Nathan the prophet, David’s first appeal was to God’s ‘חֵסֶד’. When Jonah ran from God to Tarshish rather than to Nineveh and while in the whale his grounds for failure and repentance were on the sole basis of God’s covenant love to him and to Nineveh. Israel’s relationship to God compared often to a marriage relationship, with all their rebellion, errors, unbelief and hardness of heart, ‘חֵסֶד’ remained the constant premise on which God exercised covenant love to Israel. While God cannot change his nature, according to covenant a response is required from the people in order to experience the full benefits:

But the word is very near you, in your mouth and in your heart, that you may observe it. … in that I command you today to love the LORD your God, to walk in His ways and to keep His commandments and His statutes and His judgments, that you may live and multiply, and … by loving the LORD your God, by obeying His voice, and by holding fast to Him; for this is your life and the length of your days … (NAS 30:14, 16, 20).

What emerges from this conception of life, are several characteristics of ‘חֵסֶד’ that provide a portrait of what it is to live within the field of God’s ‘חֵסֶד’. There is a covenant love language; a set of vocabulary that indicates whether in covenant relationship with God, the spiritual and relational nature of ‘חֵסֶד’ is being experienced. The language of covenant is denoted below:

i. Truth
ii. Redemption
iii. Love and tenderness (‘荣誉称号’)
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iv. Compassion

v. Forgiveness

vi. Justice and Righteousness

vii. Goodness

viii. Grace

ix. Fidelity

x. Loyalty

xi. Honour

xii. Jealousy (desire for exclusivity)

xiii. Belonging

xiv. Deliverance and Salvation

xv. Knowledge and Understanding, Presence of the other (the nature of ‘ḥesed’ relationship)

xvi. Protection

xvii. Life, Revived
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This exposition of ‘הֵסֶד’ represents not only a contextual view of life, of this love, as portrayed, it defines a secure emotional experience – the safe space in which all of life is experienced.

‘ἐρως’ in Greek mythology is expressed typically in the following statement,

For we all know that Love is inseparable from Aphrodite, and if there were only one Aphrodite there would be only one Love; but as there are two goddesses there must be two Loves. And am I not right in asserting that there are two goddesses? The elder one, having no mother, who is called the heavenly Aphrodite-she is the daughter of Uranus; the younger, who is the daughter of Zeus and Dione-her we call common; and the Love who is her fellow-worker is rightly named common, as the other love is called heavenly (Plato Symposium 458).

Eros is supposed the son of Aphrodite (Phaedrus 422) and therefore the source of divine love. The dialogue in Plato’s Symposium develops further concepts of love that present a breadth of expressions of the highest purest good, beauty, and purity as they do the debased in multiple scenarios of heterosexual, homosexual, ephebic, and lesbian loves. Yet this distinction is not held by the rhetoricians, the demarcation between “good and fair or evil and foul” (Symposium 472) is, “there is dishonour in yielding to the evil, or in an evil manner; but there is honour in yielding to the good, or in an honourable manner … the love of the noble disposition is life-long, for it becomes one with the everlasting”

557 Mic.6:8.
558 Ps.13:5; 17:7; 32:10; 52:8; 143:8.
559 Ps.21:7; 31:7-8; 89:2, 28; 1Sa.20:8, 14-15.
560 Ps.59:16-17; 136:12; Ne.9:32; Jer.32:18.
(Symposium 460). This categorization legitimizes every form and expression of love if it is identified as honourable.

"'What then?' "The love of generation and of birth in beauty." "Yes," I said. "Yes, indeed," she replied. "But why of generation?" "Because to the mortal creature, generation is a sort of eternity and immortality," she replied; "and if, as has been already admitted, love is of the everlasting possession of the good, all men will necessarily desire immortality together with good: Wherefore love is of immortality'" (Symposium 475).

Because of a much wider conception of ‘ἔρως’ love and its divinity, (eternity or immortality), honour, good and beauty perceived in the spectrum of creation and human natures, the ‘erotic’ in ‘ἔρως’ is the fruit of an understanding of this nature of love. The result, from a biblical point of reference, is the exalting of sexual libertinism and licentiousness, “ἔρως’ eros (love) is so called because flowing in (esron) from without; the stream is not inherent, but is an influence introduced through the eyes …” (Plato Cratylus 341), by which Plato typifies the egotistical and sensual desiring of an external object or person.

In biblical terms, the NT does not employ the word ‘ἔρως’ although the references to sexual immorality are explicit and integrated into Paul’s epistles in the context of incompatibility with life in Christ. It has been suggested that ‘ἐπιθυμία’ replaces ‘ἔρως’ in the NT. There are objections to this, while it primarily refers to: sin in the flesh or of the flesh, it is in opposition to putting on Christ or to the indwelling walk of the Spirit; it also refers to Jesus sharing the supper with the disciples, to Paul being with the Lord or on earth, and to his visit to the Thessalonians. The emotional desire is

---
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present but the sexual element is not explicit and if so, only portrayed as abnegation to life in God which stands contrary to the redemptive view of sexual love.

The term ‘dôd’ is synonymous reflecting the redeemed ‘ēroç’ described below. ‘Nâ‘ah’, ‘Nâ’weh’ and ‘maḥmād’ are also synonymous with beauty and desire, in particular the beauty and desirability of a person’s physical appearance.567 ‘Ra’yāh’ and ‘yāpeh’ are synonymously employed as a title of affection ‘my fair, my love’568 respectively referring to the nature of the relationship and the person’s physical outward beauty. Reference is to God’s intended relationship with his people through the imagery of a baby newly born abandoned and rejected that God calls to live to adolescence, ‘the age for love’,569 and with whom He enters into covenant: restoring dignity and reputation washing, clothing, adorning, and glorifying’. The story continues to tell how she prostituted herself. ‘Egeb’ and its derivatives,570 reflect an inordinate sensuous affection and lust, and are uniquely employed to describe Israel’s spiritual prostitution.571 The individual satiation of a strong intense love attachment is also in view with the exhortation for a husband to always passionately love his spouse in an intimate and sexual way.572 This aspect is the closest parallel to Paul’s NT incitement to preserve believers from spiritual adultery. God’s love expressed, “The LORD called your name, Green Olive Tree, Lovely (‘yapheh’ physical or exterior beauty) and of Good Fruit. With the noise of a great tumult He has kindled fire on it, And its branches are broken” (NKJV Jer.11:16). While the text announces judgment for spiritual prostitution, in view is the nature of the emotional attachment of God. Another aspect of this love is the attachment whereby God ‘sets his love, delights upon …’573 his people, a longing for.574 There are strong overtones of belonging in a context
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of covenantal relationship between God and his people. The term ‘dôd’ used majorly in Songs of Solomon explicitly establishing principles for sensual, intimate, passionate, and sexual emotion,⁵⁷⁵ often reflects the degree of mutual attachment in this love thereby establishing the principle of reciprocal and mutual exclusivity,⁵⁷⁶ and the longing for presence and proximity.⁵⁷⁷

‘έρως’ as a legitimate type of intimate or sexual love should be restored to a biblical understanding. The dynamics of the sexual relationship between husband and wife help to redefine the nature of this love. The nakedness of husband and wife is symbolic of worth, trust, dignity, and glory, not shame, lust, insecurity, or guilt, and of the giving of one’s whole self, not just sexually, as a gift to the other. It is giving not possessing, it is altruistic not egotistic, the focus being on the ‘other’s’ pleasure and enjoyment. Symbolic of the sentiment of ultimate vulnerability it expresses, gentleness, profound acceptance and reception of the other; otherwise ‘έρως’ is reduced to an animalistic instinct: egotistical, domineering, manipulative, abusive, and fearful experience. The divinely intended beauty and pleasure are lost. The sexual act is figurative of the giving of the whole self, it is not an impulsive need rather a profound expression of an intense and passionate love for a person. The sexual ‘έρως’ act seeks the utmost pleasure of the other, a reciprocal experience in which all the other loves can find expression. Paul puts it in a context of generous goodness to each other and mutual exclusivity.⁵⁷⁸ This is the redemption of ‘έρως’.

**Affection extends to compassion and tenderness:**

‘Σπλαγχνίζομαι’ in the Gospels, is reflected in the phrase ‘moved with compassion’ and is attributed to Jesus, to Paul and to believers.⁵⁷⁹ The term refers to bowels or intestines,
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a Hebraism for the deepest centre of a human being. The meaning touches emotional intensity and power. Zodhiates suggests that ‘οικτριμός’ is the weaker term, yet it is found alongside ‘σπλαγχνιζομαι’ as Paul adds descriptively, he is adding a compounding layer of emotional intensity. As ‘compassion’ is read in the biblical texts this meaning should be born in mind to communicate the force represented.

Classical Greek usage translates as ‘impulsive passions’ … then the ‘seat of feelings or sensibilities.’ In later Jewish writings, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, “… the centre of feelings” or for “noble feelings.” “The originally rather crude term *splanchnia* can thus be applied to God Himself (cf. Test. Zeb. 8.2). It characterizes the divine nature relative to God’s eschatological acts” (Zeb. 9.7). From the era of the church fathers, “Only Ignatius Philadelphians reflects Pauline usage. In 1 Clem. 2.1 *splanchna* denotes the seat of religious conviction. God’s mercy in eschatological salvation is the point in 2 Clem. 1.7, and the divine compassion in 1 Clem. 23.1” (Kittel and Friedrich @734). Simple observation of the etymological nuances indicates a diluting and moralizing religious filter upon the strength of emotional meaning.

This ‘σπλαγχνιζομαι’ in Christ always leads to a miracle or a ‘doing good’ that are not the expression of natural human emotions or sentiment of pity, sympathy, empathy, or commiseration. The reason being that God in Trinity is ‘σπλαγχνιζομαι’ and manifests it in and through the believer.\(^{581}\) Jesus, moved in his deepest centre with compassion for the crowd, represents firstly the nature of relationship and attachment He has with those around him in which there is a total absence of indifference. Secondly, the exercise of this compassion, is precursory to a ‘miracle’ or ‘work’ that brings something of the divine nature to those before him. At the simplest level this compassion brings to people something divinely significant that they do not already possess, know or experience. Jesus is moved to shepherd those deprived of this,\(^{582}\) to heal,\(^{583}\) to perform miracles,\(^{584}\) and
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teach. The apostle Paul defines relationships with believers and churches in the same spirit. He confirms that it is with the “tenderness of Jesus Christ” (NKJV Ph.1:8) that relationships are defined. He confirms that this is no natural disposition but the supernatural demonstration of Christ in him, manifesting His nature through Paul. He describes the depth of attachment concerning Philemon as “a part of myself” (TLT Phi.1:12). John likewise contrasts the incompatibility of closing one’s entrails to a fellow believer in need, questioning whether the love of God is truly in him. The etymological development, ‘ἐὔσπλαγχνος’ and ‘πολύσπλαγχνος’ tended to restrict application to human compassion, yet in all three references read in context, it is evident that this is not a uniquely human emotion rather a profoundly spiritual one originating in God and manifest in and through the believer.

‘οἰκτιρμός’ is a term that refers to the depth of emotion expressed within a person; it is distinct from ‘ἐλεέω’ which refers to pity or mercy and generally to action. The antonym is ‘σκληρότης’ or ‘πώρωσις’ which are synonyms for ‘hardness’ (Zodhiates 1034). Therefore ‘οἰκτιρμός’ can be translated ‘softness’ in reference to God, Christ and the believer. Reflected in the words, “I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show compassion on whom I will show compassion” (Ex.33:19b NAS) ‘Οἰκτιρμός’ is synonymous with the two terms ‘חננ’ (gracious or merciful) and ‘רָחַם’, (compassion or mercy) employed in this verse translated grace (‘ἐλεέω’) and compassion (‘σκληρότης’) from the LXX. The believer’s invitation and
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motivation to offer his or her whole life as a priestly offering to God is founded upon the softness of God’s heart towards them. Similarly, Paul’s call to the Philippian believers is that in their own disposition and possession of love, they join together in one Spirit and one disposition. The foundations for this unity are not any doctrinal statement but in Christ and in the Spirit, encouragement, consolation, communion, compassion and ‘softness’, (‘σκληρότης’). Ontological unity is possible because of the indwelling Christ and Spirit manifesting their own nature in the believer as made explicit here.595 In the same manner, the Colossians are to emanate compassionate hearts, kindness, humility, meekness and patience; the nature of Godhead is to become their nature and thereby they are to exude the divine nature.596

‘εὐδοκέω’ sometimes combines the notion of will or thought, but carries a strong emotional sense of pleasure, delight with an implicit element of something good. It is a failure to capture the emotional dimension of God in relationship, restricting the meaning to an exercise of will. Pleasure in this context, should be considered as the primary source of the intent or action as to thought, will or decision. In surveying the biblical texts, it is not required of the text because the pleasure carries implicitly according to context the undertone of will, choice or decision. In the relationship between the Father and the Son, Jesus exemplifies the pleasure by public affirmation that bears implicit authenticity or approval, not of the actions but of the Person of the Son and likewise with the Spirit in Trinitarian relationship.597 “For in Him was pleased to reside permanently all fullness” (TLT Col.1:19), indicates that in Christ His divine nature expresses intimate pleasure and delight. It cannot be that the Father gave Christ the divine nature, as he was eternally generate; but rather the reflection of perfect divine substance between the persons of the Trinity reveals the pleasure and delight. In the same way: the angels announce ‘goodwill’ or more accurately divine delight and pleasure of the coming Christ;598 the revelation of Kingdom mandate upon the seventy disciples and the fall of Satan – God’s pleasure and
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a jumping joy for Jesus, reflecting Trinitarian relationship,\(^{599}\) and the liberal pleasure of entrusting the Kingdom to the little flock.\(^{600}\)

The direction of divine pleasure from Godhead towards humankind and in particular believers, as demonstrated, is compounded and intensified: “predestined us to adoption as sons by Jesus Christ … having made known to us the mystery of His will … and fulfill all the good pleasure of His goodness … to save through the foolishness of the cross” (NKJV Ep.1:5, 9; 2Th.1:11; 1Co.1:21). The ultimate sense of God’s pleasure working in the believer is “… because God is the operating power in you and to desire\(^{601}\) and to actively effect his highest satisfaction” (TLT Ph.2:13).

This liberal pleasure of God is demonstrated in the character of service: Paul receives his calling from before his birth as of the pleasure and delight of God. The critical thought is that Christ be revealed in and through him.\(^{602}\) He pleasures in human weakness knowing that the strength of Christ is manifest;\(^ {603}\) this is reflected in his pleasure of sharing not only the message but his life and person, observed in maternal and paternal emotional attachment and characteristics;\(^ {604}\) through the Non-Jews collection for the Jewish believers in Jerusalem;\(^ {605}\) and finally from prison recognizes those preaching Christ from pleasure and delight.\(^ {606}\)

‘χρηστότης’ refers to goodness as excellence, in character, disposition and morality, to kindness and gentleness, and integrity,\(^ {607}\) and characterises love.\(^ {608}\) This emotional

\(^{599}\) Lk.11:21.

\(^{600}\) Lk.12:32.

\(^{601}\) The term is not passive nor determinist.

\(^{602}\) Gal.1:15-16.

\(^{603}\) 2Co.12:10.

\(^{604}\) 1Th.2:8.

\(^{605}\) Ro.15:26, 27.

\(^{606}\) Ph.1:15.

\(^{607}\) ‘χρηστότης’ T格尔 2016 and SEC 2015.

\(^{608}\) 1Co.13:4; Lk.6:35.
expression of affection is again found in and expressed by Trinity. The goodness is directly brought to us, the “exceeding riches” through all that the believer becomes because Christ in within, because Christ is the manifestation of the divine 'χρηστότης', the fruit of God’s kind and generous goodness. In like manner, the “gentle, good yoke” of Christ reflects this. In similar fashion the Spirit is ‘χρηστότης’ and His fruit produced in a believer is through indwelling, producing his own nature. Paul calls the believer to “put on … χρηστότης” (NKJV Col.3:12); the perspective is the extension of divine goodness toward, in and through the believer. One other purpose of this goodness is calling believers to repentance, a transformed life.

iii. Fear or anxiety

There are biblically thirteen reasons for fear:

i. Fear by guilt of negative consequences (The exhortation is to act according to what is good, just or upright)

ii. Fear of giving things of value to the unworthy, that they trample underfoot and then attack you.

iii. Fear of change that requires a change in oneself.

iv. Fear of the supernatural

v. Fear of authority - intimidation

---

609 Ep.2:7; Tit.3:4; Gal.5:22; Col.3:10-12.


611 1Pe.2:3.

612 Tit.3:4-6.

613 Mt.11:30.

614 Ro.2:4.


616 Mt.5:25.

617 Mt.7:6.

618 Mt.13:15.

619 Jn.6:19.

620 Mt.25:25.
vi  Fear of the crowd and threat\textsuperscript{621}

vii Fear of public shame, humiliation\textsuperscript{622} (in search of recognizance through place)

viii Fear that the mask of personality\textsuperscript{623} be removed to reveal true motivations

ix  Fear of inability to finish what is started\textsuperscript{624} (fear of mockery by observers)

x  Fear of Satan tempting: in marital intimacy (a lack of self-control and of deprival) and in unconstructive or harsh correction \textsuperscript{625}

xi  Fear of disapproval and exclusion\textsuperscript{626} (mastery of the body)

xii Fear of criticism, a judgment that discourages\textsuperscript{627}

This synthesis does not legitimize these fears, it simply provides the biblical examples where the emotion of fear is expressed or anticipated in certain circumstances. Several of them represent illegitimate fears because they are founded upon the expectations of others reactions whether for good or for bad. These symptoms point to sentiments of personal inadequacy creating: inferiority, loss of true worth, crippling of natural and spiritual ability (means) to be reactive or proactive. Succinctly put, fear as an emotion is designated to heighten internal awareness to danger or that which is out of personal control. Ironically, fear exacerbates the symptoms and by nature is constrictive in a person. Fear is not to control; it is to be controlled, not suppressed.

If God is love, and His love banishes all fear.\textsuperscript{628} Then the ministry of Godhead in love into the emotional life, addresses illegitimate fear as the key to the emotion of fear being restored to its legitimate purpose. Jesus says "And do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul. But rather fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell"

\textsuperscript{621} Ac.5:26.

\textsuperscript{622} Lk.14:8.

\textsuperscript{623} Jn.3:20.

\textsuperscript{624} Lk.14:29.

\textsuperscript{625} 1Co.7:5; Gal.6:1.

\textsuperscript{626} 1Co.9:27.

\textsuperscript{627} Col.3:21.

\textsuperscript{628} 1Jn.4:7-12, 16-18; 2Ti.1:7.
(NKJV Mt 10:28). This refers to Jesus speaking in a context of not fearing the external factors that cannot determine the fulfillment of one’s life. It is an ordering and prioritizing text, because the context is of God ministering His response of worth and value to prevail over human fear of life. The redemptive ministry of Jesus addresses fear,

Therefore, since the children share in flesh and blood, He Himself likewise also partook of the same, that through death He might render powerless [and inoperative] him who had the power of death, that is, the devil, and might free those who through fear of death were subject to slavery all their lives (NAS Heb.2:14-15).

In the same manner, the ministry of the Holy Spirit addressing fear, “For you did not receive the spirit of slavery to fall back into fear, but you have received the Spirit of adoption as sons, by whom we cry, “Abba! Father!” (ESV Ro.8:15). The Trinity ministers into the believer: personal worth, redemptive freedom, and filial relationship for illegitimate fear to be dispelled.

iv. Anger

In the framework of Old Covenant the anger of God responded to a violation of covenant relationship, allegiance and conformity. Jesus Christ exhibits his anger in the temple clearance, “His disciples remembered that it was written, “Zeal for your house will consume me”” (ESV Jn.2:17, Ps.69:9). Likewise, Jesus before Lazarus tomb, the text says twice he groaned (ἐμβριμάομαι) and was troubled (ταράσσω) within Himself and in spirit. He appears to be reacting to the entity of death, the former term suggests: a strong stern or sharp warning, threatening or critical reaction, the latter: an intense agitation, disturbance or commotion, both internally and externally, which could

629 Jesus: Jn.11:33, 38.

630 There are several terms for anger which are referred to in this section. “aphi” is the generic term employed 268 times, more than the others. “ba’ar” means to burn, kindle, consume and is employed figuratively in the context of anger, 90 times.

631 Ex.32:10-12, 22; Num.25:3; 32:13.

632 Mt.21:12-13; Mk.11:15-17; Lk.19:45-46; Jn.2:13-17.

633 Jn.11:33, 38.

634 Mt:9:30; Mk.1:43; 14:5.
be identified in context as sorrow, or fear or doubt. In this context, Jesus conveys an intense almost violent reaction. He who is Resurrection and Life exhibits an angry revulsion of death, that of Lazarus and perhaps in anticipation of his own, which is contrasted by the impotent grieving of the accompanying Jews.

Anger can be expressed in exasperation, provocation and indignation (‘παροργίζω’); inducing bitterness and aggressivity that should not be permitted to endure a day, (‘παροργισμός’) (Zodhiates 1122), displeasure or disgust (‘προσοχθίζω’), burdened, grieved or offended (Ibid. 1235), and so intermingles with sadness.

God expresses legitimate emotion to contest injustice and advocate justice, righteousness, good and covenant (old or new), fidelity in moral living. Some causes of warranted anger as an emotional response are:

i. Unbelief in Christ for eternal life
ii. Ungodliness (positive, active, direct opposition to God)
iii. Unrighteousness (absence of moral, ethical ‘uprightness’ in acts)
iv. Suppression of truth (retain, restrain, possess)
v. Hardness of heart

---

635 Jn.12:27.
636 Mk.6:50; Lk.1:12; Jn.14:27.
637 Lk.24:38; Jn.14:1; Ac.15:24.
638 Jn.13:21; Gal.1:7-9; Ac.17:5-8; 1Pe.3:14.
639 Ro.10:19; Ep.6:4.
641 Heb.3:10, 17 “qatsaph” is equivalent in Hebrew with a strong emphasis on displeasure or provocation through words (Dt.1:24), rebellion (Dt.9:7-8; Jos.22:18; failure (1Sa.15:11); jealousy (1Sa.18:8; Dt.6:15).
642 Jn.3:36.
643 Ro.1:18 corresponds to ii, iii, and iv.
644 “charah” in Hebrew (comparable to Greek ‘θυμός’) expresses anger in relation to what is just or unjust, as to God or man, and can be good or bad, in that it is legitimate, genuine or appropriate reaction. See Job 42:7; Jo.4:1, 4, 9; 1Ch.13:10-13; Ne.4:1, 7.
645 Mk.3:4-5; Ro.2:5; Heb.3:11.
vi. Self-seeking motives (inconvincible)\textsuperscript{646}

vii. Desires and will of the flesh and mind (children by nature of wrath)\textsuperscript{647}

viii. Deceit by empty words\textsuperscript{648}

ix. Sexual impurity, evil desire and passion, idolatry\textsuperscript{649}

x. Jesus Christ deals with God’s anger\textsuperscript{650} and our guilt, appoints and gives us eternal life\textsuperscript{651}

xi. Angry reaction to unmerited grace\textsuperscript{652}

xii. Burning anger (‘\(\thetaυμός\)’) as the threat of Christ to other beliefs\textsuperscript{653}

In a person’s nature (‘\(κακια\)’), living in an angry disposition is contrary to life in Christ. It is not the absence of legitimate burning anger (‘\(\thetaυμός\)’) as a genuine response,\textsuperscript{654} rather, the counsel is to be ‘Slow to anger’.\textsuperscript{655} Be angry and do not sin: do not let the sun go down on your indignant exasperation\textsuperscript{656} (‘\(παροργισμός\)’) expresses three imperatives: the former in the passive, validating an inner natural emotional reaction of anger; the text qualifies with two retainers that this anger should not govern and cannot license sin nor should it endure, because Satan will inhabit the space that unappeased anger provides. Likewise, prayer is an exercise without anger and arguing or doubting (‘\(διαλογισμός\)’).\textsuperscript{657}

\textsuperscript{646} Ro.2:8.
\textsuperscript{647} Ep.2:3.
\textsuperscript{648} Ep.5:6.
\textsuperscript{649} Col.3:6; “Ka ‘ac” in Hebrew specifically expresses provocation to anger against all forms of idolatry.
\textsuperscript{650} “‘anaph” in Hebrew applies uniquely to God in the following sequence (e.g.1Kg.8:46; Ps.60:1; Is.12:1): Fault (prostitution or idolatry) to God’s reaction (anger) to Consequence (measured judgment) to Restoration (hope, comfort).
\textsuperscript{651} Jn.3:36; 1Th.1:10; 5:9.
\textsuperscript{652} Lk.15:28.
\textsuperscript{653} Lk.4:28; Ac.19:28.
\textsuperscript{654} Ep.4:31; Col.3:8.
\textsuperscript{655} Ec.7:9; Jm.1:19.
\textsuperscript{656} Ep.4:26-27.
\textsuperscript{657} 1Ti.2:8.
Anger, however, can be destructive rather than constructive. It can be: aggressive rather than assertive, it can hate rather than contest, it can control abusively rather than alerting or admonishing, it can control rather than be controlled, it protects with hostility by damaging others rather than accepting vulnerability. Anger can therefore affect positively or negatively self and others.

The prophetic call from the OT questions, ‘until when will the anger of God subsist’?\(^{658}\) The propitiation (‘ἱλάσκομαι’\(^{659}\)) is essential to understanding anger in God. Jesus Christ propitiates in order that the believer be released from divine anger.\(^{660}\) He also propitiates for God’s righteous anger that he bore at the cross. The cry ‘it is finished’ announces the accomplishment of the propitiation of God’s anger that Jesus bore for and in a person’s place. Christ and his cross become a place of transaction for God and therefore for us. It is the incontestable and inescapable meeting place where anger is atoned and redeemed, “Steadfast love and faithfulness meet; righteousness and peace kiss each other” (ESV Ps.85:10).

v. Sadness\(^{661}\) includes, sorrow, grief, and pain
The most striking example of this is Jesus’ at Lazarus death and resurrection. He has pronounced the words, “I Am the resurrection and the life” (ESV Jn.11:25), yet before Lazarus’ tomb he weeps. The reference to Jesus’ relationship with Lazarus is ‘φιλέω’ love. He who is resurrection and life weeps in expression of the bond of love and attachment for his friend.\(^{662}\)

The garden of Gethsemane epitomizes the depth of sadness in Jesus experience:\(^{663}\) ‘λυπέω’ translated as ‘sorrow’ (NKJV, ESV), refers to being the cause of or being affected by or thrown into sadness and grief.\(^{664}\) ‘ἀδημονέω’ literally means to be very

---

\(^{658}\) Is.57:16-17; 64:9; Ps.79:5; 85:4-7,10; Hab.3:2.

\(^{659}\) Ro.3:25-26; Heb.2:17; 1Jn.2:2; 4:10; Heb.9:5; Lk.18:13.

\(^{660}\) Jn.3:36; Ro.5:8-9.

\(^{661}\) Of God Ge.6:6; of Jesus: Is.53:4, 10; Jn.11:35; Mt.26:37-38; of the Spirit Ep.4:30.

\(^{662}\) Jn.11:3, 5, 36.

\(^{663}\) Mt.26:37-38.

\(^{664}\) ‘λυπέω’ TGEŁ 2016.
heavy with trouble, great distress, or anguish, it is the strongest Greek term for this emotion.\textsuperscript{665} Περίλυπος in the text translates “I am overcome with sorrow this soul of mine until death” (TLT Mt.26:38). The term includes, from the root ‘λύπη’ pain, grief, frustration, affliction, and mourning. The term could be understood in the light of Jesus’ imminent death, but it carries an implication of being on the very edge of all-consuming grief where death is preferable to life. Through these three Greek terms, the threefold emphasis of Jesus grief serves to emphasize the in-extremis measure of his sorrow. This event and suffering should also be recognized within the sphere of atonement.\textsuperscript{666} The significance of resurrection to newness of life cannot be dissociated from measures of sadness.\textsuperscript{667}

Sadness is a legitimate expression of: regret for promises and actions,\textsuperscript{668} absence of justice and grace,\textsuperscript{669} loss, self-exclusion, or disqualification,\textsuperscript{670} false accusation,\textsuperscript{671} doubt over motivation or disposition,\textsuperscript{672} offense caused by an absence of love for the other,\textsuperscript{673} correcting and authenticating in truth and love to repentance and transformation, to forgiveness and restoration,\textsuperscript{674} depth of relational attachment and commitment and the possible loss thereof.\textsuperscript{675}

This concludes the foundational emotions expressed in Godhead that authenticate these emotions as an integral part of the image of God in a human being according to the creational order. These same emotions in the regenerative order are transformed and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{665} ‘ἀδημονέω’ TGEL 2016; 3 times Mt.26:37; Mk.14:33 Ph.2:26.
\item \textsuperscript{666} Is.53:3-5, 10-11.
\item \textsuperscript{667} Mt.17:23; 1Th.4:13.
\item \textsuperscript{668} Mt.14:9.
\item \textsuperscript{669} Mt.18:31.
\item \textsuperscript{670} Lk.18:23-24.
\item \textsuperscript{671} Mt.26:22.
\item \textsuperscript{672} Jn.21:17.
\item \textsuperscript{673} Ro.14:15.
\item \textsuperscript{674} 2Co.1:22-2:11; 2Co.7:8-12, 1Pe.1:6.
\item \textsuperscript{675} 2Co.7:11; Ph.2:26.
\end{itemize}
perfected through the indwelling of the Godhead reproducing their own emotional nature in the believer.

iv. Conscience

Conscience is the moral apparatus which distinguishes between just and unjust, true, and false, good and evil, right and wrong, innocence and guilt. The root verb ‘συνείδω’ from ‘είδω’ to perceive through sight or figuratively with the mind. In composition with the preposition ‘συν’ it means to join, to unite, or be in union together. This unity that conscience reflects is the coherence of all seven composite parts of humanity regarding the sphere of moral conscience. The term reflects an inner consciousness of self\(^{676}\) and reflected consideration of external circumstances that govern decision making and action.\(^{677}\) Paul makes it clear that his self-conscious internal moral judgment is not the final arbiter as to ‘being just or righteous’,\(^ {678} \) rather it is the Lord judging him. This scrutiny is internal and in the present continuous.\(^{679}\) Paul is describing an ontological state which is the product of redemption. The creational order reveals that every human being, whether Jew or Non-Jew, whether having the Law or not, has this universal moral apparatus and code written into their hearts.\(^{680}\)

Conscience is distinct from mind,\(^ {681} \) from heart\(^ {682} \) and body.\(^ {683} \) The author of Hebrews indicates that the heart is rendered clean or pure, evil or unclean through the condition of conscience; the use of ‘απο’ means separate or out of the source of; in this case, an evil conscience, referring to the actions and effects.

\(^{676}\) Ac.5:2.

\(^{677}\) Ac.12:12; 14:6.

\(^{678}\) 1Co.4:4 ‘δικαιούμε’ is in the Perfect, Passive, Indicative.

\(^{679}\) 1Co.4:4 ‘ἀνα’ in the middle of and ‘κρίνω’ examine, scrutinize, judge; Verb is in the Present, Active, Participle.

\(^{680}\) Ro.2:15.

\(^{681}\) Tit.1:15.

\(^{682}\) Ro.2:15; 1Ti.1:5; Heb.10:22.

\(^{683}\) Heb.10:22.
An evil conscience consists in: lies,\textsuperscript{684} pollutes or contaminates the whole,\textsuperscript{685} self-seeking, pretence, and hypocrisy,\textsuperscript{686} false or fleshly wisdom,\textsuperscript{687} adulteration,\textsuperscript{688} and shame.\textsuperscript{689} The contrasting qualities of a good conscience are: purity,\textsuperscript{690} good (in nature, pleasurable, excellent, honourable, upright, and kind),\textsuperscript{691} transparent, honest, open, generous, and candid,\textsuperscript{692} in truth,\textsuperscript{693} without blame or shame, guiltless,\textsuperscript{694} and in the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{695}

Paul makes it clear that the witness of one’s conscience authenticates the true nature of conduct before the world. This demonstration of the veracity of the conscience in action causes him to stand in oneness as proof,\textsuperscript{696} and be thoroughly known experientially (‘ἐπιγινώσκω’) by the consciences (‘συνείδω’) of others.

Conscience is taught, trained, and maintained without blame before God and men.\textsuperscript{697} The measure of judgment to justification or to condemnation comes from within, one’s own words,\textsuperscript{698} for God is just and Justifier.\textsuperscript{699} Paul exemplifies this standing when judged before the Sanhedrin, yet already judged and justified in his conscience before God. This

\textsuperscript{684} Ro.9:1; 1Ti.4:2.
\textsuperscript{685} Tit.1:15.
\textsuperscript{686} 1Ti.4:2; 2Co.1:12.
\textsuperscript{687} 2Co.1:12; 4:2.
\textsuperscript{688} 2Co.4:2.
\textsuperscript{689} 2Co.4:2; 1Pe.3:16.
\textsuperscript{690} 1Ti.1:5; 3:9; 2Ti.1:3; Tit.1:15; Heb.10:2; Heb.10:22.
\textsuperscript{691} 1Ti.1:5, 17; Heb.13:18; 1Pe.3:16, 21.
\textsuperscript{692} 2Co.2:12.
\textsuperscript{693} 2Co.4:2.
\textsuperscript{694} 1Pe.3:16; Heb.10:2.
\textsuperscript{695} Ro.9:1.
\textsuperscript{696} ‘Συνιστάω’ in the Present, Active, Participle; 2Co.4:2; 5:11.
\textsuperscript{697} Ac.24:16; Heb.13:18; 1Ti.1:19; 3:9.
\textsuperscript{698} Mt.12:37; Ro.3:4.
\textsuperscript{699} Ac.23:1; Ro.3:25-26.
is what emanates from him before his accusers. In doing so, conscience is founded not in any sense of self-righteousness or one’s own moral code, but on God in Christ who is righteousness and justice. Likewise he purports the conscience before Christ to be transported into fraternal relationships, whereby the innocence or blamelessness in Christ is to stand as criterion concerning the question of freedom of conscience and offense or stumbling block to the brother or sister.

The Holy Spirit’s ministry includes the convicting of righteousness and justifying. The correlation between just men and the Person and ministry of the Spirit is established, in Christ and therefore in the believer. The relationship between conscience and the Spirit as Paul states, “my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Spirit …” (NKJV Ro.9:1), is poignant. This anguish and desire that fellow Jews know Christ is framed by the principle of salvation for all, and is clearly part of Paul’s life in the Spirit and his conscience, a moral voice within who confirms.

The question of guilt and conscience remains. God made specific provision for guilt in the sacrifices and offerings. Jesus in dealing with the woman caught in adultery, asks a question that points to each individual’s conscience of guilt in their nature and actions, “Let him who is without sin among you be the first to throw a stone at her” (ESV Jn.8:7). Guilt is the product of sin or transgression. Each one is provoked in their own conscience, as to the condition of their own sinfulness and therefore guilt, shame, and inadequacy. Therefore, in the light of condemnation by themselves or on themselves, they withdraw. Jesus words, “neither do I condemn you” radically alter the response. There is a glimpse of “… no condemnation for those who are in Christ” (NKJV Ro.8:1), as Jesus moves from condemnation to transformation. The purpose of conscience then is to lead to transformation operating in Christ and in the Spirit. Paul refers implicitly to a ‘good guilt’ that leads to repentance and innocence attested. The example of Paul demonstrates this:

700 1Co.1:30; Ro.10:4; Ph.3:9; 1Jn.2:1.
701 1Co.8:7,10,12; 10:25-29.
702 Jn.16:8-10; Lk.1:17; 2:25; 1Co.6:11; 1Ti.3:16; Ro.14:17; Ep.5:9.
703 Lev.5:14-7:10.
704 Jn.8:3-11.
705 2Co.7:8-11.
a self-righteous Pharisee, blameless in righteousness of the law, persecutor of the church and of Christians.⁷⁰⁶ Yet Paul says of himself, “... Men and brethren, I have lived in all good conscience before God until this day” (NKJV Ac.23:1). Paul although conscious of harming greatly Jesus and his people, he esteemed himself blameless according to Jewish Law. As a Jew his conscience would not have condemned him in himself, nor before the Sanhedrin. God has taken conscience out of subjective self-justification, and set Himself in Trinity as Just, Justifying, and Justifiers.⁷⁰⁷ Paul as a believer has a burden of guilt and shame that he expresses in these verses. Because of Christ’s sacrifice and his blood, through the eternal Spirit, made blameless, the conscience can be cleansed.⁷⁰⁸ His perfect priestly service and expiation establishing efficaciously, one priest and one sacrifice for all time⁷⁰⁹ that cleanses, washes or sprinkles the conscience to purity and blamelessness.⁷¹⁰ The Hebrew author writes “for the worshippers, once purified would have had no more consciousness of sins” (NKJV Heb.10:2), because of Christ, the fulfilment of atonement, this is no longer anticipated but accomplished in Christ and in the Spirit. This ministry of Jesus Christ’s expiation and propitiation to the conscience meets and removes the guilt and shame. Paul, while he can recall his past, does not communicate guilt, in doing so, he is free, and his conscience knows no guilt nor condemnation in that respect. That being so, he too has experienced ‘no condemnation’.

The understanding of conscience points to the importance and normality in Christ and in Spirit of being without blame, faultless in the matter of conscience.⁷¹¹ This is the normative state for a believer. All should be done and ministered to the conscience to no longer walk in blame, guilt, shame and condemnation.

⁷⁰⁶ Ac.8:1; 9:5; 22:4; 26:11; 1Co.15:9; Gal.1:13; Ph.3:4-7; 1Ti.1:12-14.
⁷⁰⁷ Ro.3:26; 5:9; 8:30; Lk.7:35; Ac.3:14; 1Ti.3:16; 1Pe.3:18; Mt.5:43; 1Jn.3:7.
⁷⁰⁸ Heb.9:14.
⁷⁰⁹ Heb.9:9.
⁷¹⁰ Heb.10:22.
⁷¹¹ 1Jn.1:7.
v. **Conscious (Sub or Unconscious)**

Conscious can be defined as awareness. This awareness is self-conscious and conscious of others on a relational axis. Consciousness concerns history, events, context, memory, and circumstances, good or traumatic. If true, to be conscious is to live life in terms of relations and circumstances fully aware of self and to deploy out of self the resources, decisions, responsibilities corresponding to personal and collective reality at any given moment in time. The Eastern fathers expressed the need for consciousness,

> Without the heart, which is the centre of all activity, the spirit is powerless. Without the spirit, the heart remains blind, destitute of direction. It is therefore necessary to attain to a harmonious relationship between the spirit and the heart, in order to develop and build up the personality in the life of grace-for the way of union is not a mere unconscious process, and it presupposes an unceasing vigilance of spirit and a constant effort of the will (Lossky 200-201).

God being omniscient, means that He is conscious of all things, of origin, significance, and purpose. Nothing surprises Him, nothing extends beyond the perfection of his person and the scope of his means. God is incapable of subconsciously or unconsciousness. In the seven constituent parts that reflect the image of God in human kind, this is the one that distinguishes humanity from God.

Human kind due to ‘The Fall’ experienced the breaking down of this consciousness, by the simple fact of Adam and Eve covering their nakedness and hiding for fear that God who walked regularly in the garden with them would see their nakedness.\(^712\) The immediate symptoms that relate to conscious, subconscious and unconscious states are: fear, concealing, shame, blame, domination by control and seduction, forgetfulness in the sense of being connected to the true significance and purpose of self, others and circumstances – a form of sensible remoteness and frustration in lost realization of purpose.\(^713\) The text clearly distinguishes omniscience or omni-conscious as a quality uniquely to be found in the Godhead.\(^714\) There is a Creator-creature differentiation, as

---

\(^712\) Ge.3:7-13.

\(^713\) Ge.3:7-13, 16.

\(^714\) Ge.3:22; Ps.139:1-4; Mt.11:27; 1Co.2:10; 13:9-12; 1Jn.3:2.
with objectivity and subjectivity. That mankind has fullness of life and relationship with God based on sharing His eternal life, points to a qualitative vision in which human subjectivity is reconciled. The tree of knowledge represents the quest for objectivity which will transgress the line between these demarcations. God who is omniscient, conscious, in a permanent eternal state, is however capable of forgetting or no longer remembering, “For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their lawless deeds I will remember no more”715 (NKJV Heb 8:12).

The ‘subconscious’ is defined as the lack of awareness of memories, motives, reactions, and people, whereas ‘unconscious’ is the inability or absence of awareness and responsiveness to surrounding people and circumstances, and to self, a temporary or permanent privation of consciousness.716 Freud would say that what is suppressed in the unconscious never rises to the conscious state. Representationalism reduces consciousness to mental representations … in mentalistic terms, such as ‘to thoughts’ and ‘awareness’. Philosophers often call such mental states ‘intentional states’ which have representational content … many conscious states have both phenomenal and intentional properties such as in visual perceptions.717

In non-technical terms, the sub or unconscious is like a cupboard under the stairs. In every home there is always a place where the unwanted or unused things, for many reasons, are lodged rather than discarded. When a person cannot cope with the conscious reality of self, others, or circumstances this is where these emotional, intellectual, moral, volitional memories, of people, or of the trauma of pain, guilt, shame, failure, etc., are stocked. As soon as one or several parts of a person’s being are affected in an overpowering or traumatic way, the cupboard under the stairs enables one to believe they can forget and discard, getting on with life. Unlike God, according to the witness of Scripture, human kind does not forget and so conscious becomes subconscious (detached from present

715 See also Ps.103:8-11; Is.43:25; 44:22; Jer.31:34; Heb.10:17; Ps.25:7; Jer.33:8; 50:20.
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existence, but just under the surface and capable of appearing at any time), or unconscious where blanking out, suppressing, forced forgetting, occur. The lie and consequence of ‘The Fall’ is that the problem is buried deeper but because it is not ‘forgotten’ it continues to have effect upon a person’s present life in direct and indirect ways.

Some biblical examples will substantiate this proposal: Abraham goes to Egypt and lies about Sara, his wife, presenting her as his sister out of fear, a generation later Isaac commits the exact same error, without prior knowledge of the first instance. The trickster Jacob, from his first deception concerning the firstborn’s birth right, his character marked his dealings with Laban. The fear remained with Jacob and is seen in the relational insecurity, fear of loss, rejection, or abandonment, in covenant as he wrestles with God when returning to meet Esau. The parallels in the narratives of the post-Egypt people of Israel and the second generation of Israel are striking. They demonstrate the same attitudes, reactions, and relational problems, particularly in their romanticisation of Egyptian servitude. King David’s multiple wives, particularly Bathsheba, and their son Solomon, whose downfall was his desire for foreign wives and consequently their gods. Peter’s inconsistencies after confessing the Christ, he fails to discern the sufferings of Messiah; his dying allegiance and his threefold denial followed by his threefold restoration; Judas’ discipleship, betrayal and suicide. Peter’s ambivalent struggle with the teachings of Jesus and church concerning non-Jewish believers and churches is exemplary of engrained habitual patterns affecting him in each of the component parts of his being - an illustration of subconscious beliefs affecting the whole person; God tackles this in him through a vision of unclean animals. Peter is the
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722 Ge.31:14-21; 36-42; 32:22-31; 33:1-3.
723 Idolatry: Ex.32; Num.25; Moses intercession: Ex.33; Num.14; Against leaders & priest Lev.10; Num.16-17; food and water miracles: Ex.15-17; Num.20; blessing and curses: Lev.26-27; Dt.28.
724 2Sa.5:12-16; 1Kg.11:1-4.
725 Mt.16:16-23; Mt.26:33-34; Jn.21; Mk.14:3-11; 18-21; Mt.27:3-5.
726 Ac.10:9-35.
first Jewish apostle to defend identical salvation for Jews and Non-Jews. Yet he is confronted by Paul in Antioch for being hypocritical faced with those of the ‘circumcision party’. While Peter remained principally an apostle to the Jews, it was necessary for this partiality, engrained daily and habitually into the fibre of his being from birth, to be conformed to Christ.

It is likewise with believers in Christ, not because of them, but because of Christ - omniscient God. Upon his example, modelled on earth, in his divine and human nature, he did not become anything other than omniscient. It is part of His nature. The Gospels provide glimpses of this exhibited in small ways: ‘knowing their thoughts …’ ‘perceiving in Himself that power had gone out from him,’ choosing the twelve, ‘and yet one you is a devil,’ ‘my time has not fully come’. Likewise, the ‘I Am’ statements of John’s Gospel, demonstrate this attribute of perfect consciousness, as Jesus knowledge of and relationship of equality and eternity to the Father. Jesus therefore functions entirely in conscious reality of His true self, ‘ἐγώ εἰμί’, faced with much contestation as to his true identity conscious of his life in terms of source, beginning and end.

If Christ, in the New Age, indwells the believer then He will transform subconscious or unconscious to conscious because of His own ‘conscious’ nature as he regenerates in his own image. Three references demonstrate from a human perspective the outworking of conscious: Jesus when Judas betrays him “perchance I am Rabbi He said to him You have
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733 Mt.14:27; Mk.14:62; Jn.4:26; 6:51; 7:29; 8:12, 24, 28, 58; 10:9, 11, 14; 11:25; 13:19; 14:6; 15:1, 5; 18:37; Ac.9:5.
734 Jn.7:28-29; Rev.22:13.
735 Jn.8:14; 13:3.
736 Col.1:27; 2Co.3:18; Ro.12:2; Tit.3:4-5.
said it.” (TLT Mt.26:25). Jesus phrase infers, ‘who are you Judas?’ The betrayal record as Jesus greets Judas upon the kiss, ‘Friend, why are you here?’ is the final attempt to reach Judas, no longer himself, under Satan’s habitation and authority. John Baptist says to the enquiring crowds, “I am not the Christ.” He is conscious of self and identity, remaining within the boundaries of the prophetic mandate upon his life. Paul, at a first glance reading of certain passages in his letters such as second Corinthians chapters ten to thirteen, appears not only boastful but proud, he seems defensive and reactionary, and prone to exaggeration. He bears witness that Christ is central to his existence and in whom all that he is, is defined and from whom he takes meaning and purpose. It could be said that he ‘swings’ from inferiority to superiority, but Paul interacts responsively in how he represents himself, “though I am free … I made myself servant … that I might win more of them [to Christ]”, (ESV 1Co.9:19), ‘will it be the rod or gentleness’, ‘weak in presence and speech yet weighty and powerful when writing’, ‘when weak he is strong’, etc. Paul is able to do this because of awareness and rootedness of conscious self, in Christ,

For I am the least of the apostles, unworthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God. But by the grace of God I am what I am, and his grace toward me was not in vain. On the contrary, I worked harder than any of them, though it was not I, but the grace of God that is with me (ESV 1Co.15:9-10).

Jesus reflects perfectly the divine approach to consciousness and the reality of life. It can be resumed simply, ‘Face it, go through it, come out the other end, changed’. Jesus had to approach: the virulent opposition and hatred; the simple incomprehension as to who he
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is; the condescension of Israel in the face of her Messiah, the incarnate accomplishment (‘τελος’) of the law, etc; the imperative of suffering, humiliation, death, hell and Satan. Nowhere is it more telling than in order to vanquish death, Christ died, in order to defeat Satan, he had to go through hell; in order to defeat mortality he had to be buried; in order to break the power of sin he became sin; in order to break the curse he became it. The importance of Jesus consciousness is born out in the cry from the cross “it is finished” (ESV Jn.19:30), indicating that Jesus was fully aware of the burden of sacrifice for mankind and the burden of judgment and divine anger for God. He knew consciously in Himself, at that moment that the transaction was perfectly complete. To live in the full conscious reality of life in Christ and living life finding its origin wholly in Him, is the restoring unconscious and subconscious to its proper conscious state in Him. It can be asserted therefore that Christ defines human constitution and function according to His own person and nature. Christ in the believer then in perfecting,

In one who is perfect, there will remain no further room for the 'unconscious', for the instinctive or the involuntary; all will be illumined with divine light, appropriated to the human person which has acquired its proper character by the gift of the Holy Spirit … All the conditions necessary for attaining this final end are given to Christians in the Church. But union with God is not the result of an organic or unconscious process: it is accomplished in persons by the co-operation of the Holy Spirit and our freedom. (Lossky 215).

vi. Body
In the previous chapter the relationship of body to spirit was discussed and the principles developed can be carried forward into the context of the body defined in the Age of the Christ and the Spirit. Is the body in the image of God? The first argument against the corporeality of God will be taken from “God is Spirit.”745 The counter argument is firstly contextual. Verse twenty-three states that, “… true worshippers worship the Father in spirit and truth.” Verse twenty-four exegetically states “πνευμα ο θεος …”, literally Spirit this God and those who worship Him, in spirit and truth must worship” (TLT Jn.4:24).

745 Jn.4:24.
Contextually, the Father is worshipped, secondly, the Spirit is identified as God. “Him” can either refer to the Father in the previous verse or to the God the Spirit as objects of worship as Godhead. Similarly, the text could suggest that worshippers are to worship in Spirit [God] and truth and that such worship is to the Father. In either case, the intent of the text is not primarily to justify God as substantially spirit. The Father is distinguished from God the Spirit, the text is ontological interpreted.

Has God manifest Himself corporally? The answer is yes. In the garden of Eden, He walked with Adam and Eve in the cool of the evening;\(^{746}\) to Abraham by the oaks of Mamre, the Lord appeared and three men stood before him, their feet were washed, they rested under a tree, they ate, they walked on accompanied by Abraham, the plan against Sodom was shared with Abraham. The Lord stayed with Abraham during his intercession; while the two others went on to Sodom.\(^{747}\) It is unlikely that these were angels because nowhere in Scripture are angels recorded as eating, they are only present when sacrifices are offered to the Lord\(^{748}\) manifesting in physical form as men. Based on the simple statement that the Lord appeared to Abraham, this episode does not fit with angelic theophany, rather it does suggest that the Godhead manifested corporeally to Abraham. Jacob likewise wrestled with God corporeally, was dislocated in the hip joint, and received a change of name that only God is recorded as doing.\(^{749}\) Moses asking to see the glory and, is shown the goodness of God, because no one can see His face and live. Moses is invited to stand beside the Lord, hidden in the cleft of a rock and covered by the hand of God, and when the hand is taken away, Moses saw the Lord’s back, not his face.\(^{750}\) It is very difficult textually to attenuate such a physical encounter as angelic theophany, neither figuratively and allegorically, nor a prophetic reading, as this latter genre often relates events that are spiritual visions in very physical terms.\(^{751}\) This said, it is plausible

\(^{746}\) Ge.3:8.

\(^{747}\) Ge.18:1-33; 19:1; Jud.6:19-21; Lk.24:39-42.
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\(^{750}\) Ex.34:17-22.
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to consider in the light of the evidence presented that Godhead will sit corporeally on a throne, Christ at the right hand of the Father.\footnote{Mt.26:64; Mk.12:36; 16:19; Lk.22:69; Ac.2:33; Ro.8:34; Ep.1:20; Col.3:1; 1Pe.3:22.}

It is possible to affirm that God has manifested Himself in bodily form. It does not define his substance or nature but represents a form of manifestation, albeit infrequent but not unprecedented according to Scripture. The perfect accomplishment of the corporeal is found in Jesus Christ, perfectly human\footnote{Jn.1:1-3; 5:21, 26; 8:27; Ph.2:6; Col.1:19; 2:9.} and perfectly God.\footnote{Heb.7:25; 9:11, 26; 10:12-15.} The significance of the corporeal existence is redefined because of the human and bodily existence of Jesus Christ inclusive of psychosomatic needs: food, drink, sleep, rest, activity, but now transferred into and defined by the source that is the Spirit. The response is affirmative that the body is in the image of Christ, in particular and peculiarly of God. The body’s significance is defined by the indwelling Christ and Spirit, therefore by Trinity. The atonement of Christ in body is extremely important, if his divinity indicates the eternal, limitless,\footnote{Heb.7:25; 9:11, 26; 10:12-15.} effects of atonement, life of a unique and perfect act of redemption in his body thereby redeeming the believer in his body, a part of his whole being. It is because of this that the new order sees the body as an integral part of salvation and necessary part of life in Christ. Ontologically, there is a new regime of the Spirit in the body, “But if the Spirit who raising Jesus out of the dead dwells permanently in you, He who raising Christ [Jesus]\footnote{WH and IPNT include ‘ιησουν’ where as TR and NTIG do not.} out of the dead will also generate life to your mortal bodies through dwelling permanently him [the] Spirit in you” (TLT Ro.8:11). In the New post resurrection and post Pentecost Age, the body’s life is originated in the Spirit, who realizes resurrection from the dead of a believer’s body in the same manner as He did with Jesus. In doing so He generates life from Himself in the realm of the body. The life generated is Trinitarian life for each person individually and in unity is source and cause of life.\footnote{Jn.5:21, 25-26; 6:63; Ro.8:10.} The participle identifies this as a continuous action, whereby the body is sustained not of its own resources but
those found in the permanency of the Spirit’s residing. Jesus makes it succinctly clear, “that having been born out of the flesh is flesh and that having been born out of the Spirit is Spirit” (TLT Jn.3:6). He describes the question of origin or source; something originated in flesh life can only produce its own genre, which is more flesh likewise, Spirit produces more Spirit; body life, unless sourced in the Spirit, will only produce its kind. There is no possibility of crossover. Jesus recounts the same principle later “The Spirit is the one producing life, this flesh does absolutely not profit [or present an advantage]” (TLT Jn.6:63), He is not creating duality nor conflict, rather He is reinforcing the source interrogation. This does not undermine the intrinsic value of the body this argument has sought to elaborate; it focuses on source of life to the body.

In this New Era, the body belongs to God, established in a cyclical process, as with the whole human being: coming out from Godhead, in his image; being filled with, conformed to, and made alive in His life, in order to exist for the Lord.758 The body is recognized as in the image of God and of Christ. It is through the permanent indwelling of the Godhead and being subject to regenerate life, thereby engendering a new disposition, no longer dominated by law, sin or death, rather governed by Spirit.759 The ontological axiom is the body, is the honour, glory and spiritual nature of the corporeal human existence through incarnate Godhead.

vii. Spirit

In continuation from previous development of the πνεῦμα, humankind is composed of πνεῦμα and this in the image of God. The uses of πνεῦμα are: of character that animates whether good or bad,760 of a person’s disposition, again positively or negatively,761 of the distinction between death and life, dead or alive as a state,762 of conscious self, the whole
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person, and of impure spirits or demons, (the latter term, shows the exercise of degrees of possession in people), of antichrist, seducer, of the world, the pseudo-personalities, etc. These are spiritual beings that can express character traits that seek a place to dwell in, (person or building), they are evil and seek to take possession by filling the space, imposing of authority and governance in areas of a person’s life.

The references to Jesus and the spirit as character should be considered as archetypal. At Lazarus tomb, Jesus is enraged, indignant with anger in spirit, his declaration in verse twenty-five, suggests his reaction targets death. Anger being an emotion, suggests that it is a strong inner disposition accompanied by physical signs. Likewise at the Last Supper Jesus is troubled, relates emotionally to fear, anxiety or doubt.

Being fervent in spirit, may not refer to the human spirit. The definite article ‘τῶ’ which literally means ‘this Spirit’, often translated ‘the’, which lessens the specificity of the term, thereby implying human spirit. Moreover, the definite article gives strong credence to the person of the Spirit. Similarly, when Paul prays for the Ephesian believers to receive “… a spirit of wisdom and revelation,” he refers to the Person of the Holy Spirit rather than ‘another spirit’. His reference in chapter three “… now has been revealed by the Spirit …”, and Peter’s reference to the prophets seeking the time for Christ’s coming, “To them it was revealed … by the Holy Spirit …” also confirm; likewise, the grace of wisdom and revelation demonstrated in the believer, are all attributed to the Person and ministry
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of the Holy Spirit. Paul’s references to wisdom, refer to source: human in opposition to the Holy Spirit. His message is of the unique source and origin of the message of Christ that he bears. The distinction does not concern the entity of the human spirit but the origin of man, i.e. from within himself, the wisdom of his own conscious self is considered.\textsuperscript{772} In the same way the ‘spirit of prophecy’ equated to the ‘testimony of Jesus’ is the ministry of the Holy Spirit witnessing, revealing the things of Christ and the Father.\textsuperscript{773} The “spirit of faith” in Paul’s writings to the Corinthians either refers to a shared disposition “since we have ...” or it is a reference to the Holy Spirit by whom faith is manifest.\textsuperscript{774} His exhortation to the Ephesians “be renewed in the spirit of your mind,”\textsuperscript{775} cited as justification for the spirit synonymously meaning mind (Arno 8-9, Berkhof 23),\textsuperscript{776} under scrutiny reveals the verb in the passive, therefore this is an action that the believer is the object of. The Greek syntax is not easily translated, “be made new by this Spirit [in] your minds” (TLT Ep.4:23) more accurately conveys the meaning. The verb comes from the root term ‘νέος’ meaning brand new, a newborn baby, a new car, etc. It does not remain new but at the point of birth, or coming of the production line it is true. The evidence suggests the Person of the Holy Spirit is therefore intended. The Spirit in Godhead is uniquely able to create or generate in a human being something of this nature.\textsuperscript{777} In Revelation 11:11 the text states the “breath of God entered them,” also a reference to the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{778} Paul, explains to the Corinthians the spiritual exercise of praying to God in a spiritual ‘γλῶσσα’ contrasted with ‘νοῦς’, the faculty to think, reflect, understand. The term does not to refer to the ‘act’ of thinking rather to the ‘faculty’ to think. There is no contrast intended in language moreover, Paul’s wider argument is that of understanding as the final outcome. The implication for the spirit, according to the text, 
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is referencing the action of the Holy Spirit in a person, because the gift or faculty finds its origin in Him. In doing so, Paul clearly distinguishes between the Spirit and a person’s νοῦς. The argument for synonymous reference to man’s πνεῦμα or νοῦς is therefore inaccurate ontologically and theologically, as the Person in view is God the Spirit.

Paul’s use of πνεῦμα exhorting the Corinthian believers, “… having these promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement [of] flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God” (NAS 2Co.7:1), forms a parallelism between ἑαυτοῦ and σαρκὸς καὶ πνεῦματος suggestive of holistic intention. Depending on whether σαρκὸς is interpreted literally as the ‘physical body’ or the ‘internal human desire’ conclusions will differ. On one hand, all-inclusive unity of a human being, material and immaterial, is in view, on the other, human wants and spiritual desires are to be cleansed, disconnected from defilement and connected to the holiness of a distinctive life in God. The reference to πνεῦμα suggests a reference to disposition due to the choice of source. To the Romans Paul writes, “The Spirit Himself bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God …” (NKJV Ro.8:16). To ascertain the meaning requires a reading in conjunction with the preceding verse, “Because you did not take hold of a spirit of slavery again into fear but you took hold of a spirit of adoption in this we cry out Abba Father” (TLT Ro.8:15). To the Galatians, Paul writes, “And because you are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying out, "Abba, Father!"” (NKJV Gal.4:6). The Holy Spirit, indwelling the believer, cries out, ‘Abba Father’. The Person of the Spirit is the Spirit of adoption and so refers to the measure of the Holy Spirit indwelling witnessing and effectuating the adoption, witnesses to the person that the adoption by the Father is true and existent, validating ‘son or daughter-ship’.

The ontological reality of the New Age, the resurrected Christ and the indwelling Spirit, reveals the vital sense of source and origin of life being found uniquely in and through the Person of the Spirit in Godhead. This analysis of the biblical texts demonstrates that a human being in his entirety is shaped by the source of his or her life. That a demon or evil spirit get entry and exercise a degree of authority and governance over and in a person, is evident from the Gospel record; this spiritual ‘source’ will affect the other six


780 ἀπὸ παντός μολυσμοῦ refers to origin or separation. In context, the sense of source intensifies not just the action required but reinforces the solution of source.
constituent parts constituting: body, emotion, will, intelligence, conscience, and [sub]conscious. The believer in whom the Godhead dwells, knows only one source for his being, which is the regime of the Spirit. Paul, like Jesus, only ever puts the power of the flesh (‘σάρξ’) in opposition to ‘πνεῦμα’.

It is therefore suggested that the ‘Spirit’ in man is to be biblically understood in these ontological and theological terms.

**Movement from Old Testament to New Testament of the Spirit**

A brief consideration of the development of the Spirit in relation to a believer is critical at this junction in the argument. Of interest is how the Spirit was manifest to believers in the OT in the light of the accomplished revelation of the means of disclosure, operation and relating in the NT. There are significant differences that redefine the ontology of the believer and of Divine operation (This is found in schematic synopsis Fig.X).

The key characteristics of the Spirit in the OT regarding how He interacts with people:

i. He rests ‘on’

In general, the experience of the Spirit is His coming upon someone.

ii. He is task or mission orientated

The Spirit came upon, for a specific purpose, whether it be a task, or a word to be spoken to certain people at a specific time, as in the case of the prophets.

iii. He is present in a measure

The language of fullness is absent from the OT. The notion of defined measure is related to other criterion; exemplified when the seventy elders are appointed to share the burden of the people with Moses, God does not give a new measure, but divides and distributes the measure that was on Moses to the seventy.

iv. He does not remain indefinitely, is fleeting
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The Judges were raised up for a time and anointed with the Spirit upon them for specific purpose. Samson (and later King Saul), illustrate the fleeting nature of the Spirit. The prophets, communicate the coming of the Spirit at specific moments, as with Ezekiel; as with Haggai on specific days, but He does not remain.

v. Precursor to a greater interior reality

There are glimpses, prophetic experiences of another reality, spoken of, yet not fully understood nor experienced; atypically with specific people, within the constraints of these criteria, the Spirit enters a person. It does not persist, remaining a sporadic, temporal experience.

This serves to emphasize the radical paradigmatic change when the Spirit comes in the NT story. John writes, “And I will pray the Father, and He will give you another Helper, that He may abide with (‘μετά’) you forever - the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it neither sees Him nor knows Him; but you know Him, for He dwells with (‘παρά’) you and will be in (‘ἐν’) you” (NKJV Jn.14:16-17).

The three terms ‘μετά’, ‘παρά’, and ‘ἐν’ help to define the believer’s ontological relationship with the person of the Spirit. ‘μετά’ means accompaniment, in the middle of, with implicit concepts of participation, proximity, transfer or sequence.787 ‘παρά’ is defined as, from beside or near, the idea of proximity is reiterated, (literally, figuratively, subjectively or objectively),788 with presence, fellowship, or sphere of influence, (Kittel and Friedrich @587). ‘ἐν’ the primary preposition, in or with, denoting a fixed position in time or place; a degree of intimate relationship, a mediatory or constructive sense, used ontologically, rarely with verbs describing action or motion.789 It describes the intimacy of connection with an object, a person, an attribute or event. It may express the location internally of psychological processes or qualities. It is used to describe the ontological nature of relationship with Godhead. This rich Hebraic usage does not rest solely upon a mystically local conception, but is based on a vision of Christ, cosmically and

786 Ge.41:38; Ex.31:3; Ez.2:2, 24; 37:8-14; Lk.1:13-15.

787 ‘μετά’ SECB 2015.
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eschatologically (Kittel and Friedrich @240). ‘ἐν’ also reflects the reciprocal or mutual nature of the ontological relationship the believer has with the Godhead as union the most intimate relationship.790

‘ἐς’ a primary preposition meaning to, towards or into, indicating the point reached or end purpose.791

In the NT eis expresses the living connection between divine and cosmic realities. The NT inherits the distinction between the divine and human worlds but bridges the gulf with the concept of fulfilment in Christ. In this context eis takes on a new significance… The Psychological Sense, eis denotes the intrusion of good or bad influences into the centre of personality (Kittel and Friedrich @220).

While ‘ἐς’ does not occur in the foundational text from John’s Gospel, it does carry significance regarding the indwelling of the person and ministry of the Spirit: God causing the Spirit to indwell the believer,792 baptizing believers into the corporate body of Christ; the expression of being a dwelling and through the indwelling Holy Spirit individually and corporately becoming temple, symbol of the divine presence.793

‘ἐπί’ is defined as superimposition: on, at, over, across, or against; in the genitive as a relation of distribution.794 This term represents the continuity of the Hebrew Old Covenant conception of the Spirit’s relationship as a measure in presence and time ‘upon’ someone. It denotes a degree of continuity that should be perceived through the accomplishment (‘τέλος’) filter of the full experience and expression of the ontological relationship with the Spirit in the New Age. Joel’s prophecy and its accomplishment recorded in Acts, to Jews and non-Jews, is recorded with that Hebraic understanding.795 The same language and conception is attributed to Jesus coming.796


792 Gal.4:6; 1Th.4:8.

793 1Co.12:13; Ep.2:22.


795 Ac.2:17-18; 10:45; 19:16; 1Pe.4:14.

796 Mt.3:16; 12:18; Lk.1:35; Lk.4:18.
The principal point, is that a relationship of the Spirit being ‘ἐπί’ or ‘εἰς’ are identifiable in the Hebrew OT conception. However, the sustained intimate proximity of the Spirit that ‘παρά’ communicates belongs to the New Age. The use of ‘μετά’ more than proximity reflects a mediate and collaborative relationship whereby the Spirit is in the middle; in simple terms He is actively involved in the middle of one’s person and reality. The intensification and fulfilment of prophecy regarding this New Age experience of the Spirit is expressed in the preposition ‘ἐν’. In reference to John Baptist’s conception and birth the text states, “καὶ πνεῦματος ἁγίου πλησθῇ έτι εκ κοιλίας μητρός αὐτοῦ,”797 The term ‘ἐτι εκ’ means till this point, signifying from now on, a new reality. The meaning is constituted in the new relationship of the Spirit ‘ἐν’ the believer and Him ‘ἐν’ the Spirit.798 The New Age brings the believer into an ontological relationship with the Person of the Spirit in Godhead whereby He indwells permanently and eternally; the Spirit providing the origin and divine source of life, being reproduced within the believer.

**Ministry to the Whole Person**

The operational relationship of the Spirit in Godhead as origin and [re]source of ontological life concerns the seven constituent parts that form a human being. Ontologically, this relation distinguishes ontologically and operationally the ‘new humanity’ in Godhead from humanity outside of Christ. It is therefore significant and essential to the ontological theology of mankind. Paul’s text to the Ephesians demonstrates the ontology that the believer now lives in,

For this reason I bow (or bend) my knee before the Father the Lord of our Jesus Christ, of whom all family group lineage’s in [the] heavens and on earth is named, in order to demonstrably give you, with the strongest desire, according to the valued abundant richness the glory, [the] dignity of him, inherent enabling power to be prevailing by means of His Spirit reaching into the inner man; the Christ indwelling permanently through the faith in your the hearts, in love having been stably rooted and founded in order to demonstrate full strength, [to] possess eagerly associated

797 Lk.1:15.

798 Ez.37:14; 2Co.1:22; Ro.8:9.
with all the saints, what exactly is the span and exceeding immensity and extensive deeps, and altitude, [to] know by personal experience, and way beyond the limit of understanding or experiencing, the love of Christ, in order to be copiously full reaching the fullness of God (TLT Ep.3:16-19).

This Trinitarian passage, exemplifies the Tri-Unity of Father, Jesus and Spirit, as considered in chapter two. The purpose, in the context of the ontology of the believer, is to demonstrate the Spirit’s ontological place in the believer’s substance and nature - image of God. The text indicates that from the Father’s paternity and love, the Spirit is indwelling the believer. He is the source of inherent ability to prevail in the inner man or woman. The Spirit is the source that defines, feeds, heals, nourishes, and enables the other six components of human constitution. The construct so far has emphasized the Spirit’s person, presence and work in a believer’s substance; the necessity of indwelling to provide the divine origin and source ministers to the whole person (Fig. XI).

The Spirit’s ministry to the whole man is that Christ dwell permanently in the inner man. The apostle Paul will refer to his aim to present men ‘perfect’ in Christ before God. His anxiety with the Galatians is that Christ should be metamorphosed again ‘in’ them. Paul’s argument about the receiving of the Spirit bears greater significance that laws

---

799 Ep.4:13; Col.1:27-28; 4:12; Heb.6:1; 1Pe.5:10; 1Jn.2:5; 4:12.

800 Gal.4:19; Ro.12:2.
cannot produce Christ in the believer, only the Spirit can. In other words, “be made new by this Spirit [in] your minds and be clothed or put on the cloak the new quality of man according to God being created in righteousness and holiness truly” (TLT Ep.4:23). If Paul no longer lives but Christ lives in him, if the letter written by the Spirit who gives life is that of Jesus Christ in the believer. The implication for church is: apostles and prophets laying the foundation, that is Christ, in order that in Him they become a dwelling in which the Holy Spirit resides. The founding text under discussion indicates that this is the glory of God’s abundant riches and grace. This finds confirmation in that the Spirit of glory causes Christ to indwell in the fibre of human nature, the Christ who is the glory of God. The ministry of the Spirit and the Christ, is the transforming of human nature in the same image from glory to glory. The Trinitarian operation in distinct collaborative oneness, for whom the believer is the object of this divine relationship and work, renders pertinent the divine intentions and the union of inseparability through indwelling that constitutes the existential mode of life and operation.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has focused upon the ontological composition of the human being, identifying from Scripture seven component parts which constitute the whole person into which the Spirit of God communicates divine definition and life. In Godhead unity, He is source and origin, ministering Christ into the essence of the believer.

This vision purports the unity of a person as a complete whole. It stands therefore that dysfunction will appear when any one of the seven parts is in contradiction with the others and in reaction against the Spirit. It is not in the scope of this study to develop a further biblical and spiritual psychology of human substance, its dysfunctions, traumas, and resulting behaviours, although the substance of such has been developed.
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Ten states of humankind

This chapter seeks to establish the characteristics of human nature in its various states as described in Scripture. The following Greek terms are employed to elaborate the nature of mankind in these states. Ten have been identified reflecting differing degrees and dimensions that will now be discussed in more depth. The purpose is to explain and contrast these states to the ontological portrait of the believer in substance and in relationship to the Trinity; specifically, the Spirit, as He relates to the constituent parts of human nature.

i. ‘κακός’
‘κακός’ refers to human nature or ‘essential character’807 in contrast to ‘πονηρός’, it describes the passive quality of someone, affecting ways of thinking, feeling and acting;808 subjectively of intrinsic worthlessness, objectively depraved, injurious, evil, harm, ill, or wicked.

One key text is Jesus words found in Mark,

… since [that] going out of a man declares him unclean because from inside out of the heart of men these reasonings, this evil nature goes out adulteries, illicit sexual intercourses, murders, thefts, greedy desires for more, injurious intentions and actions, deceit, unrestrained excess, a diseased evil eye, blasphemy, pride and arrogance, senselessly disposed, all these evils go out from the inside and make man unclean”809 (TLT Mk.7:20-23).

There is no clearer text that identifies a person’s heart as the source of various forms of evil. The reference specifically to ‘κακός’ is to reasoning, and therefore is an inward reflection, integrated within the heart. ‘πονηρός’ is also employed to describe the tangible expressions of the inward ‘κακός’ as Mark’s extended list describes. The first set of six “kinds of actions are followed by six … drives (or states) of the heart” (Hendriksen Romans 286). As Leon Morris explains “… sins like those Jesus has mentioned are done with serious intent or with loss of self-control” (399). Paul, in Romans chapter one, also

807 ‘κακός’ SECB 2015.

808 ‘κακός’ TGEL 2016.

809 Hendriksen notes that Mark’s list contains the first six in plural and the latter six in singular (p283).
expresses similar intent in the phrase used three times, “… God gave them up [or over] to: … desires of hearts to impurity dishonouring the body; ungovernable passions dishonouring natural order; an intellectual faculty that is unfit, untested, unapproved, and invalidated; having been filled …” (NKJV Ro.1:24, 26, 28) through ‘πονηρός’ actions. Rather than examining etymologically and practically the nature of the actions themselves, the focus remains ontological. The rejection of God-Creator, and His giving them up to themselves, indicates the potential of ‘κακός’ nature to manifest itself in the whole person. The antithesis of ‘κακός’ is ‘ἀγαθός’ referring to good nature or constitution; similarly ‘καλός’ describes the beauty, honour, excellence of good nature, often in a context of opposition, of tribulation, or suffering, where the internal good nature and external act are to prevail. The derivative adverb ‘κακῶς’, primarily refers to the sick, physically and demonically, who were brought to Jesus. The word defines, a state of detrimental illness and misery (Zodhiates 811). Undoubtedly, human kind has the potentiality to exhibit ‘ἀγαθός’ nature. In the act of abandoning the relevance of God, man is defined by himself, the worshipping and sacerdotal focus is upon self, and as Paul observes, the ‘κακῶς’ nature dominates the potentiality of ‘ἀγαθός’. It must be recognized that when Creator-creature relationship is severed; when honour and priestly worship are abnegated, into the vacuum created by the absence of relationship with God, ‘κακῶς’ nature manifests itself in ‘σάρξ’ because consciously self is god. The judgment of God is expressed in Him freeing mankind to experience the limitations of his own nature. This can be identified as degeneracy. John Murray suggests that “…this … giving up did not originate the moral condition-they were given up to what is conceived of as an existing condition” (Romans 44). Similarly, he comments that the giving over,

... cannot be reduced to the notion of non-interference with the natural consequences of sin … [although] it would of itself be judicial retribution-to leave men to themselves affords tragic prospect … God’s displeasure is expressed in his

810 Lk.16:25; Ro.3:8; 7:19; 9:11; 12:21; 13:3, 4; 16:19; 2Co.5:10; 1Th.5:15; 1Pe.3:10, 11; 3Jn.1:11.
812 Ro.12:17; 21; 13:3-4; 13:10; 16:19; Mk.3:4;1Pe.2:12, 14; 3:13, 16-17; 4:15; 3Jn.1:11.
813 Mt.4:24; 8:16; 9:12; 14:35; 15:22; 17:15; Mk.1:32, 34; Lk.7:2.
814 ‘κακῶς’ TGEL 2016.
abandonment … to more intensified and aggravated cultivation of lusts … that they reap for themselves a correspondingly greater toll of retributive vengeance (Ibid. 44-45) … [the list of sins] accentuates the totality of the depravity involved and the intensity to which it has been cultivated (Ibid. 50).

As to total depravity, it must be noted that, Jesus refers to a good (‘ἀγαθός’) man, that is by nature, manifesting good fruit. Paul, depicting the internal conflict between his own will and God’s, ‘κακῶς’ is contrasted with the ‘ἀγαθός’ that Paul recognizes in his own nature, “consequently the good in my nature has become death? Certainly not but rather sin, in order that it might be in the light, through the good in me bringing about death – in order that I might become accordingly beyond all measure devoted to sin, the sin through the specific precept” (TLT Ro.7:13-14).

Clearly Paul does not see total depravity, he perceives consciously the ‘ἀγαθός’ nature, yet it is impotent in the face of the entity of sin, the expression of ‘κακῶς’ in ‘σάρξ’. That all have fallen short of the glory of God, “[not] … retaining God in our knowledge in the light in which He has made Himself known to us” (Coates 28), is evidence that because mankind is the source and object of himself, ‘in his own image’ whether characterized by ‘ἀγαθός’ or ‘κακῶς’ in ‘σάρξ’ both are insufficient before the righteousness and justice of God. “… If we do not glorify Him as God we shall surely fall into some form of idolatry (28).

The fatality of ‘κακῶς’ self-destructing ‘σάρξ’, is addressed in the regeneration that Christ atoned for. It also bears witness to Paul’s words to believers, some of whom were identified in this state, “… but you are washed but you are sanctified but you are made righteous in the name of the Lord Jesus and in the Spirit God” (TLT 1Co.6:11). Only the restoration of the Spirit and in Christ, in the believer, redresses the power of ‘κακῶς’ in ‘σάρξ’. It does not seem that the exercise of self-control, as Morris suggests (399) is adequate, rather the regeneration of the Spirit, a change of nature alone suffices.

---

815 Mt.7:17-18; Lk.6:45; Lk.8:8; 11:13; Ro.5:7.
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ii. ‘πονηρός’

‘πονηρός’ 818 in contrast to ‘κακός’ corresponds to active actions, the act of harming, hurting, doing evil to others or some destructive act. The term is stronger in intent than ‘κακός’: an evil influence, figuratively calamitous, passively ill, diseased, and particularly morally culpable; bad, wicked, malicious, or grievous.819 The term occurs in several exemplary lists of characteristics of evil nature and acts.820 ‘πονηρός’ may serve as a sub grouping of kinds of actions defined as evil but elsewhere, is generally one type of transgression among others. The conscious willingness to harm, speak or injure another should be central, the form may be diverse but the essence identifiably the same.

‘πονηρός’ reflects a conscious willing action that is purposefully evil, “... actions that reveal moral-spiritual penury”822 (Hendriksen Romans 283). Contrasted with ‘σαπρός’, 823 the latter refers to a degenerate nature or substance, the former being the logical consequence of ‘πονηρός’ acts. The comparison is of root or nature with fruit or action. Likewise, ‘ἀγαθός’ good nature is correlated with ‘καλός’ beautiful fruits. ‘πονηρός’ is contrasted with ‘ἀγαθός’ particularly by Jesus.824 His first effort is to show that God’s paternal relationship with his own is one of perfect good exceeding the human goodness of a heart equally capable of evil intentions.825 In warning against pseudo-prophets (‘ψευδοπροφήτης’), characterized as liars and deceivers, who infiltrate the believers as sheep (of good, innocence) but are wolves (of evil). The critical lesson from fruits is that they reveal the origins. Jesus uses grapes and thorn bushes, figs and thistles, healthy and diseased trees, to illustrate incompatibility, because each tree or bush produces according
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818 “πονηρός” TGEL 2016.

819 “πονηρός” SECB 2015.

820 Ro.1:18-32; 13:13; 1Co.5:9-11; 6:9-10; 2Co.12:20-21; Gal.5:19-21; Ep.4:19; 5:3-5; Col.3:5-9; 1Th.2:3; 4:3-7; 1Ti.1:9-10; 6:4-5; 2Ti.3:2-5; Tit.3:3, 9-10; 1Pe.4:3; Rev.21:8; 22:15.

821 In Romans 1:29-3, the first four genres are in the dative, the indirect relationship to the object suggests a generality, or grouping (Hendriksen NT Commentary Romans 1982. p80).

822 Mk.7:20-22.

823 Mt.7:17-18.

824 Mt.7:9-11; 15-20.

825 Mt.7:9-11.
to its kind; it is therefore impossible to confuse root or source corresponding to fruit or action. Much confusion in discerning true human nature and true spiritual nature could be avoided by properly applying the vital connection between source and fruit, ‘κακός’ producing ‘πονηρός’ and ‘ἀγαθός’ producing ‘καλός’. What may be perceived as human compassion is in fact confusion over nature and fruit. In the same manner, any attempt to cross breed or legitimize it, is incompatible. If there is only one example in all of Scripture portraying a similar case within church,\textsuperscript{826} then it stands that the norm is one of incompatibility. This discernment empowers the believer to move towards encountering the indwelling Christ being conformed by Him and to Him, rather than collaborating with ‘πονηρός’. Jesus also speaks out concerning this bipolarity present in the Pharisees and scribes, utilising the image of the good and bad tree and a good and bad treasure in the heart of man.\textsuperscript{827} This may be the consequence of the previous dialogue where Jesus is accused of expelling demons by Beelzebul rather than by the Spirit of God. His judgment call suggests that they are evil, incapable of discerning the true source and nature of Christ Messiah and his works,\textsuperscript{828} and responding to who He is. Their hypocrisy of external appearances and verbal projections of self, are ‘πονηρός’. The source and character produced are conformed. Interestingly, perspective is given on this incompatibility in judgment, in that their own words will be their judge to righteousness or condemnation.\textsuperscript{829}

There is only one NT text that connects ‘πονηρός’ to believers.\textsuperscript{830} The context is of a sexually incestuous relationship between a son and mother that the church seems not to have acted upon, to which Paul labels them arrogant and boastful or puffed up.\textsuperscript{831} He employs a metaphor from leaven, raising the whole lump, referring to the effect of this evil act and person, upon the whole. His reference is to Christ the new leaven, causing a purge of evil in act and in person.\textsuperscript{832} The use of ‘ἐξ’ in verse thirteen makes evident the

\textsuperscript{826} 1Co.5:8, 13.
\textsuperscript{827} Mt.12:33-37.
\textsuperscript{828} Mt.12:22-32.
\textsuperscript{829} Jn.12:47-48; Dt.18:19; Lk.9:26; 10:16.
\textsuperscript{830} 1Co.5:8, 13.
\textsuperscript{831} 1Co.5:1-2, 6.
\textsuperscript{832} 1Co.5:6-8, 13.
need to extirpate the source of evil. ‘κακία’ nature and ‘πονηρία’ actions are of the old regime, not of Christ rather ‘τιλικρίνεια’ (pure, innocent, uncomplicated) and ‘ἀλήθεια’ are hallmarks of the new. This finds an echo in Jesus teaching in the beatitudes.\textsuperscript{833}

Paul includes two lists in this section of the epistle,\textsuperscript{834} his affirmation is reflected in the closing verse of chapter six, “Such were some of you; but you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God” (NAS 1Co.6:11), (Fee 194-219). Paul corroborates, “and you, who once were alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now He has reconciled in the body of His flesh through death, to present you holy, and blameless, and above reproach in His sight …” (NKJV Col.1:21).

All other references in the NT refer to the evil actions that hallmark this age;\textsuperscript{835} of that generation;\textsuperscript{836} the world;\textsuperscript{837} of evil or impure spirits or demons,\textsuperscript{838} which when confronted by Jesus, are expulsed. The underlying lesson is that a clean empty house is insufficient in the face of evil. The house must be indwelt with a greater authority and presence, that of Christ in Godhead.\textsuperscript{839} ‘πονηρός’ is also applied to the ‘Evil One’\textsuperscript{840} that is Satan or the Devil. The most explicit text says, “when anyone hears the word of the kingdom and does not understand it, the evil one comes and snatches away what has been sown in his heart. This is the one on whom seed was sown beside the road” (NAS Mt.13:19). The fundamental issue for this person is that ‘συνεντος’ is the ability to add together to understand the whole, the incomprehensible becomes impervious, impeding the word to take root in the heart, thereby remaining on the surface of the heart - easy pickings for the Evil One. The parable of the weeds also explicitly describes the sons of evil as sown by
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the Devil, the enemy. The sons can be identified as ‘sons of evil’ or ‘sons of the evil one’.\textsuperscript{841} It is less obvious in the other texts because they lack the explicit personification of evil. That the nature of the action correspond to the character of Satan, could suggest that the evil is personified.\textsuperscript{842}

The Christian response to ‘πονηρός’

This is the judgment, that the Light has come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the Light, for their deeds were evil… everyone who does evil hates the Light … for fear his deeds will be exposed … But whoever does what is true comes to the light, so that it may be clearly seen that his deeds have been carried out in God (NAS Jn.3:19-20; ESV Jn.3:21).

The Light is personified in the person of Jesus.\textsuperscript{843} Coming into the light is coming into relationship with the person and work of Christ,\textsuperscript{844} therein John provides an unequivocal thesis and antithesis.\textsuperscript{845} Paul endorses, “May love be without disguise. Loathing evil. Being attached to good” (TLT Ro.12:9). His exemplary list of good nature characteristics follows in the text, contextually produced by a metamorphosed being antithetical to conformity to the world’s trends.\textsuperscript{846} The irreconcilability of being in Christ and being or acting\textsuperscript{848} in ‘πονηρός’ is pertinent. Jesus prays, “I do not ask that you take them out of the world, but that you keep them from the evil one” (ESV Jn.17:15), awaiting the ‘παρουσία’ of Christ.\textsuperscript{849}
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\textsuperscript{846} Ro.12:2.
\textsuperscript{848} Lk.3:19; Mt.18:32; 20:15; 25:26.
\textsuperscript{849} Mt.13:24-30, 36-43.
The believer’s reaction to ‘πονηρός’ must be equally antithetical to the nominal or secular response. "But love your enemies, and do good, and lend, expecting nothing in return; and your reward will be great, and you will be sons of the Most High; for He Himself is kind to ungrateful and evil men" (NAS Lk.6:35), gives a simple motivational imperative; the believer’s response is nothing short of a likeness (‘ὁμοίωμα’) or extension of God the Father, or of Christ. In this light the response is clear,

"Blessed are you when people insult you and persecute you, and falsely say all kinds of evil against you because of Me … But I say to you, Do not resist the one who is evil. But if anyone slaps you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also" (NAS Mt.5:11, ESV Mt.5:39).

The emphatic response is not so much a concern for the character or expression of the ‘πονηρός’ exhibited rather to the source and origin of it. The motivation therefore is because we are in Christ, in the Light, and his Kingdom, therefore the antithetical response is no less than He experienced, and should not surprise.

The non-Christian proves that by persecuting the Christian. The way in which he persecutes him does not matter … there is an antagonism in the non-Christian to the Christian” Why are they persecuted? Because they are living for Christ’s sake … and no longer live for [their] own … it is because of what we are as new men [and women] in Christ Jesus” (Lloyd Jones 139, 141).

The spirit of: self-defence, or self-justification, of retaliation, retribution or vengeance, in the face of the world and its injustices, claims and demands, belong to the mentality of the old law, ‘an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth’. As Lloyd-Jones comments, “our Lord here is unveiling and exposing this horrible thing that controls the natural man – self, that terrible legacy that has come down from the fall of man and which makes man glorify himself and set himself up as a god” (279) thus corroborating with the previous analysis of Romans chapter one. “… It is an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth until the spirit of Christ enters into us” (277). Let what you say be simply ‘Yes’ or ‘No’; anything more than this comes from evil” (ESV Mt.5:37). In the face of ‘πονηρός’ simple veracity, being
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in truth that is Christ, and therefore speaking truth is the antipode. Exaggeration and minimization, contradiction and compromise, adulation and artful therefore, belong to ‘πονηρός’.

Paul exhorts believers to take up the defensive equipping of God, “… take up the whole armour of God that you may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand firm. In all circumstances take up the shield of faith, with which you can extinguish all the flaming darts of the evil one (ESV Ep.6:13, 16). An in-depth reading of the text reveals that the persons of the Tri-Unity are the means of defence, symbolized in the Roman soldier’s armour. The theological backdrop is that the believer has received not the spirit of the world, but of God; the believer who lives ‘εκ’ God overcomes and attains victory over the world.

iii. ‘σαπρός’

Primarily used by Jesus ‘σαπρός’ is a less common term which embraces in definition and usage the concepts of ‘πονηρός’ and ‘κακός’. It means: rotten, corrupt, qualitatively unfit for use or worn out, worthless. Jesus employs it referring to the good and bad trees producing good or bad fruit. In doing so Jesus connects the nature of the tree with the fruits it produces. The source determines the nature of the fruit, evident for all to see. Degeneracy can only result from original virtue. The term compounds the correlation between source and fruit with special emphasis upon the qualitative character. For a believer to exist in the ‘σαπρός’ state is incompatible with his person originated in
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Christ and the fruits that result, qualitatively are identifiable. Inversely the quality of fruit will reveal the true origin in reality.

iv. ‘φαύλος’

‘φαύλος’ translates as easy, slight, ordinary, flaw or fowl, principally meaning worthless, or good for nothing. The ethical definition is general, bad or evil and relates to things done by a person. The term is used four times in the NT by Jesus, Paul and James. Jesus employs the term to contrast works that are in darkness with those that are worked in God, therefore in the light and without shame. His use of ‘ἐλέγχω’ suggests that refuted and convicted this state can change. However, those at the resurrection who are still ‘φαύλος’ are selected for righteous judgment of their actions. The fact that change is possible underscores the worthlessness of remaining in this state. Paul exhorts Titus to model integrity and sound or healthy speech so that those who are ‘φαύλος’ would be shamed and speechless. James describes the characteristics that enable ‘φαύλος’: jealous jealousy (‘ζηλος’), selfish ambition, unintelligibility, and ambiguity (‘ἀδιάκριτος’), and hypocrisy (‘ἀνυπόκριτος’), the signs of earthly, instinctive, demonic wisdom; these create instability, disorder, and confusion (‘ἀκαταστασία’); and are the breeding ground for ‘φαύλος’. The ‘φαύλος’ state is identifiable through the characteristics mentioned as superficial inessential meaninglessness. The unique hope of regenerate change remains possible.

v. ‘σάρξ’

‘σάρξ’, in Jesus usage, continued by the apostles, does not have a pejorative nor a depraved connotation, it is applied to: physical, human living existence; of people and lineage; in reference to Jesus they simply attest to His physical, bodily, human
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existence. While figurative and spiritual in meaning, Paul employs ‘σάρξ’ physically, to demonstrate that believers are members of his ‘σάρξ’. Likewise, Jesus presents his ‘σάρξ’ as bread to be eaten and indwell abiding in one, in which life is found, in contrast to mankind’s ‘σάρξ’. As commented in the previous chapter, ‘σάρξ’ could be suggested as synonymous with the holistic notions of heart and soul. The term is also used to contrast man or the human and God, the divine. In doing so, in view is: the question of source or origin of revelation, of spiritual origins, of Kingdom; of ‘σάρξ’ sourced in ‘πνεῦμα’ life, and the subsequent consequences.

This unbiased view of ‘σάρξ’, in a normative and factual acceptance of the constitution of humankind, must have a bearing upon understanding the negative association present in some biblical texts. The biblical witness gives evidence that ‘σάρξ’ in and of itself, is not evil, rather the powerful forces at work within a person’s nature are the source of evil in the body: the law at work in its members, showing impotence and bearing fruit to: death; actions; uncleanness; phantasm reviling true glory; secular desires exemplified by ardent desires or lusts of ‘σάρξ’, sight, presumptuous bragging but empty assurance, or arrogant words; and those who follow the lead in their ‘σάρξ’ in burning desires and sensuality. Paul suggests when writing to the Colossians, “… putting aside

868 Jn.1:14; 6:51; Ac.2:26, 31; Ro.8:3; Col.1:22; 1Ti.3:16, Heb.2:14; 5:7; 1Jn.4:2; 2Jn.1:7.
869 Jn.6:51-56; 6:63.
870 Mt.16:17.
871 Mt.16:17; Jn.1:13; 1Co.15:50; Gal.1:16; 4:23,29.
872 Jn.3:6; 6:63; Ro.8:4, 9; 5:16-17; 6:8.
873 Ro.8:6, 7, 8, 13; 2Co.7:1; Gal.5:19; Ep.2:3; Col.2:18, 23; 2Pe.2:10, 18; 1Jn.2:16; Jude 1:7, 8.
874 Ro.7:5; Ep.2:15; Col.2:23; Heb.9:10.
875 Ro.8:13.
876 2Co.7:1.
877 Jude 1:8.
878 1Jn.2:16; 1Pe.2:18.
879 2Pe.2:10.
the body of sins of the flesh in the circumcision of Christ…”⁸⁸⁰ (TR Col.2:11), in other words the entity of sin that is at work in ‘σάρξ’ is in view rather than ‘σάρξ’ directly. This translation does concur with the thought under development and therefore suggests greater rationality with the whole.

Paul in particular perceives that there is choice in the realm of ‘σάρξ’, being susceptible to influence that as a result will determine the nature of disposition, “but grace be to God, that when you were slaves to sin, you obeyed moreover out of the heart to which you were given over … because you showed your flesh, slaves to impurity and the absence of or contrary to rule in this manner at this time you showed your flesh that were to sin, were set free to uprightness…” (TLT Ro.6:14, 19). Similarly, in Romans chapter eight verses five to nine, Paul employs ‘φρονέω’ which refers to an internal disposition of thought, emotion and will, the whole inner person.⁸⁸¹ ‘σάρξ’ requires a choice origin or source, an influence or authority or governance. This does not remove the impotence through any means, good or bad, to realize the ‘new state’ that is procured and offered in Christ and his atoning and reconciling work.

It was necessary for Christ to incarnate into ‘σάρξ’ to restore the original divine intention. There is no hope if Christ did not identify fully with ‘σάρξ’, that He perfectly defeat, triumph over, and condemn the entity of sin in the ‘σάρξ’ to death. Herein lies the source of redeemed ‘σάρξ’.⁸⁸² In this God in the ‘σάρξ’, Christ through death, has restored us to His original intentions in Christ.⁸⁸³ A model is set out as Christ came in the likeness of ‘σάρξ’; through Him He sets out the way for us to come out from ‘σάρξ’ in sin into His likeness, ‘σάρξ’ in the Spirit, “being put to death in flesh, but made alive or resurrected by the Spirit.”⁸⁸⁴ If in union with Christ is in death and in resurrection, then a change of origin, and governance occurs, “it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God” (NKJV Gal.2:20).

---

⁸⁸⁰ WH, NTIG and IPNT follow, “του σωματος της σαρκος εν τη περιτομη του χριστου” in contrast to TR “του σωματος των αμαρτιων της σαρκος εν τη περιτομη του χριστου.” See also Ro.8:3.

⁸⁸¹ Ro.8:5-9; 8:12.

⁸⁸² Ro.8:3.

⁸⁸³ ‘ἀποκαταλλάσσω’ NKJV Col.1:21-22.

⁸⁸⁴ 1Pe.3:18; Ro.8:11.
Therefore, in Paul’s perception, before there is the expression of ‘σάρξ’ in the fullest sense, there is the indwelling person of Christ source of Paul’s humanity, “it pleased God … to reveal His Son in me” (NKJV Gal.1:15-16).

To the Romans, Ephesians, and Colossians, the language and figure of ‘putting on clothes’ reinforces the ontological perception. The verb is in the middle voice and therefore can be translated as ‘self’ clothing over the new source Christ, or that Christ is the clothing over my dead and resurrected self (‘σάρξ’). The language of circumcision is used to describe the effects of Christ’s ministry to ‘σάρξ’. The sources, influences and controlling factors that render ‘σάρξ’ unclean, defiled, depraved, corrupt, etc. are cut out in death, burial and resurrection. In coming alive it is in recognition that the believer is ontologically no longer the same. It is the fundamental difference between fighting against sin in the flesh and being substantially changed in nature that these ways, ‘the old clothing’, are simply no longer possible, because of one’s inability in Christ and therefore, because they have been cut off. Paul confirms to the Galatians, “Now those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions [‘πάθημα’ ungovernable passions] and desires [‘ἐπιθυμία’ wilful lustful desires]” (NAS Gal.5:24). This ontological paradigmatic shift also translates into a new life perspective, “for we who live are constantly being delivered over to death for Jesus’ sake, so that the life of Jesus also may be manifested in our mortal flesh” (NAS 2Co.4:11), an image of the ultimate perception of ‘σάρξ’ life in the New Age of Christ and the Spirit indwelling.

vi. ‘σαρκικός’

‘σαρκικός’ with the ending ‘ικός’ refers to nature, mentality or ethical traits, generally translated as fleshly or carnal, implying governance, resulting in depravity; controlled by the wrong desires which rule in flesh, it is man who gives flesh dominion in his life – a place that does not rightly belong, distinctly opposed to Spirit of God – anti-spiritual.

885 Ro.13:14; Gal.3:27; Ep.4:24; Col.3:10.
886 Ro.13:14.
887 Col.2:11, 13.
888 ‘σαρκικός’ TGEL 2016.
or unregenerate, of things: corporeal, external, implying weakness, frailty, imperfection, worldly; transient, temporary (Zodhiates 1279).

The term appears eleven times in the NT. It applies to: money as material, to Jesus Christ as priest according, “to the power of an endless life” (ESV Heb.7:16), in contrast to the priestly law which is ‘σαρκικός’. Authenticity (‘ἀπλότης’) and godly purity (‘εὐλογία θεοῦ’) through the means of God’s grace more abundantly to the Corinthians, is contrasted with ‘σαρκικός’ wisdom. Paul’s point is the defence of integrity in his writings and interaction with them. It is implied that the nature of the differentiated wisdom is not genuine nor pure in motive, it is therefore ‘σαρκικός’, possibly comparable in intention to the human, secular (worldly or earthly), philosophical, or religious. The principle is one of source and of character, one reciprocally attesting to the other. Paul responds to the Corinthian’s reasoning by saying, “… because in flesh we are conducting life absolutely not according to flesh we conduct life” (TLT 2Co.3:3). He employs ‘σαρκικός’ to describe the weapons that are according to ‘σάρξ’ in contrast to those that are inherently capable and of God. The whole thought is figurative of the source of one’s walking with God, of heavenly contention brought into subjection to Christ. Paul establishes that life is lived ‘ἐν σαρκί’ not ‘κατὰ σαρκα’ and therefore the instruments of this warfare are not ‘σαρκικός’. Fleshly, physical life is asserted without abnegation of life according to the creational order. However, Paul clearly identifies that the origin, source or means, are ‘κατὰ’, literally ‘from where one draws from’. Living this ‘σαρκι’ life is not ‘σαρκικός’, reinforcing that the ‘means’ to live ‘ἐν σαρκί’ are ‘κατὰ’ the Godhead. ‘σαρκικός’ is therefore in contrast to ‘πνευματικός’. The inherent capacity, ‘δύνατός’, is one of four Greek terms to describe

889 ‘σαρκικός’ SECB 2015; Paul employs this term to refer to the supposed Christians among the Corinthian church, 1Co.3:1.

890 Ro.15:27; 1Co.9:11.

891 2Co.1:12.

892 1Co.1:17-24, 2:1, 4, 5, 6; 2:13; 3:19; Col.2:23; Jm.3:15-17.

893 2Co.3:2-5.
facets of power. ‘δυνατός’ is the power that is inherently God and is manifest in a believer because of indwelling,\(^{894}\) to attest the contrast with ‘πνευματικός’ life.

The association of ‘σαρκικός’ as the product of ‘κατα σαρκα’ attributes a negative connotation to the term. Peter reiterates, employing the warfare motif,\(^ {895}\) and exhorts believers, as neighbouring strangers, and foreigners; that is not to say ‘κατα σαρκα’ according to the earthly or worldly means, to refrain or abstain from ‘σαρκικων επιθυμιων’. That is, the ‘σαρκικός’ disposition takes its source from ‘κατα σάρξ’, animated by ‘επιθυμιων’ passionate conscious willing desire, which in turn feeds the ‘σάρξ’. This is the ontological state of ‘σαρκικός’. Scripture elaborates lists of objects that feed ‘επιθυμιων’\(^ {896}\). Peter places this kind of person and life in opposition to the Christian life, as he counsels against this as a normative expression of the Christian.

Can the ‘σαρκικός’ person be a Christian? To respond requires consideration of Paul’s letter to the Corinthians,\(^{897}\) where he says he is unable to speak to them “as spiritual but as ‘σαρκικός’ as ‘νηπιοις’ in Christ” (TLT 1Co.3:1). The tangible signs Paul gives for this appellation are: ‘ζῆλος’ (excitement or zeal for good but also envy, contentious rivalry or jealousy), ‘ἔρις’ (contention, strife, wrangling), and ‘διχοστασία’ (disunion, dissension, division, sedition). The ontological concern is that Paul explicitly identifies some Corinthian believers as ‘σαρκικός’ and also considers them in Christ. His use of ‘νηπιοις’ is important as the term is a positive affirmation of a little child,\(^{898}\) used to describe childhood as a state that while legitimate, no one can remain statically ‘νηπιοις’; change is essential because of Christ.\(^ {899}\) The remaining references allude to childishness, immaturity, under-developed or retarded.\(^{900}\) According to Paul, one can be ‘in Christ’ and

---

\(^{894}\) Ac.1:8 ‘δυνατός’ and Holy Spirit; 2Co.9:8 and God; 2Co.12:9-10 and Christ.

\(^{895}\) 1Pe.2:11.

\(^{896}\) ‘επιθυμιων’ is predominantly perjorative, the exceptions being Lk.22:15; Ph.1:23; 1Th.2:17 of thirty-seven mentions. Satan Jn.8:44; human heart Ro.1:24; sin as an entity Ro.6:12; 7:8; of flesh Ep.2:3; Old man Ep.4:22-24; riches 1Ti.6:9; adolescence 2Ti.2:22; teaching/teachers 2Ti.4:3; old ignorance 1Pe.2:11; of eyes Jm.1:16, 18.

\(^{897}\) 1Co.3:1-4.

\(^{898}\) Mt.11:25; Lk.10:21; Mt.21:16.

\(^{899}\) Gal.4:3, 11.

\(^{900}\) Ro.2:20; 1Co.13:11; Ep.4:14; Heb.5:1.3.
yet be ‘σαρκικός’. He does not endorse this state, because it is ‘νηπιοις’ in his judgment. It is therefore deduced that Paul perceives a development which suggests a spiritual process whereby a ‘σαρκικός’ can grow to maturity, ‘πνευματικός’ whereby there is disconnect with regard to source, σάρξ is no longer nourished by ‘σαρκικός’, rather by ‘πνευματικός’, Christ becomes the unique source of being. That possible change is substantiated, as is Paul’s perspective of a temporary but perhaps necessary stage of spiritual development in Christ. If childlikeness does not develop to maturity in Christ, it becomes childishness, it can unequivocally not be mistaken as the normative ontological state of being in Him.

vii. ‘σάρκινος’

‘σάρκινος’ is defined as: composed of flesh, pertaining to the earthly and perishable body; wholly given up to, rooted in flesh. The word ending ‘ινος’ refers to substance or matter, whereas the ‘ικός’ ending refers to nature, mentality or ethical traits. Trench considers ‘ινος’ not to be as strong as ‘ικός’ and more congenial to unspiritual, undeveloped rather than anti-spiritual. However, Cremer and Thayer make ‘ινος’ the stronger: one who is flesh, given up to flesh, rather than acting according to flesh.901 The Dictionary of the NT describes ‘σάρκινος’ as consisting of flesh, corpulent, and real, in contrast to the imaginary, and with it bearing the nuance of corruptibility (Kittel and Friedrich @702). Zodhiates considers ‘σάρκινος’ as the tendency to satisfy the flesh matter, a sinful propensity, under the influence of carnal desires. The author confirms the ethical meaning of the ‘ικός’ ending (1279-1280).

This term occurs once in the NT in first Corinthians chapter three verse three. The context and usage bear no negative connotation as Paul will compare the tablet of stone with the tablet of the heart of flesh. Trench would seem to be closer to this usage in his assessment of ‘σάρκινος’ as undeveloped flesh life, but fully able to be developed as the context indicates; the more glorious, more permanent glory, of being metamorphosed out of glory into glory, originated in the Spirit and the Lord. The use of ‘απο’ in the text emphasizes the source and clearly puts the person of the Spirit as source. It is also ‘απο’ the Spirit that Christ is formed in the believer. ‘σάρκινος’, therefore has no negative connotation.

901 ‘σάρκινος’ TGEI 2016.
neutral perhaps, but the accentuation is certainly of potentiality, and of disposition to this regenerative work, in order to leave the ‘σάρκινος’ state.

viii. ‘Φυσικός’

‘Φυσικός’ refers to inborn or innate nature,\(^ {902}\) derived from ‘φύσις’ meaning physical life, of natural [re]production, or descent; figuratively of a native disposition or constitution, of natural mankind. The term is the distinct from ‘πνευματικός’ as the highest quality of nature and is more primal than ‘ψυχικός’ the sensitive nature.\(^ {903}\) Neither this term nor its derivatives of innate or natural nature carry a negative connotation, as they essentially point to the creational or natural order. That said, ‘φυσιόω’ carries a secondary meaning to inflate, blow or swell up. Paul employs this term to warn against pride resulting from: divisive partisanship,\(^ {904}\) undermining to take eminence,\(^ {905}\) unresolved sin that is normalised,\(^ {906}\) contrasting knowledge with love,\(^ {907}\) depriving through fake humility – of things unseen and angel worship.\(^ {908}\) The NT employs ‘φύσις’ to apply to physical nature of animals and mankind in their creational order with no particular nuance, a simple statement of fact.\(^ {909}\) The term is also applied to the divine nature, of the gods and of God.\(^ {910}\) It is used of: cultural or religious identity as nature to distinguish culturally Jews from Non-Jews,\(^ {911}\) and Gentile’s sub-conscious code in moral conscience.\(^ {912}\) Paul refers to the natural sexual orientation of man and woman, unpejoratively, but does extend to unrestraint following “the lust of their hearts to impurity” (ESV Ro.1:24) in which they

\(^{902}\) ‘Φυσικός’ TGEL 2016.

\(^{903}\) ‘Φυσικός’ SECB 2015.

\(^{904}\) 1Co.4:6.

\(^{905}\) 1Co.4:18, 19.

\(^{906}\) 1Co.5:2.

\(^{907}\) 1Co.8:1; 13:4.

\(^{908}\) Col.2:18.

\(^{909}\) Ro.2:14, 27; 11:21, 24; 1Co.11:14; Jn.3:7.

\(^{910}\) Gal.4:8; 2Pe.1:4.

\(^{911}\) Gal.2:15.

\(^{912}\) Ro.2:14.
dishonour their bodies in the natural order and God. Paul identifies the relinquishing of Creator God worship with all of life and being, transferring this relationship to themselves, being god for each other, idolatry of another order. The intent does not affect the nature of the natural order, whereas the deformed humanity through: lusts of their hearts, dishonourable passions, and a debased mind do. These primal instincts thus create another order or nature that brings upon itself its own judgment. Paul does not treat ‘φύσις’ pejoratively, he does however, demonstrate how this natural order can be formed or deformed, driven to act contrary to nature.

The term is employed negatively when Paul says, “… [you who] were by nature children of wrath” (NKJV Ep.2:3). He is describing the nature of man outside of God, His grace and love, which was enslaved to the nature of depraved desires (‘ἐπιθυμία’), and of active taking pleasure in (‘Θέλημα’) the ‘σάρξ’. The natural order of wrath is only expressed in accordance with the nature of the life being lived. Therefore, the depravation and impulses of the desires of ‘σάρξ’ are what characterizes the state.

Peter, in the same manner, speaking of the indictment against pseudo-prophets and teachers, complying to unbridled lust with no limits (‘ἀσέλγεια’); according to ‘σάρξ’ the unclean desire (‘σαρκος εν επιθυμια μιασμου’) (TR 2Pe.3:10); Peter compares these to a natural living animal without reason (‘αλογα ζωα φυσικα’) (TR 2Pe.3:12), who gets caught and killed. His judgment is they denigrate by their own ignorance and will be subject to the same judgment figuratively as the animal. Upon closer examination, the nature of the animal is not depraved, he is subject to the law of the natural order. Peter’s point is: those pseudo-prophets and teachers will in their alternative natural order will be subject to the natural outcome of that same order, such is the nature of the ‘Φυσικο’ state of mankind.

ix. ‘ψυχικός’

This term suffers from traditional suppositional interpretation. According to Zodhiates, ‘ψυχικός’ is soulish with affinity to sinful propensities, and animalistic instincts (1279); it is part of immaterial life common with animals; pertaining to natural; a body governed by the soul or natural and fallen instinct of man (1495). Two other Greek Lexicon’s add dimensions of meaning: of breath or belonging to breath; the nature and characteristics of

913 Ro.1:24-27.
breath; the principle of animal life; life governed by ‘ψυχή’. 914 ‘ψυχικός’ is the sensitive animate nature, sensual, distinct from higher nature of ‘πνεύμα’ and from ‘Φυσικός’, the lower or animal nature in man. 915 This proposal insists upon the natural order in ‘Φυσικός’.

‘ψυχικός’ is employed five times in the NT, a derivative of ‘ψυχή’ which has been fully discussed in the previous chapter evaluating “Theories of Trichotomy and Dichotomy.” James and Jude employ the term in derogatory way.

James, as previously discussed with the term ‘φαῦλος’, refers to the same signs: jealous jealousy, selfish ambition, unintelligibility and ambiguity and hypocrisy that nourish ‘φαῦλος’ and are qualified as ‘ψυχικός’. 916 Bible translations use ‘sensual’ (NKJV), ‘unspiritual’ (ESV) or ‘natural’ (NAS) to translate the term. James not only identifies the cause of ‘φαῦλος’, but he also defines the nature of this kind of wisdom. His concern is the discerning of genuine spiritual wisdom. Jude describes grumblers and complainers who according to natural instinctive and active desires (‘ἐπιθυμία’), are possessed with exaggerated or swollen amazement to gain profit, mockers and dissenters. These genres of persons would appear, as was forewarned by the apostles. Jude calls them ‘ψυχικός’ who do not have the Spirit. 917

Paul uses the term to describe the natural man who cannot receive the things of the Spirit. 918 The passive use of ‘δέχομαι’ indicates that this person does not have the vital entity, ‘πνεύμα’ indwelling to know experientially or to examine profoundly. In Paul the term is not pejorative, he is simple stating the neutral ontological state of a person who is only operating within his sphere of natural instinct or capability. He also uses ‘ψυχικός’ to contrast with ‘πνευματικός’ in the experience of resurrection. 919 Paul compares the

914 ‘ψυχικός’ TGE 2016.
915 ‘ψυχικός’ SECB 2015.
916 Jm.3:14-17.
917 Jude 1:17-19.
918 1Co.2:14.
919 1Co.15:44, 46.
nature of ontological existence in the creational and natural order with the resurrection and eternal order. He justifies normatively the creational order, a body with a sense of self, fitted for earthly existence, while the spiritual body is fitted for the eternal Kingdom reign. While contextually Paul’s focus is eschatological, the principles apply to the believer in the present, in the light of Christ’s resurrection. The biblical understanding of the Spirit developed so far, purports to the indwelling Spirit, Christ, and Father, as an ontological state of being, being perfected in the light of the eschatological perfect realization. James and Jude, have a Jewish influenced understanding and have emphasized the dangers of the natural or instinctive state relating to behaviour and actions. Paul, on the other hand, is profoundly more ontologically focused, with a stronger emphasis upon the natural state in its neutrality rather than its potential for subversion. The latter is not a foregone assumption that can be imposed generically upon the biblical text, as his perception of resurrection affirms ‘ψυχικός’ as such. In conclusion, it is not that the ‘ψυχικός’ person is against God, rather he or she is neutrally and naturally instinctive. Therefore, it is possible to transition from ‘ψυχικός’ to ‘πνευματικός’ in an encounter with the Divine Godhead whereby their indwelling becomes source and origin of life.

x. ‘πνευματικός’
The ‘πνευματικός’ person distinguishes him or herself singularly from the nine other biblical dispositions or states of being. ‘Πνευματικός’ is described as the higher or renovated ethereal human nature or divinely supernatural, regenerate, or religious, or more accurately spiritual nature.\footnote{πνευματικός \textit{SECB} 2015.} Thayer adds to this definition: relating to, that which possesses, and belonging to, the human spirit or rational soul, higher being but inferior to God; belonging to the divine God, the Holy Spirit; one filled and governed by the Spirit.\footnote{πνευματικός \textit{TGEL} 2016.
The term ‘πνευματικός’ is set in contrast to ‘σαρκικός’,²²² to ‘νήπιος’,²³ to ‘ψυχικός’,²⁴ to ‘πονηρία’ and ‘σάρξ’.²⁵ It is used primarily to describe the expression of gifts and ministries that have their origin in the person of the Spirit of God; evidenced by the source, the language, the means and the distinctive recognizable effect of the Spirit exercising them through a believer. The reference is not so much focused upon the person as the nature and expression of ‘πνευματικός’.²⁶ The gifts are intimately associated with a conception of church. Paul makes clear that spiritual gifts actively exercised produce stability, founding - unshakeable, strengthening, and inalterability, (‘στηρίζω’). Church is conceived as being ‘πνευματικός’ in substance, origin and demonstration. The ‘πνευματικός’ believer forms with others of the same nature a permanent ‘οἶκος’, referring not to the building but to the household of God.²⁷ The ‘πνευματικός’ people singularly form the family, who are the tangible demonstration of the indwelling of Godhead. They are a priestly family offering ‘πνευματικός’ offerings to God,²⁸ an ontological reference to offering their whole lives, likened to Christ,²⁹ in the love of Christ as he did,³⁰ of praise and thanksgiving,³¹ of generosity and liberality in good.³² Further consideration is given in the following chapter on the subject of the church. Paul perceives the believer’s spiritual battle, not against flesh and blood, that is humankind, but rather the ‘πνευματικός’ of wickedness and the authority figures of darkness. It is possible that Paul, is using parallelism to say the same thing, as ‘σκότος’ in classical

---

²²² Ro.7:14; 15:27; 1Co.3:1; 9:11.
²³ 1Co.3:1.
²⁴ 1Co.15:44-45.
²⁵ Ep.6:12.
²⁶ Ro.1:11; 1Co.12:1; 14:1, 37; Ep.5:19; Col.3:16.
²⁷ If the dwelling was intended ‘οἰκία’ would have been used.
²⁸ Ro.1:11; 1Pe.2:5.
²⁹ Ro.12:1; Ph.2:17.
³⁰ Ep.5:2.
³¹ Heb.13:15; Ep.5:19; Col.3:16.
³² Heb.13:16.
Greek applied to the spiritual underworld, the region without light.\textsuperscript{933} Or, his intent is to refer to the dark powers of this age, a temporal reference in contrast with the ethereal.

**First Corinthians fifteen**

Paul also contrasts the ‘ψυχικός’ with the ‘πνευματικός’ body or existence, in a context of resurrection. He contrasts four type of earthly bodies,\textsuperscript{934} with four groups of heavenly bodies.\textsuperscript{935} His next comparison is with the natural or creational sown (‘σπείρω’) and the raised (‘ἐγείρω’) resurrection orders,\textsuperscript{936} through a series of six qualitative and substantive characteristics.\textsuperscript{937} Paul’s point is that the ‘σπείρω’ (sowing of seed) within the body determines its nature. The natural cannot become spiritual, if that seed has not been sown. Jesus resurrection substantiated in this chapter is the new prototypical paradigm. As a result, the seed of resurrection life that is in Christ is also found in resurrection bodies. According to Christ, he appears physically and recognizably,\textsuperscript{938} yet with spiritual qualities beyond the earthly limitations of human seed. The ‘ἀλλάσσω’ (transforming) of the resurrection of the living and the dead at the ‘παρουσία’ of Christ\textsuperscript{939} is the final transformation that began in the ‘ἀποκαταλλάσσω’ ministry of Christ through the cross, ‘God restoring all things to His original intentions in Christ’.\textsuperscript{940} The spiritual logic is therefore that Christ, the firstfruit in resurrection, will be followed by those believers who

\textsuperscript{933} Mt.8:12; Jn.3:19; Ac.26:18; Ro.13:12; 2Co.4:6; Col.1:13; 1Th.5:5.

\textsuperscript{934} 1Co.15:38-39: human, animal, birds and fish.

\textsuperscript{935} 1Co.15:40-41: sun, moon, and stars.

\textsuperscript{936} ‘σπείρω’ and ‘ἐγείρω’ in verses 42-44 are employed in the passive mode, recognizing that both ‘orders’ are of divine will, originated in God.

\textsuperscript{937} 1Co.15:42-49: perishable/imperishable; dishonour/glory; weakness or infirmity/inherent ability power; natural/spiritual; living being/living spirit; earthly dust/heaven image.

\textsuperscript{938} Jn.14:14, 16, 17; Lk.24:15-17, 25-31, 38-43; Jn.20:26-28; 21:1-2, 7-14; 1Co.15:3-8.

\textsuperscript{939} Jn.5:29; 6:39-40, 44, 54; 11:24; Ac.24:15, 20-21; 1Co.6:14; 2Co.4:14; 1Pe.1:3.

\textsuperscript{940} Ep.2:15-16; Col.1:20-22.
pass through the same process he inaugurated because the seed of resurrection is within.\textsuperscript{941}

While Paul is evidently occupied with the nature of the corporeal and spiritual resurrection body, the concept of seed, alludes to the seed or sperm\textsuperscript{942} of Christ’s resurrection life taking root in the believer. The passages referenced indicate that the resurrection of Christ is unique because it establishes a new order of which He is the seed and the firstfruit.\textsuperscript{943} It is not a resurrection to the natural order, as recorded in the Gospels narratives,\textsuperscript{944} it is a resurrection to eternal life. For when Jesus says to Mary and Martha “I Am the Resurrection and the Life … and everyone who lives and believes in me shall never die” (NKJV Jn.11:25-26), He is the ‘τέλος’ and therefore in that moment intimated that resurrection was ‘in’ the substance of His being and nature.\textsuperscript{945} So wherever the Christ is, there is resurrection. Therefore, Christ abiding ‘in’ or indwelling the believer is resurrection life in that person. Likewise, if the Father and the Spirit who raised Jesus from the dead dwell within and are operative, they too generate life in mortal bodies.\textsuperscript{946} The ‘seed’ of resurrection life, is then in the believer uniquely because of the presence and ministry of the indwelling Trinitarian presence. Paul is in a context of ‘παρουσία’ yet he is also establishing resurrection life in Adam (earthly) and in Christ (heavenly or spiritual). Resurrection life is not restricted to an end time paradigm, but that shift occurred when Jesus rose from among the dead continuing effectively in the present in the new ontological order.

The ‘πνευματικός’ believer is the one who exists and lives out of the resurrection life that the Trinity produce ontologically in Christ and through the Spirit ministering. The

\textsuperscript{941} 1Co.15:20, 23; Ph.3:11; Col.1:18; Jm.1:18; 1Pe.1:3-5; Ro.6:3-5, 8-11; Ro.8:11; Ep.1:19-20; 2:4-6; Col.2:12-12.

\textsuperscript{942} ‘σπέρμα’ 1Co.15:38; Gal.3:16, 27-29; 1Pe.1:23; 1Jn.3:9.

\textsuperscript{943} Col.1:18; Ro.8:29-30.

\textsuperscript{944} Mk.5:35-36, 41-42; Lk.7:11-17; Jn.11:43-44; Mt.27:50-53.

\textsuperscript{945} Ro.6:8.

\textsuperscript{946} Ro.8:11; Ep.1:19-20.
resurrection reality is no longer bound to an eschatological event rather it is found in Christ and is found therefore in the believer who is indwelt by Him.

As with Christ, resurrection is not dissociated from death and burial. There is therefore a process of becoming wherein death, burial and resurrection characteristic of Christ, are operating in the ‘πνευματικός’ believer.

**Duality Broken**

The significance of this process is critical to estrangement that imposes upon any dualistic perception and practice regarding the ‘πνευματικός’ believer. In the light of the various states of mankind it is pertinent to define the ontological nature and practice of ‘πνευματικός’. The continuous argument of this section leads to the abandonment of the Greco-Roman dualism that has so influenced Christian understanding of biblical theology in this area. The ‘πνευματικός’ epitomizes the holistic unity of the believer in Christ. It is the absence of dualism or schism in his being. As has been demonstrated regarding the dualism expressed by Paul in Romans chapter seven, it is understood not as a negation of ‘σάρξ’ but of the power of the Law, the entity of sin, and of impotent human nature and will. This dualistic language applies uniquely to the person who is not ‘πνευματικός’. The dualism between ‘σάρξ’ and ‘πνεῦμα’, ‘νόμος’ and ‘πνεῦμα’ that Paul expounds, is also not a reflection on the ‘πνευματικός’ believer. At no point does Paul condone or justify a dualistic comprehension of life in the Spirit. He is demonstrating the antithesis to ‘πνευματικός’.

... we are [not] children of the slave but of the free woman ... if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the law ... if we live by the Spirit, let us also walk by the Spirit” (ESV Gal.4:31; 5:18, 25); You, however, are not in the flesh but in the Spirit,

---

948 Ro.6:3-5, 8; Col.2:11-12; Ro.8:2-3; 2Co.5:15-17; 13:4; Ep.2:4-7; 1Co.15:49.
949 Ro.7:5.
950 Ro.7:17, 25.
951 Ro.7:18, 19, 21.
if in fact the Spirit of God dwells in you … we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live according to flesh (ESV Ro.8:9, 12).

The ‘πνευματικός’ existence represents a rupture with dualism as the Godhead become unique source and resource for the ontological believer that Paul explicates.

**New Law of the Spirit**

The law of the Spirit can be considered through six facets: prophetic; accomplishment; source; existential; love; and character, some of which have already been examined. "Απο του νομου της αμαρτιας και του θανατου," (TR Ro.8:2) literally translated, ‘the law, the sin and the death’ describes the detachment of human nature from the origin that is threefold. The death and resurrection of Christ realizes this perfectly, in perfect unity life is generated from the source of the Spirit and in Christ Jesus. The spiritual man no longer finds the origin for his being and existence in any other ‘state’ than in the Spirit and in Christ, as Paul says, “it is no longer I who live but Christ who lives in me …” In other words that person knows experientially the change of source, “That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit” (NKJV Jn.3:6). The ‘πνευματικός’ has one unique source or origin for life, that is ‘εκ’ Spirit and Christ, in the same way the Spirit resurrected Jesus out of the source of death, into life. Therefore sowing ‘εκ’ the Spirit reaps everlasting life. This expression of life is found in the Trinitarian relationship Jesus has with the Father, consubstantial in

---

954 Ro.10:4; Mt.5:17-18; Ro.8:3; Heb.7:28.
955 Jn.6:63; 14:16-17; Ro.2:28; 7:4; Lk.12:12; Mt.10:20; 12:27-28; Ac.9:31.
956 Jn.1:12-14; Ac.18:25, 28; Col.1:16-17, 27; Ep.4:15; 4:4-7; Gal.1:15-16; Jn.15:4-5; Gal.6:15.
957 Mt.7:12; Gal.6:2; Mt.22:37-40; Ro.13:10; Gal.3:18; 4:4; Jm.1:25.
958 Gal.5:22-23; 2Pe.1:3-11; 2Co.6:6-7; Ep.5:9-10; Col.3:10-15; 1Ti.6:11-12; 2Ti.2:22-26.
959 1Co.15:56.
960 Ro.8:11.
961 Gal.6:8.
divinity, equality and eternity and attribute with God the Father. Moreover, their relationship models the present principle, “… I say to you the Son can do nothing of Himself, he only does what he sees the Father doing”\textsuperscript{962} (TLT Jn.5:19). Jesus likewise, through the vine analogy makes it clear that a person can produce no fruit in and of themselves. The use of ‘ἀπό’ in John fifteen designates source, origin or separation from. Therefore, Jesus, modelling what he does as flowing from the union or unity with the Father, this unity of being becoming the source of his ministry, in like manner, the believer is to evidence the same experience of source in the Spirit and in Christ.\textsuperscript{963} The ‘πνευματικός’ person has the fullness of Christ, of God, of the Spirit as the unique and perfect source for this existential life in which the Godhead will manifest the shared nature; invariably according to the same six key ontological principles of Trinitarian operation. This is the definition of the new ontological existence of the believer in union with Godhead.\textsuperscript{964}

**Perfecting**

The principle of source having been established, the principle of duality having been disbanded, the new law of the Spirit being established, necessitates response to the question, how does the ‘πνευματικός’ live? Paul’s writings to the Galatians in chapter five, from the original Greek text lacks the English word “by” and while not grammatically correct English, does communicate this imperative: “Walk Spirit … Be led Spirit … Live Spirit …” eliminate with intensity any alternative mode of living. John Baptist announces, Jesus as one “who will baptize you in the Spirit” (TLT Mt.3:11). The language is vital, ‘βαπτίζω’ is symbolic and analogous of immersion into permanent change; Jesus does not give someone the Spirit rather he baptizes one ‘ἐν’ the Person of the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{965} This reading concurs with the wider understanding of the ontological

---

\textsuperscript{962} See also Jn.7:17, 28; 8:28; 10:18; 14:10; 15:4; see also the Spirit Jn.16:18; 1Co.6:19.

\textsuperscript{963} Ac.26:18 – out of darkness and Satan; Ro.6:18 out of sin; 7:2-6; out of law; 8:2 out of law, sin, and death, 21 out of slavery; Col.2:20 principles of world; 8:35 to the love in Christ; 1Co.1:30 in Christ out of will of God; 2Co.3:5 not out of own ability; 2Co.3:18 transformed in image of Christ out of the Spirit and Lord.

\textsuperscript{964} Col.2:9-10; Ep.3:19; Ac.4:31.

\textsuperscript{965} Lk.3:16; Jn.1:33; Ac.11:16; Lk.1:17; Jn.4:23-24; Ro.8:9; 15:16; Ep.5:18; Col.1:8; Gal.3:27.
considerations of the NT. Paul’s use of ‘φρονέω’ in Romans chapter eight,\textsuperscript{966} leads to understanding the disposition of the Spirit. The term is should not be limited by ‘mind’;\textsuperscript{967} its significance purports a holistic meaning encompassing mind will, and emotion,\textsuperscript{968} “the activity represented by this word involves the will, affections and conscience … to sense mentally” (Zodhiates 1454).\textsuperscript{969} The invitation is addressed to the believer in this ‘disposition’ to collaborate with the person and operations of the Spirit. The Spirit of resurrection produces resurrection life of Christ in the believer which becomes the normative ‘mode’ of existence and living.\textsuperscript{970}

This ‘πνευματικός’ believer, sourced in this existence, is expressing a sense of governance that is holistic as the law of the Spirit operates the six facets into his or her being. The prior consideration given to evil spirits inhabiting, leads this believer to comprehend the ontological necessity of governance of the Spirit penetrating the seven component parts of human being and identity. “The transformed body, therefore, is not composed of spirit … it is a body adapted to the eschatological existence that is under the ultimate domination of the Spirit …. To be truly pneumatikos is to bear the likeness of Christ in a transformed body, fitted for the new age” (Fee 786). Where Fee refers to ‘domination’ this proposal appeals to governance, not of obedience neither of submission, nor authority, for without the existential source of the Spirit in Godhead there is no ‘πνευματικός’ life; rather ‘πνευματικός’ life is found in the relational collaborative framework of Trinitarian operations.\textsuperscript{971} The ‘πνευματικός’ believer is called to cooperate in the process of perfecting, ‘καταρτίζω’ meaning to restore or repair, to prepare or equip, to put in order or place, and to render complete or perfect\textsuperscript{972} (Fig.XII).

\textsuperscript{966} Ro.8:5-7, 27.

\textsuperscript{967} NKJV, ESV and NAS versions all translate it as mind.

\textsuperscript{968} ‘φρονέω’ \textit{TGEL} 2016.

\textsuperscript{969} For example: Ro.12:3, 16; 15:5; 1Co.13:11; Ph.2:2, 7; Mt.7:23-24; 10:16.

\textsuperscript{970} ‘πράξεις’ mode of acting, doing, dealing.

\textsuperscript{971} For example: Ep.22-24; Col.3:9-10 where the transformational verbs are in the middle voice; Ro.8:5-13 elaborate the collaborative in the ‘πνευματικός’ relationship in the Spirit, in Trinity.

\textsuperscript{972} ‘Καταρτίζω’ \textit{TGEL} 2016; derivatives ‘κατάρτις’ and ‘καταρτισμός’.
The term ‘τελειώ’ and derivatives carry the meaning to make, carry through, complete by adding, accomplishment, completeness, or perfection, reflected in and found in collaborating fully with the perfecting ministry of the Trinity. Paul’s anxious cry for the Galatians is that Christ be metamorphosed again in them, such is the state of dualism and confusion between law and Spirit. Scripture makes clear Paul’s aim, the perfection of every believer, correlative with the aim of Christ to have many sons share his perfection. Perfectionism is distinguished from being perfected. While the phrase, “Therefore, leaving the discussion of the elementary principles of Christ, let us go on to perfection, not laying again the foundation …” (NKJV Heb.6:1), might presuppose process or development, the question of source suggests that there is no progressive evolution from any other state towards ‘καταρτίζω’ into ‘τελειώ’. The two terms describe the believer whose origin is ‘πνευματικός’ and therefore being perfected in the perfection of Christ and of the Spirit. The sense of process belongs within the ‘πνευματικός’ state.

The brother in need of gentle correction is to be perfected not punished; the corrective is understood in the spirit of ‘καταρτίζω’, perfecting the person concerned, whereas punishment confines a person compounding guilt, fault, shame, or judgment. The ministries of Christ given to the church have for primary focus the perfecting of the person of Christ in every believer to the perfect stature (‘τελείως’) of Christ, “Katartisis is the inner strength of the organic relationship of the community, or of the character of its members” (quoted in Kittel and Friedrich @ 100).

The vital point is that of a singular source from which the believer is being perfected in Christ, in Trinity. The incompatability with the other states of humankind defines
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973 Mt.5:48; Ep.4:13; Jn.17:23; 1Pe.5:10.
974 Gal.4:19.
975 Ep.4:13; Col.1:28; 1Co.14:20.
976 Heb.2:10; 5:9; 10:14.
977 Ph.3:12.
978 Gal.6:1.
979 Ep.4:11-13, 15-16.
‘πνευματικός’ as regenerative and transformational process that draws on one unique source, Christ and Spirit in Trinity. Herein, unbiblical dualism finds its resolution.

First Corinthians Chapter Two verse Ten – Chapter Three verse Five

Paul portrays God as self-revealing, of Himself and his purposes. This disclosure is of something or someone that has previously existed but is now seen, known or understood. God the Spirit reveals the other members of the Godhead, searching out the profundity of God. The Spirit indwelling the believer is a measure ‘ἐκ’ the Person of the Spirit of God980 who exercises the same ministry within the believer. The Spirit therefore is primary in disclosure of the nature of God and the nature of the believer. This ontological reality is the foundation for Paul explaining that this spiritual wisdom is contrary to secular wisdom because of source; it is not the product of the human spirit, nor of the spirit of the world, in this case the Graeco-Roman world. The conclusion of source succinctly says ‘του πνευματος του θεου’ creates ‘πνευματικός’ comprehension and expression in which is found the thinking of Christ. Paul’s reference to ‘πνευματικός ἀνακρίνει’ infers that human wisdom is no comparable judge to the in-depth scrutiny of the Spirit in the spiritual man. (The chapter cited, when considered in terms of whole thought, should conclude in chapter three verse three, before Paul bridges the theme with further examples). Paul’s word to the Corinthians is that they are still dualistic; Paul commends them, “… so that you are not lacking in any spiritual gift, as you wait for the revealing of our Lord Jesus Christ” (ESV 1Co.1:7), yet they are ‘ψυχικός’, ‘σαρκικός’ and ‘νήπιος’. The ontological implications are that they have received the Spirit as evidenced in their giftedness, yet the implicit source of their beings, exemplified by the 'σοφία’ discourse, is not ‘ἐκ’ the Spirit of God that leads to Christ. The comprehension for ontology reinforces the importance of source. The Corinthian form of ‘πνευματικός’ engendered supra-spiritual disparity, whereas Paul advocates this as contrary to genuine ‘πνευματικός’ that centres upon Christ.981 The ontological question of process occurs again in this text. To understand ontologically, Paul considers the Corinthians ‘in Christ’, having evidently been visited by

980 Jn.3:5; Ac.2:17; 2Co.3:18; 1Jn.3:24.

981 1Co.1:4-8, 29-31; 2:16; 3:11, 23.
the Spirit in diversity of gifts. Paul points however, to the incompatibility of source that is irreconcilable to the normative ‘πνευματικός’ state. There is no legitimacy given to any other state than ‘πνευματικός’ for the believer. If process is conceivable, it is the human process of disunion from other life sources in order to find existential union in the Spirit and in Christ, not just religiously or for religious purposes, rather for an all-encompassing existence.

**First Corinthians Chapter Ten.**

The collective expression of ‘πνευματικός’ is well expressed in first Corinthians chapter ten.982 Contextually, Paul employs analogies rather than types (Zuck 179-180) from Israel’s exodus and desert experience to demonstrate the nature of the present-day difficulties within the community within a particular cultural environment.983 Paul provides several examples from the conduct of the people of Israel as a basis for warning.984 He intimates his intention in verse four “… and that rock was Christ.” (ESV 1Co.10:4), he further develops his thought,985 focusing upon the ‘κοινωνία’ in the body and blood of Christ. Paul will develop the Lord’s Supper in practical terms in chapter eleven. However, this reference could be understood as precursory preparation for what he will add later. The language is rich in symbolism of NT concepts, however,

The fellowship … was most likely a celebration of their common life in Christ, based on the new covenant in his blood that had previously bound them together in union with Christ by his spirit … indicates most strongly that koinōnia refers to the common sharing in the Lord’s supper that binds them together as a unique eschatological community (Fee 467, 469).

---

982 1Co.10:1-22, especially vs.1-5, 14-17.

983 Red Sea crossing Ex.14:19-22; Cloud of divine presence and guidance Ex.13:21-22; Ex.40:34-36; the manna by supernatural provision Ex.16:31-35; Dt.8:3; water from the rock Ex.17:6; Num.20:20:8-11.

984 Idolatry Ex.32:6; Dt.4:15-20; 1Co.10:14; Sexual and spiritual immorality Num.25:1-3; 1Co.10:1;1Co.10:18-22; testing and grumbling against God; Num.21:6-9; 14:20-23; 1Co.10:12-13.

985 The wider argument begins in 1Co.8 and carries through chapter 10.
However, to take the Mosaic period event and find analogy in the symbols of bread, blood and body in the Lord’s Supper, is to stop short at the sacrament as the end point, it is to lose sight of the ultimate reality of Christ, as the analogous symbolism derives from union or ‘κοινωνία’ in Christ. This reality defines the position regarding the ‘table’ of demons, comparable to ‘κοινωνία’ with them, “for first century Christians, ‘fellowship’ with God meant ‘disfellowship’ with every other worldly association” (Detzler 77). The ‘κοινωνία’ suggested as the Pauline conclusion of this section is the implications of union or communion, which is more profound than the collective participation in the symbol. Paul rightly is pointing out through his original images that despite historical and collective participation, many were lost along the way, as reflective of functional, positional and religious suppositions.986 Moses grasps something of the greater reality as he says, “And he humbled you and let you hunger and fed you with manna, which you did not know, nor did your fathers know, that he might make you know that man does not live by bread alone, but man lives by every word that comes from the mouth of the LORD.” (ESV Dt.8:3). It is therefore vital to capture the exclusivity of ‘κοινωνία’987 in Christ. ‘κοινωνία’ is firstly defined as the nature of relationship with the Trinity,988 in which relationship, solidarity, partnership, and contribution or participation are the principal defining aspects, witnessed in intra-Trinitarian relations,989 into which the believer is introduced through Christ. The criteria of ‘τέλος’ in Christ necessitates intensification, for He is the bread or manna of life from heaven;990 He is the cloud incarnate;991 He is the life blood, generating life, with Spirit who is life;992 the body, church, is defined as coming out (‘ἐκ’) of Christ, because the believer is firstly in Him.993 The confusion expressed due

---

986 Ac.2:42; Mk.14:22-25; Lk.22:15-20; 1Co.11:23-30.

987 ‘Μέτοχος’ and derivatives, literally “to hold or possess in the middle of” being accepted as synonymous with ‘κοινωνία’.

988 1Jn.1:1-3; Ph.2:1; 2Co.13:14.


991 Is.7:14; Mt.1:23; Jn.1:1, 14.


to the conflicting doctrinal positions regarding the ‘κοινωνία’ as sacramental are:

‘transubstantiation,’\textsuperscript{994} ‘consubstantiation,’\textsuperscript{995} communicatory\textsuperscript{996} or symbolic.\textsuperscript{997} Fee expresses this dogmatic concern throughout his commentary, “… but what the evidence does not seem to allow is a sacramental understanding of the meal itself, as if they were “participating in the Lord” by the actual eating of the food, as though the food were the Lord Himself” (467), even though the text suggests “a prefiguration of baptism and the Lord’s Supper” (444). The point is losing the significance of the spiritual truths thus demonstrated regarding the person of Christ and the believer’s relationship of union in Him rather than through mediatory symbols is to impose religious criterion, considered in the previous chapter; upon union in Godhead which is the ultimate ‘τέλος’, a theological and ontological anathema. The ‘πνευματικός’ believer is therefore introduced to the archetypal ‘κοινωνία’ in the person of Christ.

\textbf{Summary}

In this section, the thesis has expounded the ten states by which humanity can be defined in relation to God. Ontological considerations have been developed to elucidate the nature of humankind in each of these states. The purpose has been to lead the believer to a full appraisal of the intended nature of the believer in accordance with Christ in Godhead, understanding where polarised religious and unreligious humanity comes from, and the primary ontological intention of Godhead in Christ and in Spirit to ‘πνευματικός’ ontological existence.

\textsuperscript{994} Roman Catholic teaching whereby the substance of the bread and wine become flesh and blood of Christ. “… after the consecration of bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ… is truly and substantially contained in the august sacrament of the Holy Eucharist (Canon and Decrees of the Council of Trent quoted in Gore 185-186).

\textsuperscript{995} Martin Luther’s view of Christ corporeally present the ubiquity of Christ’s body (Gore 186).

\textsuperscript{996} Reformed view of communicative grace through partaking in the Supper (186).

\textsuperscript{997} Ulrich Zwingli’s view, a memorial ordonnaence of remembrance (118), later developments of the divine presence of Christ, and confirming of faith, (Ferguson and Wright 737) memorial and the affirmation of faith the predominantly Baptist view (Comité d’entraide réformé baptiste 79-81).
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF INCARNATION

Movement from Old Testament to New Testament

The significance of incarnation is not limited to the means by which Jesus the ‘Son of God’ became ‘Son of Man’; that is to lose the extent of the implications for believers in salvation. The concept of ‘union in Christ’ is a major theme throughout the NT writings; however, there is prophetic precedence from the OT that provides a basis for promise and accomplishment. At this point, discussion of incarnation based on continuity or discontinuity is to miss the ontological significance. As previously quoted and developed, the key prophetic texts,¹ announce a new ontology to accomplish and render obsolete the religious ‘mode’ developed in chapter two, “Religious and Existential Considerations.”

If the covenant (‘tôrâh’ and ‘νόμος’) is accomplished in Christ,² the ‘τέλος’ who is Christ is attested by death,³ by which the old is accomplished and consequentially annulled. Without death and without accomplishment, there is no end to the old, it remains binding and operative. The author to the Hebrews applies this covenant logic to Jesus Christ, who becomes priest and high priest. In doing so, a change of priesthood requires a change of law,⁴ “… for the law made nothing perfect … In speaking of a new covenant, he makes the first one obsolete … since a death has occurred that redeems them from … the first covenant” (ESV Heb.7:19, 8:13). Understanding covenant working explains the necessity of a fulfilment, a death, and a new more glorious, more perfect covenant.⁵ The coming of Christ in human form represents the accomplishment of the prophetic declarations, as Isaiah expresses in the Servant becoming a new covenant. Christ is in His person the New Covenant.⁶ The death and resurrection of Christ therefore stand as the witness to the annulation of the old and the inauguration of the new. The importance of this confirms that the ‘religious mode’ has been rendered obsolete and the ‘ontological or existential

¹ Is.59:21; Jer.31:33; Ez.11:19-20; 36:25-27.
² Lk.22:37; Ro.10:4.
³ Ro.7:4-6; 2Co.3:7-11; Heb.9:15.
⁴ Heb.7:11-12, 15-16, 18-19, 22.
⁵ Heb.7:22, 28; 10:9, 14; 2Co.3:11.
mode’ has been ushered in, founded upon the incarnation of Christ. Christ has not called believers to a new form of religious disposition or practice, he has radically altered every concept of God, of belief and believer, as expressed in the new. The indwelling of Godhead becomes the cornerstone rather than adherence to and practice of a written code.

The only legitimacy of the old is that hypothetically it may or may not lead to the new, the imperfect and the ineffective leading to the perfect and the efficacious. Paul’s reference to the guardianship of the Law, ‘φρουρέω’, associates with prevention of attainment, as being held under its power and without escape. He compounds the concept of ‘νόμος’ with ‘παιδαγωγός’. The underlying meaning is that the one under Law is held back in childhood, or immaturity or childishness till Christ comes. The use of ‘εκ’ in the phrase suggests another source or origin to be rendered righteous other than faith in Christ. The ‘τέλος’ that is Christ is discontinuity in that there is a change of source.

Ontologically, Christ in His person and in incarnation establishes a new source.

**Incarnation in the life and ministry of Christ**

Of the baptism that John declared Jesus would bring is declared as “into” the Person of the Spirit, likewise Jesus talks of the Spirit who will speak, lead and manifest from within. This incarnational concept was foreign to the Jews; they could historically relate to the Spirit ‘upon’ such as the prophets. The inter-testamental literature posits a, “… conscious loss of the Spirit … the period of prophetic inspiration is over … Rabbinitic literature… expressly stated that the Holy Spirit departed from Israel after the last prophets,” (Ladd 380), “… the Law attains the position of …. One and only … intermediary between God and humankind” (541). The Rabbis of the period designated the Spirit as being contained within the ‘Tôrâh’ (Edersheim 955), “… the law is now in
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7 2Co.3:14-16; Gal.3:19.
8 ‘φρουρέω’ TGEL 2016; SECB 2015.
9 See also Ro.3:26; 5:1; 9:32; Ep.2:8; Ph.3:9.
10 Gal.3:22-34; see also 1Co.1:30.
11 Mt.3:11; Mk.1:8; Mt.10:19; Lk.1:17; 4:1; Jn.4:14; 7:36-37; 14:17; Ac.1:5.
12 Edersheim, Alfred. Footnote 15.
effect the only voice of the Spirit, that the Spirit does not speak apart from the law” (Douglas et al. 1138). The concept of incarnation of the person of the Spirit occurs in this backdrop.

Jesus often refers to the heart of man as the source of good and of evil. It is not an external rather an internal source and reality. It is incarnational in terms of what authority has been permitted to rule and influence, exemplified in Jesus’ accusation of expelling demons ‘in’ Beelzebul.13 John witnesses to Jesus having life in Himself and giving it to whom he wills, life as an entity or attribute is incarnate in Christ, He is life.14 The miracles of God accomplished by Jesus were understood to be worked ‘in’ him.15 The word of God is to incarnate the human heart if it is to produce any good fruit.16 Jesus describes the basic cell of community, two or three gathered in my name, I am ‘in’ them. Some translations employ the term ‘among’ (ESV) or ‘in the midst’ (NKJV, NAS) which is not inaccurate in the wider etymological sense of the word. However, further development of the relationship between Christ and his body, substantiates harmoniously ‘in them’ as integral to the wider teaching. Union in the incarnate Christ in Godhead fundamentally creates Christian community.17 Jesus employs this incarnational language as he refers to the foundational truth of the Mosaic covenant, ‘in’ all your heart, your soul, your thoughts.18 The purpose here is to confront the religious accomplishment of acts that may have the appearance of existential belief but lack the incarnate substance and reality. The penultimate statement of Jesus occurs as he figures Himself as the bread of life saying, “Whoever feeds on my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me, and I in him. This is the bread that came down from heaven, not as the fathers ate and died. Whoever feeds on this bread will live forever” (ESV Jn.6:56, 58). He connects this incarnational feeding to Him being in the Father and the believers being in him and He in them.19 Jesus is thus creating

---

13 Mt.5:28; 6:23; Mt.9:34; 12:24, 27, 28.
14 Jn.5:21,26.
15 Mt.14:1.
16 Mt.13:19, 21.
17 Mt.18:20.
18 Mt.22:37.
a homogeneous and consistent reality of incarnation and indwelling. These examples raise
awareness that beyond the preaching, the dialoguing, the practical and supernatural
works, Jesus maintains the incarnational concept as central and constant, reinforcing the
divine intention of the new ontology for the believer and for the church.

**Atonement**

In the work of redemption, the truth of incarnation is axial,

> becoming in the likeness of men … (TLT Ph.2:7), Inasmuch then as the children
have partaken of flesh and blood, He Himself likewise shared in the same ...
Therefore, in all things He had to be made like His brethren, that He might be a
merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation
for the sins of the people (NKJV Heb.2:14,17).

The divine witness is that without Christ incarnate in perfect humanity there would be no
redemption for humankind. The effectiveness of propitiation is that Christ became,
through incarnation, all that was an obstacle to reconciliation with the Father, in Himself.
To save human nature, Christ became human. If mankind is viewed holistically as
asserted, then there is only one holistic salvation of one whole human being. Scripture
witnesses to Jesus becoming sin, “… this because Him who absolutely not knowing by
experience sin for our sakes He made sin in order that we might become righteousness
of] God in Him” (TLT 2Co.5:21). Likewise, “Christ redeemed us from the curse of the
law by becoming a curse for us so that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might
come to the Gentiles, so that we might receive the promised Spirit through faith” (ESV
Gal.3:13-14). The incarnational dimension to atonement requires that Jesus did not carry
or bear sin, he ‘became’ sin on the cross. His sinless perfection is compounded by the
fullness of sin in nature and act. In propitiatory understanding, Christ becomes the place
of transaction. Sin and curse are incarnate into Him, so that righteousness incarnate into
the believer in the Person of Christ incarnate. In the same way Christ has been incarnate
into the sacerdotal priesthood, “… called by God as High Priest "according to the order
of Melchizedek," (ESV Heb.5:10), in like manner ,the believer becomes in Christ a priest
to God.\textsuperscript{20} “… a hope that enters into the inner place behind the curtain, where Jesus has
gone as a forerunner on our behalf, having become a high priest forever after the order of
Melchizedek” (ESV Heb.6:19-20), in order that believers come close to the throne of
God.

Likewise, that Christ put on a human body and existence, in the same way the believer
through Christ will receive incarnate resurrection life that will be perfected in His likeness
at His coming.\textsuperscript{21} “… who will transform our lowly body that it may be conformed to His
glorious body, according to the working by which He is able even to subdue all things to
Himself (NKJV Ph.3:21). As salvation moves from an act of deliverance to an ontological
reality in the person of Christ, He is salvation in a believer, “And being made perfect, he
became the source of eternal salvation to all who obey him …”\textsuperscript{22} (ESV Heb.5:9).

Paul’s text to the Corinthians epitomizes the ‘new’ incarnational nature of the new
ontological existence found in Christ and Christ in the believer, “But out of Him you are
in Christ Jesus who became wisdom to us originating [with] God, not only righteousness
but also sanctification and redemption” (TLT 1Co.1:30). The incarnational principle is
reinforced and establishes the consequences for union in Christ and the ‘ordo salutis’. The
text underscores the concept of origin and source, as believers have their origin ‘ἐκ’ God
and ‘ἐν’ Jesus Christ. The wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption find
their source in Christ, in God, which through incarnation establishes the new ‘mode’ of
life in Godhead as that same reality is replicated by the Godhead indwelling believers.

Ontologically, the incarnation designates this mutual and reciprocal indwelling
relationship. Any interpretation of theological aspects of Godhead, of the believer in
Christ, of the church in Him, of Christian life and experience that is not reinterpreted and
applied through Christ the ‘τέλος’ and the new incarnational ‘mode’ of existence, will fall
far short of the perfection in Christ and be found inadequate for the believer integrated
into the New Age.

\textsuperscript{20} Mt.4:10; Ac.13:1-3; Ph.3:3; Heb.9:14; 12:28; 1Pe.2:5, 9; Rev.1:6.

\textsuperscript{21} Ro.13:14; Ro.6:5; Gal.3:27; Ep.4:23-24; Col.3:9-10; 2Co.3:18; 1Jn.3:2.

\textsuperscript{22} Ac.5:31; 2Ti.1:10.
UNION IN CHRIST AND “ORDO SALUTIS”

Historical and theological overview of “Ordo Salutis”

The term ‘ordo salutis’ was first introduced in 1737 by the German Lutheran theologian and philosopher Jacob Carpov, 1699-1748. Within the wider context of rising rationalistic method in the sciences, he had a bearing upon the Enlightenment. Christian Wolff (1679-1754), a renowned rationalist, mathematician, systemiser, and philosopher, “… revived ontology as a systematic framework for the empirical sciences, and expanded the geometric method, a mathematical design for rational thought and conceptual reasoning.”¹ His study affected theology, cosmology, teleology, ontology, and ethics. Israel Gottlieb Canz (1690-1753), influenced by Wolff, “applied this philosophy to revealed theology.”² Carpov taking ‘the system of Canz’, introduced this method to the teaching of theology. His writings had him condemned, and he left Jena in 1736 although continuing to pursue his course of theology.³

‘Ordo Salutis’ is the ordering of the way of salvation. The desired effect is to provide sequence and rationale to the steps involved in salvation. The denominational or doctrinal affiliations give place to variances in this regard: Arminian and Lutheran theologians place faith and experience prior to regeneration (the analytic method); whereas Calvinistic methodology commences with predestination (called the Synthetic method) (Gore 134-135). Within Reformed thought there are variants in order and sequence (illustrated in Fig.XIII).

At this point the concern is the task of defining Union in Christ upon which ‘Ordo Salutis’ has traditionally been further developed.


Incarnational Union

Built upon the premise that mankind is made in the image of God, Jesus Christ being the perfect image of the Father, restores that image in the believer through incarnation. Christ took upon Himself human form and nature so that believers become partakers of His nature and thereby becoming one with God and Him with us\(^4\) (Ferguson and Wright 697-699), is typical Eastern Orthodoxy. The Eastern Orthodox mystical view constructed from the Creation of man in the image of God, that likeness, “… implies the idea of participation in the divine being, of communion with God” (Lossky 118). The phrase famously cited by St Irenaeus and St Athanasius, “God became man in order that man might become god.” St Basil reiterates in other terms, “Man is a creature who has received the commandment to become God” (124), and “… breaking the tyranny of sin, our Saviour opens to us anew the way of deification, which is the final perfected end of man” (134). Through a process of becoming, the deification qualified by one criterion, distinguishing the ‘Prototype’ from that which is made in the ‘likeness’ of God. The one is uncreated whereas as the other is created and only exists through the creative act. Imperfection in man is perceived as ‘unlikeness’ that limits the person from entering into fullness and obscures the image of God (125). The principle of ‘becoming’ respects that the divine is a part of human nature and cannot be denied although man is clearly able to be and act contrary to that although will never be separated from it nor lose it.

Sacraments such as vigils, alms, good works, baptism, and confirmation are considered means of communicating and receiving the Holy Spirit. Action and meditation are perceived as part of the ‘γινώσκω’ knowledge by personal and conscious experience, and together further the ascent to perfect union (Lossky 202). The “uncreated and deifying gift” of the Holy Spirit is conferred upon and referred to as the ‘baptismal grace’ (170). Contemplative prayer is considered the means to fulfilling union with God, the ecstatic or wonderment state developed in the prayer method ‘hesychasm’ (212) climaxes in a mature or perfected state where consciousness is found in union or oneness with the Divine (207-208). For example, the primacy of love, the fruit of this kind of prayer, communicated by the Holy Spirit, although a shared attribute of the Trinity, is described as “an uncreated gift, a divine deifying energy in which we really participate in the nature

\(^4\)“Union with Christ” New Dictionary of Theology 1988.
of the Holy Trinity by becoming partakers of the divine nature” (213-214) “… in his person he will unite the created and the uncreated, the human complex and deifying grace” (214-215). The thematic of light as a part of God’s nature, plays much importance, just as with love, something that God is, encounters a person and through indwelling transfigures or transforms so they become light, “a mystical experience … immaterial and is not apprehended by the senses … according to its own nature and limitations” (221-222), heightening consciousness rather than forgetfulness, constraint, need and sleep state. This internal transformation deifies one’s nature. The mystery for the Orthodox is found in the union with God worked out in a human being (216, 217, and 220).

A typical reformed view would state, “we do not become divine, as some oriental religions believe. But in some sense the very life of God comes to live within us so that we are rightly called sons and daughters of God” (Boice 391). To limit the indwelling of God to a filial relationship is fall short of the repercussions of the explicit witness of Scripture to the ontological indwelling of Godhead. The irksomeness of ‘deification’ should be placed in the context of the Creator-creature distinction. There is no substantiated and confirmed suggestion from Scripture that we are gods. If the Orthodox distinction between the uncreated and the created is further developed to distinguish the possession of the infinite attributes of Godhead, the term becomes less offensive. That said, the believer who receives eternal life is in essence eternal, according to Jesus. From the moment that a person is found in Christ and Him in them, and similarly with the Spirit and the Father, communion with the uncreated divine nature occurs. The created and uncreated orders are united and reconciled in Christ.⁵ Through reciprocal union in Christ, the uncreated and created is also reconciled in the believer. This being the case, where Christ is, we are and where we are, there is Christ, reflecting the Trinitarian indivisibility and inseparability. Christo-centricity is foundational to a balanced view of union, ‘ἐν’ Him, ‘διὰ’ Him, and ‘εἰς’ Him;⁶ which is not strongly emphasized in Orthodox mysticism, the focus being predominantly on God and the Spirit. However, Christ’s cause and mediation of source is essential to the nature of union.

---

⁵ Col.1:16, 19-20.

⁶ Col.1:16; 1Co.1:30; 1Co.8:6; Ro.11:36.
Recognizing that only through the indwelling of the divine can a person enter relationship and salvation, stands in contrast to any notion of human attainment. There is a tension that the Orthodox seem reconciled to, as Lossky writes, “… the apophatic attitude towards God: the more one is united to Him, the more one becomes aware of His unknowability, … the more perfect one becomes, the more one is aware of one’s own imperfections” (204-205). This paper has suggested the term ‘spiritual’ (‘πνευματικός’) rather than ‘deified’ (‘θειος’) to mark this necessary distinction between the uncreated of all that is Godhead and the created, all that is humankind. The distinction being between communion in the divine nature and being deity (‘θεος’).

**Covenant and Federal Union**

Covenant is the basis for humanity’s relationship with God, individually as believers and collectively as church, through Jesus Christ. On this basis Christ is perceived as federal or representative head of redeemed humanity; naturally mankind is ‘in Adam’ and redemptively believers are ‘in Christ’ (Ferguson and Wright 697-699). Imputation is emphasized because of Adam’s sin, all have sinned and therefore in Christ’s obedience and atonement forgiveness, righteousness and life are imputed to all. “As Adam was the representative head of the old humanity, so Christ is the representative head of the new humanity” (Berkhof 447).

**Sacramental Union**

Focus on the sacraments as the primary means of union and communion with Christ expressed in receiving the administered sacrament, is receiving Christ Himself and thereby nurturing and maintain communion with Him, as practised by the Roman Catholic Church (Ferguson and Wright 697-699). According to Berkhof, “it makes the grace of God something substantial, of which the church is the depositary, and which can be passed on in the sacraments; and completely loses sight of the fact that the sacraments cannot effect this union …” (451-452). It should be underlined that the sacraments in reformed doctrine, are perceived as means of grace that detract from the centrality of the person of Christ. Means become confused with origin, source and ‘τέλος’.

---

7 ‘θειος’ generally of divinities or deities, godlike: Ac.17:29; 2Pe.1:3, 4; ‘θεότης’ of being God[head]: Col.2:9 uniquely of Christ; ‘θειότης’ of divinity or divine nature: Ro.1:20 uniquely of God.
Catholic theology

It is evident that union of the creature with God does not consist in oneness of substance or in communication of the Divine Substance itself to the creature, it is only a unity of relation. It is however more than a moral union. It must be conceived as a physical union, based upon the fact that the united parties live a life of the same kind, and that this similarity of life proceeds from the intimate character of the union: God being the principle and the object of the creature's supernatural life. St. Paul points out clearly enough that the union of adoption is more than the moral union of friendship, when he compares it to the union of the bodies in a carnal connection (1 Cor. vi. 16, 17) (Wilhelm and Scannell 509).

The Catholic view distinguishes union from the substance of the Godhead in bidirectional union. The emphasis is primarily upon a moral and relational union. Although there is recognition of indwelling quality of life that will be interpreted morally as the example to follow.

St. Cyril of Alexandria … extolling the sublimity of adoptive sonship and of the privileges connected therewith. Considering how intimately he connects the two doctrines of the Incarnation of the Logos and the deification of the creature chiefly in St. Peter Chrysologus, who points out that the adoptive sonship is almost as marvellous as the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ (515).

The deification of the creature reflects the understanding of the believer’s union as of the same nature as Christ’s and the Spirit’s with the Father. While justifying deification, through union and the indwelling of Trinity, the earthly and human demonstration is drawn into the framework of striving after eternal life through: meritorious good works, acts of supernatural union intimating the beginning, the anticipation of, and the accomplishing of moral responsibilities incumbent upon the sons of God (521). These acts are by nature Faith, Hope, and Charity, “the substance of all supernatural life.” (522). These three attributes are representative of the image of God, defining the nature of union with Christ, in mind and volition as the pillars of this relationship whereby, “theological Faith as a supernatural thinking, and theological Love as a supernatural volition. Hope draws its supernatural character from Faith and Charity, and tends to a future union with God rather than expresses a present union …imply[ing] a permanent indwelling of God
in the soul.” (ibid). Together this triplet encapsulates spiritual life. Love is elevated as it accomplishes spiritual union with God. The same love is the basis for good salvific works (522, 529).

The difficulty being that love has usurped the centrality of Christ and perfection in Him, source and means are confused. The unresolved tension of union with the Divine and the accomplishing of meritorious acts is incompatible with the view of Christ as perfect salvation, resulting in a faulty Christology. Union is ontologically weakened substantially, while the emphasis rests upon moral attributes of infused graces and characterizing works. The focus is upon the outworking rather than upon Christ the origin and source of all of existence.

**Experiential Union**

The believer who enters this union, experiences, and lives demonstrably the continual transforming and renewing into the likeness of the image of God: through the Spirit’s working in the believer; a progressive conformity, and through the applying of God’s word to all of one’s life (Ferguson and Wright 697-699). These themes are recurrent in Lutheran, Evangelical and Catholic beliefs. Berkhof observes that the mystical union is generally treated anthropologically in Lutheran belief; established by faith, thereby emphasizing the subjective realization in believers’ lives. In doing so he believes that the objective union in the perspective of eternal origins is undermined. He suggests that the Reformed view encompasses the subjective based on the federal and objective on mystical union (447).

**Luther**

The primary concerns of Luther are not ontological concerning Christ, “Luther does not seek that which is God Himself, rather what he is for us, he considers him as a personal God revealed in Jesus Christ … the religion that they [Augustine and Luther] lived was the direct relationship of man with a personal God revealed in Jesus Christ, realized by love following the Mystics” (Jundt 236, 54). His concerns were directed towards the practical effects of union upon humankind, “By simplifying the prescriptions the justice that justifies us later becomes synonym of grace, mercy, because Luther, above all else, wants to affirm God’s need to come to our aid” (Strohl 164). Much of Luther’s conception
relies upon a four stage/state/age understanding of Christian experience, borrowed from Augustine (Jundt 85):

i. Before the Law – man in darkness, ignorance, and rational impotence, and life according the flesh

ii. Under the Law – the conscious knowledge of sin and slavery to sin

iii. Under grace – the beginning of being led by the Spirit to struggle against himself and aspire to shake off the yoke of the flesh, even though being just by faith

iv. In peace – progression to pious perseverance toward peace that will be fulfilled after entering into the rest of the spirit till resurrection day

Luther does state clearly that “Christ Himself … is my justice, He is my quality and … my formal justice … I want Him immediately to be my gift, my doctrine, in order to possess all things in Him” (Denifle 289). He affirms Christ inherent in the believer, on the basis that the believer form in spirit, one body with him, not only spiritually but really as He is in heaven. Consequently, the ubiquity of Christ found strong objection from the Catholics. In describing Luther’s view of union in the believer, Heinrich Deifle uses the term ‘thickening’ to convey the sense of unity in union (289-290, 292). Likewise, in affirming the ‘justifying faith’ as an definite free gift of God, whereby Luther would say, “… it is God who believes in us” (284-285), this same faith creates spiritual communion with God, constantly repeating the need for detachment from visible, material things for attachment to the invisible spiritual realities (Strohl 164, 170). His ontological view, affecting much of his development of union, ensures distinction from the philosophical understanding of God as a unique and real substance, the Supreme Being. Luther considers, “God to be Personality and Absolute Will.” The image of God in man is perceived in the will as having primacy in human nature, as a reflection of the Divine. “Union is understood as that of two personalities and harmony of two wills” (171-172).

It appears that Luther, through his personal experience and reflection, emphasizes a dualist vision of mankind in which sin is confused with the physical, earthly life. It is also attributed more efficient power than that of the indwelling Christ and Spirit, whereby he

---

8 A translation of the French term ‘conglutiné’ in the original text.
remains always a sinner and knows not how to avoid the just judgment of God (Ibid. 141-142). It is renouncement and separation from his humanity or soul that enables union (219, 221). The emphasis on struggle within the progressive vision of sanctification is very pronounced.

Salvation is considered within union, and therefore not complete until union is perfected, until then there is a struggle against the world and seductions and within man, (Jundt 120-122). While faith and justification are gifted in Luther, an over-emphasis upon the effort required by the believer in progressive sanctification, neglects the regeneration by the Spirit of the human nature as this dissertation has established. Much of Luther’s understanding of union and ‘ordo salutis’ is embryonic and loosely encompassed by his understanding of grace and its ministry in the believer (85-86); to the point where ‘union’ is so conditioned by faith, by justification, by sanctification, by purification, and by holiness that one loses sight that it is the person of Christ who comes to indwell the believer who is the unique means and object. The reality of union is not the fruit of such an effort, reflective of the remnants of Catholicism, rather of the divine impulsion whereby Christ indwells as the starting point of salvation and not as the fruit of sanctification or the work of grace, as Luther defines them (Jundt 54, 85-86).

**Spiritual / Mystical Union**

The mystery of union with Christ, is being ‘one’ with Him through the Spirit, originating in spiritual new birth, focusing upon the ‘secret’ life of prayer, meditation on God’s words, contemplation, and worship, akin to the Eastern orthodox tradition. This union is not to be confused with the loss of self through absorption into the universe or the ecstatic supra-spiritual experiences as observed in pagan and occult practices. Rather, it is the complete union of those fully renewed in God’s image enjoying unobstructed perspicacious fellowship with him, in pure love, truth, trust and mutual delight in relationship with God, and others (Ferguson and Wright 697-699). This would be reflected in Pietistic and Charismatic streams. “Subjectively, the union between Christ and believers is effected by the Holy Spirit in a mysterious and supernatural way, and for that reason is generally designated as the *unio mystica* or “mystical union”” (Berkhof 447). The danger of mysticism is that of deification whereby identification of the believer

---

9 1Co.1:30; 6:57.
with Christ becomes a “union of essence” whereby one is merged into the other, losing the distinction of persons (Ibid. 451-452). Deissmann emphasizes the “mystical” dimension that identifies Christ and the Spirit as the ‘Spirit-Christ’, “a body that is not earthly or material, but consists of the divine effulgence” (A. Deissmann quoted in Ladd 523), to which Johann Weiss adds “… a fluid which surrounds and also penetrates us … a formless, impersonal, all penetrating being” (J. Weiss quoted in Ladd 523). This presents several difficulties such as the fusion whereby a loss of distinct identity in ‘ὑπόστασις’ occurs, which is contrary to the Personhood of the Godhead and therefore of the union into which the believer is called. The text does not have to be read as one fully integrating into the other with a loss of identity. This loss, (to use ‘personality’ etymologically unsatisfactory, as it refers to ‘personata’ or mask, thereby not a true reflection on being), in addition to the inadequate view of individuality finds a response in the defined perfect ontological unity, as Jesus expressed His ‘oneness’ with the Father and the Spirit. The mysticism of Christ or the Spirit should not detract from common attribute nor distinct ὑπόστασις. Further treatment has been expounded in the chapter “Ontological Considerations in Trinity.”

**Existential Union**

On the basis of the Pauline comparative references to Adam and Christ, two forms of existence emerge: ‘in one man Adam’ and ‘in one man Jesus Christ’ both being the result of imputation as a mode. Paul communicates two contrasted but not comparable modes of existence, as the superlative nature of existence in Christ demonstrates. Reformed theologians refer to this text as substantiating the ‘Federal Head’ concept of union in Christ. However, interpreted in the wider context of Christ’s death and resurrection, ‘in Christ’ accomplishes ‘in Adam’ as the perfect man, putting an end to this form of existence for indwelt believers. The new mode of existence is ‘in Christ’ and ‘in Spirit’ of the New Age,

---

10 Ro.5:12-21; 1Co.15:20-23, 42-49.

11 ‘λογίζομαι’ used 40 times in the NT, generally a factual calculation, weighing up, in reference to righteousness demonstrated in Abraham particularly in Roman Ch.4.

12 Ro.5:12, 15, 17, 18, 19; See also Ac.17:21; Jn.17:21; 1Co.10:17; 12:11, 12, 13; 2Co.5:14; Ep.1:10; Heb.11:12.
It is best explained as originating neither in mysticism nor in the realistic ideas of sacramental communion, nor in the idea of the Church as an institution, but in primitive Christian eschatology. The death and resurrection of Jesus were eschatological events, effecting the transition from this age to the Age to Come… (C.K. Barrett, Romans (1957), 127) Therefore to be “in Christ” means to be in the new sphere of salvation (Ladd 525).

A believer who dies with Christ and is buried with Him and resurrects with Him enters into the existential mode of normative existence that is ‘in Christ’.\textsuperscript{13}

**Socinianism**, (Lelio and Faustus Sozzini 1525-1562), holds a wide range of challenges to Orthodox Theology concerning the divinity of Christ and the significance of Christ’s atonement. Because of his view of Christ, mortal and human until resurrection after which he became immortal (Rees 174, 177); any sense of divinity was accorded uniquely through the presence and indwelling of the Holy Spirit (421). By deduction and implication, there is no incarnational nor union dimension to ‘believers in Christ’, it appears to be confined to a religious faith of ascension to tenets of belief about someone (423). It follows that Christ for the Christian, “his role was to inspire disciples to follow his example, for only those who persevered in obedience were raised from the dead”\textsuperscript{14} (Ferguson and Wright 649).

**Arminianism** (Jacobus Arminius 1560-1609) recognizes union in Christ through the Spirit of Christ and thereby participation in all his blessings (Arminius 94). The emphasis thereafter lies in the ethical and character-based practices of the regenerate and renewing man,

It is an infusion (both into the human understanding and into the will and affections,) of all those gifts of the Holy Spirit which appertain to the regeneration and renewing of man such as faith, hope, charity, etc.; for, without these gracious gifts, man is not sufficient to think, will, or do anything that is good (253), Jesus Christ also by his Spirit assists them in all their temptations, and affords them the

\textsuperscript{13} Ro.6:3-5; Ep.2:4-7; 4:20-24; Col.2:11-14; 3:3; Ph.3:8-11; 2Co.4:10-11.

\textsuperscript{14} “Socinus and Socinianism” *New Dictionary of Theology* 1988.
ready aid of his hand; and, provided they stand prepared for the battle, implore his help, and be not wanting to themselves, Christ preserves them from falling (254).

The immediate consequence of union bears a distinct anthropological focus and outworking. This interpretation “represent[s] mystical union as a mere moral union, or a union of love and sympathy … Such a union does not involve any interpenetration of the life of Christ and that of believers. It would involve no more than loving adherence to Christ …” (Berkhof 451-452).

This concludes the consideration of the nine principal views of union in Christ.

**Humanity and Divinity in the Believer**

The ‘mode of indwelling’ is complex in that it directly reflects upon interpretations of the Lord’s Supper, upon Christ’s nature, both divine and human, the role of the Father, Jesus and the Spirit. Calvin the Reformer confronted the propositions of Andreas Osiander (1498-1552), a German Lutheran theologian, defending Luther’s approach to justification as an external imputation and real union with Christ (Ferguson and Wright 484). In doing so, Calvin refers to “transfusing the divine essence [Father, Son and Spirit] into men” and states that while “we are one with Christ … we deny that the essence of Christ’s is confounded with ours … A substantial mixture by which God … makes us … a part of Himself” (Calvin 448). In response to the substantial union of transfusion, Calvin proposes union of diffusion whereby in Christ, in whom are the Father and the Spirit, because all the fullness of the Godhead dwells, so in Him we possess God entire. The Holy Spirit being portrayed as the bond of union by which Christ effectually binds us to Himself, (26, 332, 448), concordant with Augustinian conception. Calvin refers to the federal headship of Christ in the context of diffusion. He goes on to refer to “putting on, in-grafting into, abiding in” Christ in unity with him (452, 855). As previously discussed, the deification in Eastern Orthodoxy and Mysticism is clearly a representative expression of union. Murray attempts to qualify union whereby ‘similitude’ is contrasted with ‘identity’ in that union does not elevate the believer to the same union that exists within the Trinity. He states that “union is not incorporation into the life of the Godhead … analogy does mean identity” (Redemption 179). When Christ’s being transforms the believer, the qualities of Christ become in that person, they become his or hers not by acquisition but by incarnation and union. In the same way that my sin became part of
Christ, in the same way what He is becomes part of the believer.\textsuperscript{15} The ontological import is that because Christ is … in union I become.

The consubstantiality of the Trinity remains unique as the one ‘οὐσία’ is the perfect divine substance equally in all three Persons of the Godhead; each person is individually and in properties absolute ‘ὑπόστασις’ of God. The union in Christ and Godhead is not consubstantial, for Christ does not use the same consubstantial language between the Father, Son and Spirit, as of the believer. For example, ‘If you have seen me you have seen the Father’ is never replicated upon the believer. The deification of the believer, in Eastern orthodoxy, should respect this distinction.

**Ontological etymology of Union**

The following terms, ‘ἐκ’, ‘ἀπό’, ‘ἐν’ and ‘μένω’ identify the concepts that build a biblical understanding to the ontological and existential relationship of union in Christ.

‘ἐκ’ denotes origin, translated as from or out of with reference to place, time or cause, source or origin; presupposing the separation of someone or a thing from, being part of or in another.\textsuperscript{16} E.g. of a place: coming out of Egypt; figuratively of rising from the dead; of an ethnic group; of John’s baptism.\textsuperscript{17}

The Bible sets clear precedence for the ontological dimension of the believer’s existence ‘ἐκ’ God,\textsuperscript{18} Christ,\textsuperscript{19} His resurrection,\textsuperscript{20} and the Spirit.\textsuperscript{21} The Scriptures speak of Jesus as the firstborn (see argumentation of the precedent chapter),\textsuperscript{22} ‘ἐκ’ the dead. The ‘new existence’, as previously developed is established upon the Person of Christ out of death and into resurrection. It has no anteriority; it stands as the only legitimate basis for the

---

\textsuperscript{15} 2Co.5:21.

\textsuperscript{16} ‘ἐκ’ \textit{TGEL} 2016; \textit{SECB} 2015; Zodhiates p529-532.

\textsuperscript{17} Mt.2:6, 15; Ro.6:4; Ac.13:21; Mt.21:26.

\textsuperscript{18} Jn.1:13; 1Co.1:30; Ro.9:1; 1Co.10:17; 1Jn.3:9.

\textsuperscript{19} Jn.1:16; 6:50-51; 1Co.10:4.

\textsuperscript{20} Ep.1:18-20; Ro.6:4; Col.2:12-13.

\textsuperscript{21} Jn.3:5, 6, 8; Gal.6:8; Ro.8:11.

\textsuperscript{22} Col.1:18; Rev.1:5.
Trinitarian existence of believers in Jesus Christ. Other forms of existence are described as: law, sin and death;\(^{23}\) flesh;\(^{24}\) natural blood (DNA) and relations, sexual or human will;\(^{25}\) the ‘κόσμος’ including people groups, human race, socio-political groupings, systems of government, the planet or universe;\(^{26}\) or contrary spirits.\(^{27}\) In each of these, the principles of source or origin and cause are evidenced. The creational existence of all things, including humankind, ‘ἐκ’ God is accepted.\(^{28}\) In the ‘New Age’ in Christ and in Spirit, the objective is that God restore to His original intentions in Christ:\(^{29}\) Jews and Non-Jews – in one ‘New Man’;\(^{30}\) and all things on the earth and in heaven.\(^{31}\) Reconciliation, (‘ἀποκαταλλάσσω’), is a recreation of the original creational intent. The New Age existence cannot therefore be considered outside of being in Christ who restores the believer to ontological existence ‘ἐκ’ God, in Trinity.

Proselytizing in Judaism was expressed by rabbis using vocabulary of creating newborn converts. This only has a figurative meaning because the disciple has come to a new life. That new life is based upon religious observance and adherence to laws as means and mediation of the ‘new life’ (Kittel and Friedrich @153). While the vocabulary is familiar, this stands contrary to the means and mode of the new birth and paternity in the new existence generated ‘ἐκ’ God. The believer is ‘αλλ εκ θεου εγεννησαν’ and ‘γεννηθε εξ πνευματος’.\(^{32}\) The origins of this existence are in the persons of Godhead and opposed to the natural order of hereditary blood line; the necessity for Christ to come in the Davidic hereditary blood line is to exercise redemptive authority over the natural order.\(^{33}\)

\(^{23}\) Ro.8:2.

\(^{24}\) Jn.3:6; Ro.3:20; Gal.6:8.

\(^{25}\) Jn.1:13.

\(^{26}\) Jn.15:19; 17:14; 1Jn.2:16.

\(^{27}\) 1Jn.4:2-3; Ac.16:16-18; 19:12-16.

\(^{28}\) Heb.11:3; Ac.17:26; Ro.11:36; 1Co.8:6.

\(^{29}\) ‘ἀποκαταλλάσσω’ literal meaning.

\(^{30}\) Ep.2:11-16.

\(^{31}\) Col.1:20.

\(^{32}\) Jn.1:13; 3:5, 6, 8.

\(^{33}\) Ro.1:3-4; Jn.7:42; Gal.1:15.
John chapter one verse thirteen illustrates the power and volition of a human being as an insufficient cause. In this generation ‘γεννάω’ the divine paternity is implicit, which comprises: generative source or power in a person, of filial relationship, of identity and belonging that are inseparable from the [re]generative act, “to as many as take hold of Him he gives the authority to become by genesis (‘γίνομαι’ Kittel and Friedrich @152) legitimate children descendants of God …” (TLT Jn.1:12). The taking hold, (‘λαμβάνω’ often mistranslated with a passive connotation), is in the middle voice implicitly conveying taking hold of the measure or part that is being given or offered. The authority (‘ἐξουσία’ is joined to the becoming again in the middle voice, so the authority is legitimately exercised, filling the designated part in becoming generatively child of God. ‘Τέκνον’ defines descent in a physical and external sense of parentage, with a strong bearing of paternal bond.  

For the existential argument this moves the grounds from a forensic, legal or mystical conception to an ontological and physical reality; there are physical, tangible and visible traits, of being generate in the image of Christ and existing ‘εξ’ God in filial relationship. The regenerate ‘τέκνον’ relationship is perfected by becoming ‘υἱός’ of God. The term refers to internal, ethical and legal dimensions that emphasize the relationship. The purpose of belonging is reinforced in redemption and freedom ‘εξ’ the covenant of law through death into a new qualitative genre of life. The active taking hold of the Spirit who comes to indwell is reinforced by Paul to the Galatians; the Spirit’s indwelling and witness to sonship because the believer takes hold of it, sourced (‘ἀπολαμβάνω’) in adoption. The Spirit indwelling is accomplished in the believer in Christ and to God. This represents the ethical and legal dimensions of legitimacy that do not require a forensic federal interpretation.

34 Ro.8:16; 9:8; Ep.5:1; 1Th.2:11; 1Jn.3:2.
35 Ro.6:5; 8:29; 2Co.3:18; Col.3:10; 1Co.15:49.
37 ‘τέκνον’ and ‘υἱός’ TGEL 2016.
38 1Co.6:19-20; Ro.7:4.
39 Ro.8:15-16; Gal.4:5-6; Ep.1:4-5.
John’s epistolary writings bear the imprint of this understanding as he employs the phrase, “εκ θεου γεννάω” (TR). The verb applied to believers, is always in the passive voice. He emphasizes a completed act that is moving from one source and mode of existence into a new one. In doing so, he highlights incompatibilities: if God is righteous then the one ‘εκ θεου γεννάω does or produces righteousness;\(^{40}\) this one is incapable of sinning,\(^{41}\) is loving as God, Christ and his fellow believer,\(^{42}\) carrying of victory,\(^{43}\) and does qualitative good.\(^{44}\) If the founding principle is anchored in “… keeping His commandments …” (NKJV 1Jn.3:24), then the perspective is a religious one of obedience. This however is incorrect. Firstly, the term ‘τηρέω’ is employed in the participle, and refers to holding preciously something of value. Secondly, the ‘ἐντολή’ in view contextually, is love for God and for the fellow believers.\(^{46}\) The founding ontological principle identifies the ‘σπέρμα’ of God in the believer.\(^{47}\) While used of lineage, of physical seeds, of the Word and Kingdom of God,\(^{48}\) this seed is fulfilled in the indwelling Christ, the fullness of divinity.\(^{49}\) Ontologically, the one who is ‘εκ θεου γεννάω’ is ‘σπέρμα αυτου εν αυτω μενει’. The [re]generation originated in God is not positional it is incarnational consequentially because the divine ‘σπέρμα’ that is Christ indwells. The Trinitarian effect is demonstrated by the Spirit indwelling. It is upon this reality that John and Paul correct the incompatibilities of the indwelling divine Person. Therefore, the absence of sin in a believer is the presence of the sinlessness of Christ; the righteousness

\(^{40}\) 1Jn.2:29; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1, 4, 18; for ‘εκ θεου’ or ‘εκ πνευματος’ see also 1Jn.3:24; 4:1-4, 6,7, 13.

\(^{41}\) 1Jn.2:29; 3:10.

\(^{42}\) 1Jn.3:9; 5:18.

\(^{43}\) 1Jn.4:7; 5:1.

\(^{44}\) 1Jn.4:4; 5:4, 18.

\(^{45}\) 3Jn.1:11.

\(^{46}\) 1Jn.3:11,14,16-18.

\(^{47}\) 1Jn.3:9.

\(^{48}\) Lineage Mt.22:24-25; Abraham Lk.1:55; Jn.8:33; Abraham and Christ Gal.3:16; David and Christ Jn.7:42; Ac.13:23; Ro.1:3; 2Ti.2:8; spiritually of believers Ro.9:8; Mt.13:38; of creation 1Co.15:38; as the Word or Kingdom of God Mt.13:19, 24.

\(^{49}\) Gal.3:16; Jn.1:16; Col.2:9-10.
that is ethical character is present because God who is perfect righteousness indwells. Paul exemplifies this principle of origin concerning: ministry capacity, apostleship, inherent ability/power, and love, thereby establishing the source or origin and causal distinction.

The biblical witness also lends itself to an understanding that the indwelling of God in Trinity is ‘εκ’ the perfection of the Person. In other words, it is ‘εκ’ the Person of the Spirit that we receive an incarnate measure of His Person. It is whole, as representative of his whole person and nature; similar language and inference are made regarding the Person of Jesus Christ. This Trinitarian fullness described by Peter as the ‘γενησθε θειας κοινωνι φυσεως’, is the natural divine nature or essence of God in which believers are in communion. This fullness is not correlated to the infinity of God but it does reflect his eternity for life in Christ is eternal; it is not the believer becoming god substantially, rather Peter perceives the ‘κοινωνι’ of the divine nature through indwelling. The believer is hypostatically fully spiritual and fully human because that person exists ‘εκ’ Trinity.

John’s reference to the indwelling Spirit swelling up ‘εκ’ the believer connects the original causal source as the Person of the Spirit in Godhead who indwelling, becomes source in the person and perpetuates the manifestation of his person ‘εκ’ the believer. The text says this experience of the Spirit is to eternal life rather than towards others, as each believer indwelt by the original causal source no longer needs to receive that from another.

---

50 2Co.3:5; 2Co.2:17; Gal.1:1; 4:7; 2Co.4:7; 13:4; 8:7.

51 Jn.4:13-14; 1Jn.3:24; 4:13.

52 Jn.1:16; 6:51.

53 Of God Ep.3:19; Of Christ Jn.1:16; Col.2:9-10; of Spirit 2Pe.1:3; Ac.4:31; Ep.5:18; 2Ti.1:7 - according to TR.

54 2Pe.1:4.

55 See also Col.2:9-10; Ac.17:29; 2Pe.1:3.

56 Jn.4:13-14; 7:38.
While the divinity and humanity of Jesus in Trinity has been treated in the preceding chapter “Ontological Considerations in Trinity”, a reference in this context is merited. “Consequently, Jesus said to them if this was your God Father whoever [of you] would [have] loved me because I come out ‘ἐκ’ God and because neither have come ‘ἀπό’ myself but He sent me” (TLT Jn.8:42). The wider context is the debate regarding origin and identity to which Jesus uses his relationship with Father to disprove the Jewish assumption of God being their source, of identity and of filial paternity, by stating their real sources in verse forty-four. Jesus’ relationship is stated in two ways: one affirmatively, he comes ‘ἐκ’ God and he does not come ‘ἀπό’ Himself. Both terms refer to source and in that sense are partially synonymous. Jesus refers to God as Father and therefore to Himself as God the Son. His divinity, equality, and substance affirmed; He is “the exact imprint of His nature …” (ESV Heb.1:3). That Jesus not refer to Himself as his own source, although he has life in Himself, and gives life to whom he pleases, suggests that causal origin is not in view, rather the perfect relational unity that binds the three Person of the Trinity together in absolute oneness. This concords with Jesus manner of speaking about Himself, his will, words, teaching, works, authority, in that he relates to listeners that the source is not Himself but with the Father. This is not reflective of a subordinate relationship rather that the source (‘ἐκ’ and ‘ἀπό’) which are the basis of ontological and relational unity becoming the source of Jesus ministry. This is perfectly demonstrated by the previous references to Paul’s conceptions and practices in this chapter. While a clear ontological model and language emanates, the analogy cannot apply to believers in that Christ is his own perfect source congruent with the Father and the Spirit. However, the believer necessitates the Trinity as the causal source with which he or she experiences ‘κοινωνία’.

‘ἀπό’ denotes a similar meaning of source and resource, with the connotation of separation from, a position of being on, by, or with (Zodhiates 529); or away from, (Brown 51, 126) a united relationship. Where ‘ἐκ’ indicates the primary, direct, or ultimate, ‘ἀπό’ marks the secondary, indirect or mediate origin (Zodhiates 217).

57 Jn.1:4; 5:21; 11:26; 17:2.
59 Mt.19:9; Mk.10:11-12; Lk.16:18; Col.2:20.
The mode of Jesus’ ministry is conform to the principles expounded above. There is special emphasis upon ministering ‘ἀπό’ Himself that is particularly evident and always intimately bound to the Father, ontologically and functionally: in coming, doing, judging, teaching, glory, authority and speaking.60 While ‘ἐκ’ emphasizes origin, ‘ἀπό’ accentuates the mediatory source, reinforcing the primacy of being and function out of Trinity. One rare example is given where Jesus exercises his authority ‘ἀπό’ Himself, which is universal and all encompassing, 61

For this reason the Father loves me, because I lay down my life that I may take it up again. No one takes it from (‘ἀπό’) me, but I lay it down of my own (‘ἀπό’) accord. I have authority to lay it down, and I have authority to take it up again. This charge I have received from my Father (ESV Jn.10:17-18), demonstrating the equality in nature, attribute, and scope of exercise. The relationship bond is maintained however, Jesus emphasizes that the giving of his life in atonement is a decision of his own authority as much as it concurs with Father’s will. The Spirit concords with Jesus not speaking ‘ἀπό’ Himself mediaily, likewise, the Father and Jesus are the source ‘ἐκ’ which the Spirit unified speaks.62 The believer is brought into this same relationship with Christ, “Stay in me, I in you. Even as the branch can absolutely not bear fruit out of (‘ἀπό’) itself, except it stay in the vine, likewise not even yourselves, except you might stay in Me” (TLT Jn.15:4). In like manner, as an extension of Christ the mediatory nature of existence echoes the language and thought emanated from Christ. Similarly, ‘ἀπό’ indicates rupture from servitude, liberating ‘ἀπό’: sin, law, death, rudimentary principles of world, life, religion, science, tradition, impurity, and dead works, 63 in order to exist ‘ἀπό’ Christ. Paul also reflects this Trinitarian image in his conception of ministry. The language is modelled upon that of Christ’s. 64

60 Jn.7:28; 5:19, 30; 8:28; 7:17, 18; 14:10.
61 Jn.13:3; 17:2; Mt.28:18; Ep.1:21; Col.1:16; 2:10, 15; 1Pe.3:22.
62 Jn.16:13-15; 1Co.2:12; 6:19 see also for the similar relationship between Father and Son Jn.7:17.
63 Ro.6:7,17; 1Jn.1:7, 9; Rev.1:5; Ro.7:2, 3, 6; Ro.8:2; Gal.5:4; Ac.13:38-39; Col.2:20; 2Co.7:1; Heb.10:22; 9:4.
64 Gal.1:1; 2Co.3:5; Ac.19:12; 1Co.11:23; 14:36; 1Th.2:6.
Medially, it is evident that the reception of the Spirit, of Christ, of the Father reflects preceding observations whereby the believer receives a full measure out of the perfection of the Divine Person, as demonstrated in, “but we all faces having been unveiled reflecting in a mirror the glory of the Lord we are metamorphosed permanently ‘ἀπὸ’ the glory to glory even as ‘ἀπὸ’ the Lord the Spirit” (TLT 2Co.3:18). The ontological consequences of this concept are fully exposed in this text. The causal origin is evident as is the medial origin, as the Spirit and Christ operate permanent transformation originated in glory and compounding that glory, uniquely sourced in Godhead. Paul makes a significant statement saying, “From now on, therefore, we regard no one according to the flesh. Even though we once regarded Christ according to the flesh, we regard him thus no longer” (ESV 2Co.5:16). In view is the permutation not only in origin, but also in means. The believer is no longer considered ‘ἀπὸ κατὰ σάρκα’ but is defined by existing ‘ἐν’ Christ. The believer in Christ, and in Trinity, exists ontologically ‘ἐκ’ Godhead, ‘κοινωνός’ of the divine nature through the indwelling of the three Persons; he or she [re]sources the substance of existence medially ‘ἀπὸ’ the Trinity, ‘it is no longer I who live, of my own source…’

The significance is further compounded as the believer ‘ἐκ’ and ‘ἀπὸ’ in Trinity finds fulfilment and demonstration within the ontological existence ‘ἐν’ Christ. In Scripture these theological concepts are held together. ‘ἐν’ primarily meaning ‘in, among, in the middle of’ is rarely used of movement but rather a relationship or position in reference to space, time, or state. It is employed meditatively, instrumentally, and constructively, “… with the primary idea of rest” (Zodhiates 579). References to the heavens, or to Kingdom, Jesus’ blood, are external and impersonal. The term applied personally and internally concerns inner self as a whole, or in part: conscience, character, or

---

65 Ac.2:17; 3:20; 2Co.2:18; Col.3:21; 1Jn.2:22, 27.
66 ‘ἐν’ SECB 2015.
67 Mt.5:16; 6:10; 10:32-33; 18:18; Ac.2:19; Col.1:20.
69 Mt.22:20; Ro.3:25; 5:9; 1Jn.5:6; Rev.1:5; 5:9.
70 Mt.13:21; Mk.5:30; Lk.7:39; Jn.6:61.
71 2Co.5:11; 1Ti.3:9 – conscience; Mk.2:6; Ro.2:15 - hearts; Ro.1:28; 1Co.1:5, 21; 13:12; Ep.1:17 - knowledge; Ro.1:10; Ep.1:9; Col.1:9; Heb.13:21 – will.
emotion, the term also applies to relationship of the believer to Trinity, which according to this definition is spatial, or loosely to state, and instrumental.

“This rich usage is not just a Hebraism, nor does it rest on a mystically local conception, but it is based on the view of Christ as a cosmically and eschatologically universal personage.” In John’s writings generally, “The formulas are neither ecstatic nor eschatological but mystical in a very broad sense with a strong personal and ethical reference” (Kittel and Friedrich @240).

The specific concern in this section is ontological with regard for the believer’s existential relationship to Trinity and vice versa. “But ‘ἐκ’ Him [God] you are ‘ἐν’ Christ Jesus who is become for us wisdom ‘ἀπό’ God righteousness and holiness and redemption” (TLT 1Co.1:31), binds together the ontological prepositions that define this relationship. Godhead being origin, union in Christ as the ontological state of being, who become source whereby the person and character of the indwelling Godhead operates likeness (‘ὅμοιος’). Conclusively, ‘ἐν’ defines ontologically union as the nature of relationship, it reflects the agency of mediation and the perfecting process of construction.

‘ἐν’ Jesus Christ and Jesus Christ ‘ἐν’ the believer

If this ontological relationship was unidirectional, then the federal concept of a positional standing ‘in Christ’ would suffice to explain theologically the believer’s relationship to God. However, Scripture witnesses to a bi-directional relationship whereby the Trinity also indwells the believer. The resulting tension must be maintained between the spiritual relation in Godhead with the incarnate presence and operation of Godhead. The heavenly reality therefore is indissociably bound to the earthly incarnate existence. The “spiritual blessings in the heavenly places in Christ” (NKJV Ep.1:1) must imperatively not be separated from the incarnation of the Christ in whom these blessings are found, in the believer; they cannot exist for the believer otherwise. While Paul emphasizes predominantly in his teaching the believer in Christ, he maintains this bi-directional tension that John’s writings describe. The believer is ‘ἐν’ God, just as God is in him/her;

---

72 Jn.5:26; 7:18; 11:38; Ac.10:17.
likewise ‘ἐν’ Christ just as Christ is ‘ἐν’ that person; ‘ἐν’ the Spirit just as the Spirit is ‘ἐν’ the believer. It is an error to apply critical thought to an ontological reality that dissect whether or when the Father or Jesus or the Spirit indwell; attempting to attribute personal function confuses further the issue. The reason being, all three Persons are perceived as consubstantially the same in essence and therefore able to manifest the same qualities and perform any of the same functions. That said, it may be possible to identify the Father through the ministry of paternal love; Christ through saving acts; Spirit through revelation or transformation. However, that is to identify the persons through function and as previously argued will inevitably constrict perception of the substance and operation of the Godhead individually. The underlying ontological reality that should not be obscured is that the Father, and the Christ, and the Spirit are all explicitly said to indwell a believer and the believer is said to indwell ‘ἐν’ them. This Tri-unity in which the believer exists, lives and functions is the heavenly reality, “seated in Christ.”

‘μένω’ is employed particularly as part of the Johannine thematic of union in Godhead. The term applies to a permanent dwelling, to stay or remain, in respect of place, time or state; to continue in the present, or to stay as one is, an absence of change is implied, “In the NT the word is an important one relative to the permanence of God in contrast to human and earthly mutability” (Kittel and Friedrich @481). In composition and derivative forms the concepts of endurance and perseverance emerge strongly in the context of trial and tribulation and of an identifiable character in the believer. There are synonymous terms that communicate a temporary dwelling place (‘παροικία’ or ‘πάροικος’78) and a permanent dwelling place (‘κατοικία’, ‘κατοίκησις’, ‘κατοικητήριον’, and ‘κατοικία’). The latter term is employed to describe Christ’s full and perfect divinity;79 the permanent dwelling of Christ in the human heart and of the

73 1Jn.2:5-6, 24; 3:24; 4:13, 15, 16; Jn.14:23; 17:21; Ep.3:20.
74 Jn.6:56; 14:20; 15:4-5; 17:21; 2Th.1:12; 1Jn.2:24.
75 Mt.3:11; Ac.11:16; Ro.2:29; Ro.9:1; 1Co.12:9, 13; Ep.2:18; 4:30; 1Jn.2:27.
76 Mt.10:20; Jn.14:17, 26; Ro.8:9-11; 1Co.3:16; 6:19; 2Co.1:22; 6:6; Ep.2:22; Jm.4:5; 1Pe.1:11; 1Jn.2:27.
77 ὑπομένω Mt.10:22; 2Ti.2:12; Jm.1:12; 1Pe.2:20; ὑπομονή’ Lk.21:19; Ro.5:3-4; Col.1:11; 1Ti.6:11; Jm.1:3-4; 2Pe.1:6.
78 Ep.2:19; 1Pe.2:11.
79 Col.1:19; 2:9.
Spirit, in gathered believers corporately indwelling the church, the dwelling of Godhead.

In reflecting the heavenly reality of Godhead’s indwelling through ‘μένω’, Jesus calls believers into the Trinity relationship in heaven and in humanity ‘inclusion by extension’,

Just as the Living Father sent Me in the same manner because of this reason of the Father I live and he feeding on Me will live because of Me (TLT Jn.6:57). After a little while the world will no longer see Me, but you will see Me; because I live, you will live also. In that day you will know that I am in My Father, and you in Me, and I in you (NAS Jn.14:19-20). “In order that all in one just as you Father in me in the same manner I in you in order that also them in us in one in order that the world believe that you sent Me (TLT Jn.17:21).

These texts emphasize Christ as the extension of the Father and believers as the extension of Christ because of abiding union. The beginning and the end of salvation is founded upon the singularity of union in Godhead. The term ‘καταγω’ in these three texts translates “in the same [or like] manner” and has particular significance because it intimates that the believer is in union with Christ and the Father in exactly the same way as they are. The ontological relationship into which believers are brought therefore reflects the extension of a homogeneous principle. John provides other examples of the same ontological dynamic: in knowing by personal experience, in love, and in word. These are signs of the ontological union. The hypostatic indwelling then extends to synonymous relationship with the Father. The nature of the believer’s existence is then the extension of the six principles of Christ’s relationship previously developed.

The reference to taking precious care of the specific commandments, (John reiterates the ‘new commandments’ given in Christ throughout his letters. It is not a reference to Mosaic law), “Now he who keeping His commandments abides in Him, and He in him.

---

81 Ep.3:17; 2:22.
82 Jn.10:15, 38; 14:10.
83 Jn.10:14-15; 1Jn.3:24; Jn.15:9-10; 1Jn.4:12, 16; Jn.5:38; 8:31; 15:7.
84 Jn.15:10; 1Jn.3:24.
And by this we know that He abides in us, by the Spirit whom He has given us” (NKJV 1Jo 3:24). In the construction of the two passages referred to, the present conditional instruction ‘τηρέω’ in the participle referring to treasuring rather than obedience. That is to say then that obedience to commands does not procure union or indwelling. It is a consequence of the indwelling, a means of preserving and maintain union as with love and the word indwelling. These are fruits of continuing abiding in union. The logic could be expressed as: in union with Trinity, the believer indwelling and indwelt is the object of Godhead, love, word, experiential knowledge and therefore in response remains ‘if’ he so chooses. In John’s first epistle there are numerous explanations of behaviour that does and does not reflect the mutual abiding.85

**Nature of indwelling**

“The one eating my flesh and drinking my blood abides in Me and in the same manner I in Him” (TLT Jn.6:56), expresses the extent of union of Christ in relation to a person’s humanity. The graphic image, with verbs in the continuous count indicate an ongoing present process. Employed sacramentally, limits their meaning and weakens the fundament of union in Christ as an ontological existential reality rather than a religious observance; whether that be understood transubstantiatively, consubstantiatively, symbolically, or even graciously.86 Jesus is saying that a person must ingurgitate the essence of Christ into his/her being. This does not require the loss of distinction between Christ and a believer, as an identity hypostatically, just as it is not demonstrated in Christ Himself who knows perfect reciprocal union with the Father. The figure points to the origin, source and means of the union relationship.

The image of the vine in John Fifteen contains a concentration of the term ‘μένω’ and provides the importance of rootedness or vital attachment,

> Even as the branch can absolutely not bear fruit out of itself, except it abide in the vine, likewise not even yourselves, except you abide in Me … I Am the vine you

---

85 Presence of sin 1Jn.3:6,9; love expressed to other believers 1Jn.3:14-15; generosity 1Jn.3:17; public declaration of Christ God-Man 1Jn.4:15.

86 Transubstantiative is the Roman Catholic view; Consubstantiative is the Lutheran view; Symbolic is the Evangelical view and Grace communicative is the Reformed view.
the branches. He abiding in me I in him/her, he/she bears much fruit, because by yourself without Me you can absolutely have no purpose (TLT Jn.15:4, 5).

The emphasis is that of human impotency, ‘no one can bear fruit in and of or out of themselves.’ That is to say, they are a source of life for themselves which is contrary to Scripture and the argument under development. Jesus is source in them and it is ‘ἐκ’ Him alone that fruit is born and therefore implicitly ‘ἀπό’ Christ. The repetition of the phrase with the second emphasis upon purpose, that is to make or produce. The existence of the branch depends upon the vine, its purposefulness too, and consequentially it is potential fruitfulness.

Paul’s phrase, “In union with Christ I have been crucified and I no longer live but Christ lives in me: but now I live in flesh, in faith I live to the Son of God …” (TLT Gal.2:20), expresses primacy. Paul is very much alive; his epistles bear witness to a strong character. The crucifixion then concerns the death of every source of life that is outside of Christ.  

87 Christ is source, but it is much deeper in consequence; before Paul thinks, speaks, sees, feels, wills, judges, acts there is Christ. Paul expresses ontological primacy in human constitution and identity in Christ, in Godhead (see Fig.XI). Christ is given precedence in every part of Paul’s composition in personhood and identity; only then does the believer experience fully union in Christ, this is the ‘πνευματικός’ believer. Paul’s exhortations to be filled with spiritual wisdom, discernment, revelation and knowledge are an appeal for Christ, in Trinity to have ontological primacy. If the heavenly reality is the believer in Christ, then the believer’s being is swallowed up in Trinity. It does equate to non-existence, nor does it lack identity and temperament, but rather is sourced, supplied, rooted, extended, and replicated in Godhead. In the indwelling union, Godhead is reproducing the reality of the believer in Christ in the heavenly places, seated in Christ, in Father, in Spirit.

The Trinitarian term ‘ἐνδύω’ meaning to sink into or put-on clothing describes the Pauline emphasis of sinking into Christ, the created and re-generatively transformed new man. 89 The verbs are consistently employed in the middle voice and therefore foresees a

87 Ph.3:1-10.

88 Lk.24:49; Ro.13:14; Ep.4:24.

89 Gal.3:27; Ep.4:24; Col.3:10.
collaborative continuous process of ensuring that Trinity, in particularly Christ is in a place of primacy. The middle voice reflects in Godhead and in the believer a united reality, whereby Christ is put on and also the believer puts on Christ. The clothing is internal, attiring the seven constituent parts of human identity and temperament. This is the ‘πνευματικός’ man or woman who collaboratively allows Christ and who chooses to attire themselves in Christ. The figure enhances Christ’s primacy, just as Paul in person and identity exists and resources out of Christ; Christ now clothes personhood and identity. What is expressed of Paul comes out of Christ, the substance and expression or likeness is filtered through Christ. Paul’s ultimate objective is captured in, “Christ being metamorphosed in believers again” (TLT Gal.4:19), indicating that it is possible for believers to lose the fundamental reality of union, as the Galatians did, thereby falling into one of the other nine states. Paul perceives the ‘τέλος’ of ministry process and focus to bringing the believer to “… a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fullness in Christ Jesus” (NKJV Ep.4:13). That there is a process in union with Christ is implicitly pursued by being “… perfected for the day of Christ.” In this text, union in Christ is regenerative transformation whereby the seven dynamic parts that constitute human identity and temperament are impregnated with the nature and characteristics of Christ, a direct repercussion of the indwelling union with his Person in Trinity. The ‘clothing’ figure demonstrated a double dynamic: substance and likeness of both Christ and Paul, in recognizable unity. However, in this instance the substantial is Christ, Christ in union. The human substantial is not denied, deformed or inhibited, it is transformed whereby the substance of human composition and temperament is penetrated in essence by the mind, emotion, will, conscience, [sub]conscious, and body of Christ. Paul takes union one stage further in the perfecting process whereby there is and expression of consubstantiality in the believer. The substance and likeness become intimately united, a reflection of the inseparability and indivisibility of the Trinitarian substance and relationship. This is the outcome of the ‘putting on’ and does suggest process. Because the believer is brought into the same manner of relationship as Christ with the Father, the unity of substance and likeness, in this two-way dynamic, is the perfected outcome, in “that they may all be one, just as you, Father, are in me, and I in

90 See also Col.1:28; 4:12; 1Th.3:10; Jm.1:4; 1Pe.5:10; 1Jn.4:18.

91 Ph.2:7; Ro.8:29.
you, that they also may be in us, so that the world may believe that you have sent me” (NKJV Jn.17:21). This becomes the normative experience in which active collaboration in Godhead relationship is essential. The finality is not an opposing duality rather an intimate union and unity whereby spiritual and human are united in one ‘οὐσία’, in form and likeness both are identifiable in perfect inseparable union.

These key scriptural concepts enable a defining of the incarnational dimension to union. It shows that the federal emphasis on imputation is insufficient alone to properly convey the course of salvation in a believer. Consideration of origin, (‘ἐκ’), [re]source (‘ἀπό’), indwelling (‘ἐν’), clothing (‘ἐνδύω’) and regenerative transformation (‘μορφόω’) uniting substance and likeness in the perfected image of the Trinity is the imperative intention of the Godhead towards the believer.

**Union in Christ and “Ordo Salutis”**

An ontological perspective of the relationship of the believer to the indwelling Trinity has been elaborated. It is important to consider the implications for the process of salvation described as ‘Ordo Salutis’. The historical traditions will be reviewed and an ontological reading proposed. An overview of the historical traditional views is in figure XIII.

| John Murray⁹² Louis Berkhof⁹³ Wayne Grudem⁹⁴ R.J. Gore⁹⁵ J.M. Boice⁹⁶ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Election | Election | Eternal Election | Predestination |  |
| Effectual Calling | Calling | Gospel Call | Effectual Calling | Effectual Calling |
| Regeneration | Regeneration | Regeneration | Regeneration | Regeneration |
| Justification | Justification | Justification | Justification | Justification |

⁹² Murray Redemption p89-90.
⁹⁴ Grudem p670.
⁹⁵ Gore p139-167.
⁹⁶ Boice p402-403.
Adoption | Adoption | Adoption
--- | --- | ---
Sanctification | Sanctification | Sanctification
Perseverance | Perseverance | Perseverance
Death | Death | Death
Glorification | Glorification | Glorification

Several comments should be made in interpreting the information in the table: none of these elements singularly or collectively create union in Christ and in Godhead. Union in Christ, from a perspective of Godhead, of the heavenly and uncreated reality to the earthly and created together in incarnation, hold primacy as the beginning of salvation. Romans chapter eight states that the biblical text suggests an order in the way of salvation:

> For those whom He ‘foreknew’, He also ‘predestined’ to become conformed to the image of His Son, so that He would be the firstborn among ‘many brethren’; and these whom He predestined, He also ‘called’; and these whom He called, He also ‘justified’, and these whom He justified, He also ‘glorified’ (NAS Ro.8:29-30).

There are several other texts providing lists of elements of the process in varying orders that avoid dogmatism, “… but you are washed, but you are sanctified, but you are made righteous in the name of the Lord Jesus and in the Spirit God” (TLT 1Co.6:11).97 ‘Washing’ could be in the blood of Jesus or in the Holy Spirit regenerating (see the following references): the middle voice refers to a responsive, collaborative act, followed by an act in which the believer is passive and God alone is active – the act of ‘sanctifying or consecrating,’ followed by ‘being justified.’

> “… according to His mercy He saved us through washing regeneration and renewal of the Holy Spirit who He poured out upon us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour in order that being rendered righteous [by] his grace we might become heirs according to the hope of eternal life” (TLT Tit.3:5-7).

This text would support the Holy Spirit ‘washing’ in the previous reference, which in this instance leads to ‘regeneration and renewal,’ the former term referring to a new created

---

97 Washing is in the middle voice distinct from the other two verbs in the passive voice. The former implies mutual collaboration each for his part, while the passive is clearly an operation to an object.
life and the latter to a new quality of renewed or restored life. This leads to ‘legitimacy of the heir’ and eternal life assured.

“If moreover children, also heirs; heirs truly [of] God, joint/together heirs moreover [with] Christ; if after all we feel pain of suffering joined together, in order that also we might together be glorified and approved” (TLT Ro.8:17). The co-heirs of God with Christ is conditioned by suffering in union in Christ with ‘glorification’ in view. The uniting with Christ is ontological not circumstantial; rather, the ‘likeness’ in life experientially is integral to union.

Moreover, He brought together Himself the love of God to us in order that furthermore [to] us being sinners Christ on our behalf died. Consequently, much greater being made righteous right now in the blood of Him, we will be saved through Him … If because being hateful we were reconciled to favour to God through the death of the Son of Him, much greater being reconciled to favour we will be saved in the life of Him absolutely not only moreover but also glorying in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through absolutely not even now we take hold of the reconciliation to favour (TLT Ro.5:8-16).

… making peace and God might restore to His original intentions both in the one body through the cross killing the hatred in Him (Ep.2:16).

In the flow of Pauline thought, being made righteous is bound to being reconciled to favour and glorying. Reconciliation does not figure in the synthesis illustrated, although it contains elements of [re]generation, transformation, renewal, restoration, and relationship; reconciliation is therefore necessary to the ‘ordo salutis’ because it integrates into the process of saving people. The subject is God; although He is in Christ reconciling,\(^98\) the believer being the passive object of the ministry of Christ in God. Reconciliation clearly serves the perfecting of believers, “he has now reconciled in his body of flesh by his death, in order to present you holy and blameless and above reproach before him …” (ESV Col.1:22). Being justified by Christ’s blood parallels being reconciled by his death. The two are not directly related in logical order; they are used to reflect partially two aspects of Christ’s atonement. Both produce the common product of

\(^{98}\) 2Co.5:18.
peace,\textsuperscript{99} while reconciliation recreates relationship, justification innocents the guilty. The Colossians reference refers to the perfecting of the believer, which finds embodiment in regeneration, sanctification, and cleansing.

The order then in the corporate context of Christ’s relationship to church, “… Christ loves the church and gave Himself over for her in order that He might sanctify and cleansing her [with] the washing of water in the word …” (TLT Ep.5:26), is to sanctify, set-apart or consecrate and wash clean. It is neither the blood nor the Spirit regenerating, rather it is the specific ‘ῥημα’ word of God, reflected in Jesus’ prayer, “Sanctify them in the truth; your word is truth” (ESV Jn.17:17). In this instance, union in Christ precedes the response of the ‘ῥημα’ indwelling,\textsuperscript{100} the word being the means of internally washing clean. The ‘washing’ and ‘sanctifying’ could relate in that a person could be consecrated or given over to washing. Alternatively, the washing might be associated implicitly with the regeneration by the Spirit, whose sword (instrument) is the word of God.\textsuperscript{101}

“Brothers having been loved by the Lord God that chose you out of the beginning to salvation in the sanctification [of the] Spirit and faith [and] truth to this He called you by our Gospel to obtaining the glory [of] our Lord Jesus Christ” (TLT 2Th.2:13-14). The ‘choosing’ (‘αἱρέομαι’), occurs only in the middle voice and therefore implies a reciprocal act, in contrast to the ‘calling’ (‘καλέω’) of God’s active call through the Gospel. The inference of ‘the beginning’ does not necessarily equate to eternity, although salvation is in the eternal counsel of God, or simply in the creative and redemptive order. ‘Sanctifying’ flows out of ‘choice’ and ‘faith’ not necessarily faith in conversion, simply belief, trust, reliance and dependency upon the ministry of salvation to a person in union. This ultimately leads to a ‘glorified’ state.

… according to God the Father’s foreknowledge in the sanctification of the Spirit to obedience and sprinkling the blood of Jesus Christ… blessed the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ out of and according to His great mercy birthing us again to living hope through the resurrection Jesus Christ out from the dead to an inheritance…who being kept in the power of God through faith to salvation … faith

\textsuperscript{99} Ro.5:1; Ep.2:16; Col.1:18.

\textsuperscript{100} Jn.15:7.

\textsuperscript{101} Ep.6:17.
… being tested might be found to approval and glory and honour in the revealing of Jesus Christ (TLT 1Pe.1:1-5,7)

The ‘foreknowledge’ of the Father, expressed by the ‘sanctifying’ of the Spirit to obedience and ‘purifying or cleansing or washing’ by the blood of Jesus, to which is added ‘regenerating’ through Jesus’ resurrection and ‘faith’ tested leads to ‘glory.’ Again ‘sanctifying’ leads to ‘cleansing’ through Jesus’ blood (death), leading to ‘regeneration’ (through resurrection), and ‘faith’ as defined above which seems to have for object the person and work of Christ, the Spirit the Father crowned by ‘glory’ in Christ.

The table below summarizes the overview of the principal biblical texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ro.8:29-30</th>
<th>1Co.6:11</th>
<th>Tit.3:5-6</th>
<th>Ro.8:8-16</th>
<th>Ep.2:16</th>
<th>Ep.5:26</th>
<th>2Th.2:13-14</th>
<th>1Pe.1:3-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreknow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predestine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reconcile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash</td>
<td>Wash</td>
<td>Wash</td>
<td>Wash</td>
<td>Wash</td>
<td>Wash</td>
<td>Wash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regenerate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regenerate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt</td>
<td>Sanctify</td>
<td>Renew</td>
<td>Sanctify</td>
<td>Sanctify</td>
<td>Sanctify</td>
<td>Sanctify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justify</td>
<td>Justify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glorify</td>
<td>Heirs</td>
<td>Glorify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glorify</td>
<td>Heirs/Glorify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perfecting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The source and purpose of union in Christ is found in the attributes of God. Union itself finds its raison d’être in the love, the grace, the mercy, and the peace in Godhead. Union then flows out from the nature of Godhead as an expression of that nature rather than a forensic or legal initiative. Where Berkhof states that justification by faith and the imputation of Christ’s righteousness, are the eternal basis, “a justification from eternity … it is only on the basis of our oneness with Him that such an imputation could be reasonable” (448, 452-453). The above argument suggests that it is not out of one salvific aspect, rather it is out of the ontological person of Godhead that justification and its
application flow, God being just and justifier.\textsuperscript{102} This reflects the strong basis for union that is founded upon the federal reading of Romans chapter five. There are concerns that the federal concept is either over-emphasized or dissociated from the other concepts of union. The results appear in a positional understanding of the believer in Christ. It is called ‘objective realization’ in Christ, which is contrasted with the ‘subjective realization’ of the Holy Spirit (448). The difficulty is that if Christ is the fulfilment of Adam, annuling the Old Covenant of the Old Man, therefore through Christ wholly Divine becoming perfect Man, the objective and subjective no longer exist independently because they are united in Christ, “reconciling all things to Himself, whether on earth or in heaven …” (ESV Col.1:18). Union in Christ and Him in us therefore causes the distinction to disappear in order that there be one singular reality of existence in Christ. If are reconciled: heaven and earth, the spiritual and the human, the infinite and the finite, the uncreated and the created, it is reasonable to affirm that the objective and subjective to no longer exist, they concede to the greater fulfilled reality. Wherever Christ is then we find contrasting opposites reconciled, perfected, and demonstrated.

“Since the believer is a ‘new creature’ (2 Co.5:17), or is ‘justified’ (Acts 13:39) only in Christ, union with Him, logically precedes both regeneration and justification by faith, yet, chronologically, the moment one is united with Christ is also the inaugural moment of regeneration and justification… the initial act is that of Christ, who unites believers to Himself by regenerating them” (449-450).

Berkhof here exposes his ordering in the stages of salvation, rightly underlining that in Christ many of these works occur immediately and simultaneously. If this is understood as union, the first initiating cause then it holds true, that the ‘event’ must be held in relationship to the ‘process’. Each aspect necessarily, inherently and biblically stands in this tension, that must be maintained.

John Murray also justifies the ordering of the way of salvation.

This superabundance [The provision which God has made for the salvation of men …] appears in the eternal counsel of God respecting salvation; it appears in the historic accomplishment of redemption by the work of Christ once for all; and it appears in the application of redemption continuously and progressively till it

\textsuperscript{102} Ro.3:26; Is.50:7-9; 53:11.
reaches its consummation in the liberty of the glory of the children of God (Redemption 81).

From Romans chapter eight verse nineteen, Murray believes that the list is more than a question of Pauline convenience rather there are overwhelming reasons … for thinking that the order … is the order of sequence according to the divine arrangement. (Romans 85). His assumptions are as follows: justification is virtually synonymous with reconciliation (Ro.5:9), “… faith is presupposed in justification, is the precondition of justification, (87) then again justification is prior to faith just as the accomplishment of redemption is always prior to the application of it.” (85) “Repentance is the twin sister of faith … conversion is simply another name for repentance and faith conjoined… Sanctification is a process that begins, in regeneration, finds it’s basis in justification, being a continuous process rather than a momentary act like calling, regeneration, justification and adoption …” (89).

As has been previously explained justification may produce in part the similar fruit of peace, but it does not have the cosmological and ecclesiological purport of reconciliation. Reconciliation is much more widely defined that the judicial and ethical sense of justification. The accomplishment and application through union in Christ cannot be dissociated. If Christ died and rose again thereby accomplishing the work of salvation, it is of no effect without there being an application to human beings. Furthermore, while sanctification is perceived as a process, the biblical record demonstrates that salvation is also an ongoing process which does imply that regeneration, justification, reconciliation, adoption, and glorification are an integral part of the process, there by not being confined to the federal and positional singular event conception.

Murray concludes, by stating his perception of the ‘ordo salutis’: calling, regeneration, faith and repentance, justification, adoption, sanctification, perseverance, glorification … there is a logic which evinces and brings into clear focus the governing principle of salvation in all of its aspects …” (89-90). A survey of the NT scriptures reveals that union in Christ cannot be restricted to a salvific interpretation, for the following themes demonstrate the extent of union in Christ as it defines the believer ontologically (Figure XIV).
The task is to demonstrate how these qualities are experienced in the believer from an ontological perspective. There exists one founding principle that will affect the interpretation and understanding of how union in Christ and Godhead manifests itself. The binding together of a believer in Christ and Christ in the believer is essential to the ontology of the believer. If he/she is in Christ only, the mystical, the acquisition by faith, or the objective and postulate approaches, associate the believer with spiritual realities that are imputed, that is to say accounted in favour to someone, “we do not become actual partakers of Christ until redemption is effectually applied” (Murray Redemption 175). In this one could suggest that union precedes the ‘ordo salutis’ and that it is not objectively real unless it is subjectively experienced. It is only as the union incarnates into the believer that the vital truths of existence in Christ become reality; the supposition thereby is the experiential.

This chapter demonstrates that Christ’s and Godhead’s union in believers is more than presence, it is source and origin; is more than indwelling as a static position; it is reordering ontological of the believer in this New Age of Christ and Spirit, it causes existence and expresses identity in union, “… it is Christ who lives in me” (NKJV Gal.2:20). Grudem suggests “when we act like Christ we become like Christ” (846) which inverses the ontology and contradicts the verbs in the passive voice, where the believer in union is receptor not initiator. It is because Christ indwelling in union by essence and nature ontologically generates substance and likeness by ministering who He is into the essence of the believer; then what he/she is, reflects in what is done.

The following analysis is concerned with this ontological perspective. The composed list is not definitive or exhaustive, it is representative, encompassing the identified aspects of ‘ordo salutis’ and enlarging the salvific to a wider appreciation of the existential dimension to union. Union is salvific but that should be read in the wider ontological context of the whole the person and an all-of-life perspective.

i. Call and Election

Etymologically, word meanings are expressed simply: ‘καλέω’ to call or invite; ‘ἐκλέγομαι’ to choose, pick or select. To these primary words are added ‘προσκαλέομαι’ to call to one’s self, particularly used by Jesus in an ontological sense,103 and of a divine

103 Mt.10:1; 15:10; 18:2; Mk.3:13.
call to apostolic ministry.\textsuperscript{104} ‘τίθημι’ to set, put, place, fix or establish,\textsuperscript{105} which in context for the best part applies to God initiating in a context of Trinity,\textsuperscript{106} of church\textsuperscript{107} and ministry.\textsuperscript{108} The call and choice is exemplified by Jesus calling all the disciples to Himself and from among them choosing twelve apostles.\textsuperscript{109} This latter calling is not salvific it is a selecting from among the general group of followers to a specific relationship and mission which required them to be with Jesus in relationship of privilege, constant presence and access to Him and to a Master-Disciple teaching, learning, life-sharing, relationship.

The vocabulary of ‘call’ (‘καλέω’ and derivatives), ‘election’ or ‘choice’ (‘ἐκλέγομαι’ and derivatives) is explicitly differentiated in few biblical texts.\textsuperscript{110} The general or universal tenure of the call and the specific nature of choice are evident; Matthew, Peter and Paul’s use does suggest a term familiar to Hebrew understanding, “For many are called, but few [are] chosen” (NKJV Mt 22:14). Contextually the terms are employed synonymously of the divine call.\textsuperscript{111} It is erroneous to suggest that as God chooses, it is a sovereign act on his part, (Grudem 679). The use of the verb ‘ἐκλέγομαι’ to make a choice or choose out of, is consistently in the middle voice. By definition the middle voice requires a collaborative, or responsive participation in order for choice to be effectively experienced and demonstrated.\textsuperscript{112} “You absolutely not called out Me, contrariwise I called out you, in order that you go out and bear fruit and your fruit remain” (TLT Jn.15:16), demonstrates the origin of calling and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{104} Ac.13:2; 16:10; Jm.5:14.
\item \textsuperscript{105} Synonymous with the concept of appoint see ‘τάσσω’: Ac.13:48; Ro.13:1; and ‘καλέω’: 1Co.3:11; Ph.1:17; 1Th.3:3.
\item \textsuperscript{106} Mt.12:18; Mt.22:44; Ac.13:47; Ro.9 :33; 1Co.15:25; 1Th.5:9; Heb.1:2, 13; 10:13.
\item \textsuperscript{107} 1Co.12:18, 28.
\item \textsuperscript{108} 2Co.5:19; 1Ti.1:12; 2:7.
\item \textsuperscript{109} Lk.6:13.
\item \textsuperscript{110} Mt.22:14; Lk.6:13; 2Pe.1:10; Ro.9:11; 11:28-29; TR Greek version only of Mt.20:16.
\item \textsuperscript{111} Where the sense of ‘election’ is implicit in the use of ‘call’ Jn.15:16; Ac.2:39; Ro.1:7; 1Co.1:9, 24; Gal.1:6.
\item \textsuperscript{112} Heb.3:1.
\end{itemize}
choice is in God, the initiative belongs to Godhead, however the twelve disciples, as with all others who would follow, believers abiding in Christ, are in a responsive relationship to God’s choosing for it to fulfill its purpose. Berkhof comments, “… after God has performed His part, it still remains in the power of man to be regenerated or not, to be converted or to continue unconverted.” (455). Jesus exemplifies this negatively with Judas a called and chosen one, yet a devil.113

In a salvific context, “… blessing us in all spiritual blessings in the heavens in Christ accordingly He chose us in Him before the founding of the world to be holy and faultless in character before Him in love …” (TLT Ep.1:4), while determining that choosing us in Christ occurred in eternity past, should take into account the participative or responsive requirement. It could be said that the election was decided between Father and Christ in the divine uncreated will which is not separate from the created order and the free nature of man to respond whereby what was counselled in the Godhead from eternity is demonstrably experienced by the believer whose response is vital. This approach is not Arminian in that “God does not determine the eternal state of any, but allows the individual’s free will,” (Gore 141); neither is it Calvinistic in that “God can sovereignly work through our desires so that our choices come about as he has ordained” (Grudem 680). The ontological holds the tension of the initiator-responder of the collaborative middle voice in God’s exercise as the “specific agent” (Murray 93) of election choice thus breaking free from the bipolarization of active and passive roles. He further suggests that if effectual call is a sovereign act of God, then regeneration would occur prior to human response (97).

‘Election’ and ‘Call’ set out the ontology of the believer in a perspective that begins in eternity ‘past’, “… who saving us and calling a distinctive calling … according to His own purpose and grace being given to us in Christ Jesus before time, infinite eternity” (TLT 2Ti.1:9), and is accomplished in eternity ‘future’,

Moreover God all graces, calling by name into the infinite of His glory in Christ Jesus, [through] light suffering He desires ardently to complete, repair, equip, strengthen you, desires ardently to make constantly stable, set fast, firm, desires

113 Jn.6:70; 13:18.
ardently to make you strong in health, desires ardently to lay a stable foundation (TLT 1Pe.5:10),

whereby the believer in calling is set in the eternal ‘future’ perspective of the infinite glory of Christ. Calling and election in an eternal paradigm establishes destiny. Election is: to union in Christ; to salvation; to sanctification; to atonement, to cleansing in Christ; to life; to justification; to sonship through adoption; into the glory of Christ.

While the election and call are rooted in the eternal paradigm, they are also portrayed as present continuous implementation of call and choice which suggests process and growth. Paul’s writings to the Galatians capture well the turning away from the Gospel of Christ contrasted with “Him calling you” (NKJV Gal.1:6; 5:8). God’s calling to and choosing in Himself and in Christ remain present and continuous, actualized according to the divine purpose (‘πρόθεσις’ literally the ‘first thesis’); the call out of darkness and into the Kingdom and Light. The call firstly is to Godhead, but it is also to a hallmarked quality of life, demonstrated in nature and in character of the believer; that conditions entry in to the eschatological Kingdom,

… on account of these [things] even more so brothers exert yourselves sure and firm the calling and choosing because producing these [qualities] you might not

---

114 See also Ep.1:4; Ph.3:14.
115 1Co.1:9; Ep.1:4; Ph.3:14; 2Ti.1:9; Ro.1:6; Rev.17:14.
116 Mt.24:22; 2Ti.1:9; 2:10; Ac.2:21; 1Th.5:9; of Jesus Christ Ac.13:47.
117 1Pe.1:2; Ro.1:7; 1Co.1:2; 2Ti.1:9; Jude 1:1.
118 1Pe.1:2; Ac.22:16.
119 Ro.4:17.
120 Ro.8:33.
121 Ro.9:26; 1Jn.3:1.
122 1Th.2:12; 2Th.2:14; 2Ti.2:10; 1Pe.5:10; Ep.1:18.
123 Ro.8:28; 2Ti.1:9; Ac.2:19; Ro.9:11.
124 1Pe.2:9; 1Th.2:12; Jm.2:5.
125 Ep.1:4; Col.3:12, 15; 1Ti.5:21; Tit.1:1; 1Th.4:7; 2Ti.1:9; 2:22.
stumble for in this manner will be abundantly ministered to you this entrance the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (TLT 2Pe.1:10-11).

The preceding context is necessary to understand that participation in the divine nature, generates in the believer characteristics and qualities of nature defined in Christ. Along with other referenced texts, both call and choice in God, are to the progressive and continual transformation of character to perfecting, without blame, fault, or stain. It must be recognized that this process of call and election calls to the integrity of Godhead reproduced in the believer. It is evident from this argument that God is intentionally in perfect integrity where call and choice is concerned. The point of walking worthily,126 is “… our God will count you worthy of your calling, and fulfill every good desire of goodness and the work faith in power” (TLT 2Th.2:12). The choice of God in this is that a believer enter His integrity in Christ. In this the uncreated divine choice from eternity will be fully realized in the created choice within the believer in Christ to infinite eternity.

ii. Reconciliation

Reconciliation is a composite word from the root ‘ἀλλάσσω’127 meaning to change or transform or to make different,128 and concerns a change of nature or substance. The composite terms in the biblical texts are ‘διαλλάσσω’129 with an emphasis on agency in transformation, employed by Jesus in a context of human relationship directly bound to repercussions in the Divine relationship. It is through the means of change or transformation in a person that relationship is restored and in like manner with God.130 καταλλάσσω and the noun καταλλαγή are primarily applied in the redemptive context of Christ’s atonement. The etymological intention is of a new relationship of peace that has never existed, by which a person is changed and enters this new relationship (Zodhiates 835-836). Composite words in Greek intensify and

126 1Th.2:12; Ep.4:1.
127 Ro.1:23; 1Co.15:51-52; Heb.1:12.
129 Mt.5:24.
130 ‘διαλλάσσω’ TGEL 2016; SECB 2015.
131 Ro.5:10, 11; 11:15; 2Co.5:18, 19, 20; 1Co.7:11.
emphasize a deepened meaning; ‘ἀποκαταλλάσσω’ and derivatives ‘ἀποκατάστασις’, applied: to healing, to John the Baptist as Elijah restoring repentance in Kingdom, and to Peter’s question concerning the restoration of Israel. This usage bears the most accentuated form of the word defined as to reconcile completely, back again, with the notion of a former condition or harmony; translated as ‘God restoring all things to His original intentions in Christ’.

God is presented as the source and impulse of reconciliation, although Paul also presents Christ ‘ἐν’, ‘διά’, and ‘εἰς’ all things, as the source of reconciliation, making this a Trinitarian operation. Christ is therefore not just the means of reconciliation but he source in union with the Father in Him and Him in God. The scope of reconciliation concerns the ‘κόσμος’, all things in heaven and on earth that are being restored through transformation to God’s original intentions. The import of this ministry applies to alienated sinners and hostile enemies; to those in Christ, thereby suggesting an ongoing amplifying process, where the benefits of reconciliation, conditioned by continuance in faith in Christ are demonstrated, to ethnic groups, Jews and Non-Jews, creating a new corporate and distinct people. The majority use of the passive voice indicates that this is uniquely of God and in Christ, no human contribution is of any consequence. It is only as reconciliation operates in the believer that he/she is active in receiving, allowing it to exercise within.

---

132 Ac.3:21.
133 Mt.12:13; Mk.3:5; Lk.6:10; Mk.8:25; Mt.17:11; Mk.9:12; Ac.1:6.
134 2Co.5:18.
135 Col.1:21; 2Co.5:19.
136 Ro.11:15; Col.1:21; Ac.3:21.
137 Ro.5:8, 10.
138 2Co.5:20; Ep.2:13, 16.
139 2Co.5:18, 19 employ the Present/Active/Participle, suggesting present continuous; Col.1:23; 2Co.5:20 – an imperative addressed to believers in Christ.
141 Ro.5:11; 2Co.5:19.
Collectively, ‘καταλλάσσω’ demonstrates the defining of a new relationship both in genre and in quality. ‘ἀποκαταλλάσσω’ defines the meta-narrative in God, in Christ and in the believer upon the centrality of the cross, the blood, the enmity, the sin, and the body of Christ. Reconciliation communicates peace and perfecting that are found uniquely in the person of Christ who ‘is’ peace; through the indwelling Christ producing His reconciliation in believers, the fruit of which is Christ manifesting His peace that becomes the believers. Unity and oneness in union with Christ is also produced by reconciliation, by which the believer becomes an integral beneficiary and participant of intentional transformation found in ‘ἀποκαταλλάσσω’. This represents the reinstatement of Christocentricty in cosmological, corporate and personal contexts because Christ is ‘ἀποκαταλλάσσω’.

iii. Redemption

Redemption is used by Murray and Grudem for example as the broad theme of atonement that encompasses the parts of salvation, though redemption does have particular characteristics that incorporate it identifiably in salvation. ‘ἀπολύτρωσις’ means release, freedom or liberation through payment of a ransom price in full. The Hebrew terms are ‘gē’ûliym’ or ‘gā’al’: to redeem, ransom or avenge with a price, of another or of self; to be the redeeming kinsman of property, enslaved, and deliverance from unjust circumstances.

---

142 Ep.2:13, 15; Col.1:20-21; 2Co.5:18.
143 ‘ἀπολύτρωσις’ TGEL 2016.
144 See synonyms: ‘pāḏāh’; ‘pedûyiym’ and ‘pidyôm’ especially emphasize the redemption price: Num.3:46, 48, 49, 51; Ex.21:30.
145 Num.35:12, 24, 25.
146 Ex.13:13; 34:20; Num.18:16-17.
147 Lev.25:26; Ruth 4:6.
149 Lev.25:48-54.
150 Dt.15:15.
151 Ps.55:18; 72:14; 106:10; 107:2.
Redemption is in Christ, and he is the origin (‘ἀπό’) of it. He is redemption in the believer as he/she is in Him, “… through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus …”\(^\text{152}\). Redemption requires blood for atonement to be made necessary to the forgiveness of sin.\(^\text{153}\) The price paid is equivalent to the price for a slave bought from a slave market. Therefore Jesus Christ ‘weight’ in the balance of redemption is the just price, for all the redeemed,\(^\text{154}\) from the old masters: law, curse, and death.\(^\text{155}\) Redemption is the breaking and ending of one slavery to belong to another master. When Christ redeems, it is to this end, “But now, thus says the LORD, who created you, O Jacob, And He who formed you, O Israel: "Fear not, for I have redeemed you; I have called you by your name; You are Mine” (NKJV Is.43:1), “that He might redeem us … for Himself His own special people …” (Tit.2:14), “… that we might receive the adoption as sons …” (Gal.4:5).\(^\text{156}\)

There are four criteria from the biblical concept of the ‘redeeming kinsman’\(^\text{157}\) played out in the story of Boaz and Ruth, that apply to Christ and are necessary to a full appreciation of the believer’s redemption individually and corporately:

i. He must a have a blood tie

In view is the necessity of Christ’s humanity, his communion with flesh and blood, as fully human, and therefore in blood relationship as Seed of David, Son of Adam.\(^\text{158}\)

ii. He must have the means to redeem

The requirement of a redemption price responds to the question what is a suitable price for the redemption of every person believing in Christ, the sum ‘weight’ of their lives?

\(^{152}\) 1Co.1:30; Ro.3:24.

\(^{153}\) Dt.21:8; Ep.1:7; Col.1:14; Tit.2:14; Heb.9:12, 15; Rev.5:9; also Is.44:22; Ps.34:22; 130:8; Is.29:22.

\(^{154}\) Mt.20:28; 1Co.6:20; 7:23; 1Ti.2:6; Rev.5:6; see also Jer.31:11.

\(^{155}\) Gal.3:13; 4:5; Col.1:13; Ho.13:14.

\(^{156}\) See also 2Sa.7:23; Is.54:5; 62:12; 63:16; 1Co.6:20; 7:23; 1Pe.2:9; Rev.5:9.


\(^{158}\) Gal.4:4; Heb.2:14-15; Ro.1:3; Lk.3:38.
Christ is the redemption price: his person and his life, the moral perfection of his nature, and his blood symbol of atoning sacrifice.  

iii. He must have the desire to pay the price  

God is said to desire redemption out of love, mercy, covenant affection, and out of His own affliction identifiable with the affliction or the bondage of his people. In Christ’s coming, he took on human form; in will and decision, he has the authority over Himself to give his life and take it up again; yet this will is not contrary to the will of the Father, as in the garden of Gethsemane Jesus chooses to align his will with the Father’s, that they be perfectly united, ‘as one’. Likewise Jesus prayer, “Father I desire that they also, whom you have given to me, may be with me where I am, to see my glory …” (ESV Jn.17:24).

iv. He must take the redeemed as belonging  

A slave is rarely free from belonging to someone. In some cases, having the redemption price, a slave can redeem himself, but then to live and work would need a new master. In salvation redemption, a person’s means are of insufficient ‘weight’ in the balance. The imperative is that Jesus Christ alone redeems from relational bondage to people and influences in order that the old authority be broken and a new one made possible. This change of ownership manifests itself in believer’s becoming children, sons and daughters of God, his own special people.

Christ is the Redeemer and the redemption price. It is God who accepting Christ’s ransom price, redeems Christ from death, raising him up. It is experienced by those already in Christ Jesus whereby: forgiveness, justification, adoption, and call proceed.

---

159 Mk.10:44-45; 1Jn.2:2; 1Pe.1:18-19; Ep.1:7; Heb.2:10.
160 Is.54:8; 62:12; 63:9; Ps.44:26; 130:7; Jn.10:17.
161 Ph.2:6-8; Jn.10:17-18; Heb.2:16; Mt.26:39, 42, 44.
162 Ps.31:5.
164 Ro.3:24.
165 Gal.4:5.
166 Is.43:1.
Redemption is not a state nor a position but an ongoing process throughout the believers’ lifetime until completeness of the whole person in Christ’s ‘παρουσία’.\textsuperscript{167} Ontologically, the believer in Christ is undergoing constant redemption as Christ exercises His ministry as Redeemer within.

iv. Salvation

‘σώζω’ and derivatives\textsuperscript{168} describes salvation in a generic sense: to deliver, rescue, preserve, and heal, and in a salvific sense. Salvation in NT thought is a process; the biblical texts describe salvation in terms of a past act, “[through] grace you are having been saved …” (TLT Ep.2:5, 8); of a present process,\textsuperscript{169} “Now I make known to you, brethren, the Gospel …, which also you received, in which also you stand, and by which you are being saved, if you hold fast to the word I preached to you—unless you believed in vain” (NAS 1Co.15:1; ESV 15:2); as a future realized act,\textsuperscript{170} “… so Christ also, having been offered once to bear the sins of many, will appear a second time for salvation without reference to sin, to those who eagerly await Him” (NAS Heb.9:28).

Christ is portrayed as salvation incarnate\textsuperscript{171} therefore, being made alive with Christ,\textsuperscript{172} being regenerate and renewed by the Spirit,\textsuperscript{173} being justified by the blood through Him,\textsuperscript{174} being reconciled through His life,\textsuperscript{175} through the sanctification of the Spirit,\textsuperscript{176} through grace; these dimensions of salvation flow from the ontological person of Christ. Outside of union in Christ and Him in the believer salvation cannot be realized; the

\textsuperscript{167} Ro.8:23; Ep.1:14; 4:30.
\textsuperscript{168} ‘σωτηρία’ and ‘σωτηρίον’.
\textsuperscript{169} Ac.4:12; Ro.1:16; 8:24; 1Co.1:18; 2Co.2:15; 6:2; Ph.2:12.
\textsuperscript{170} Mt.24:13; Ac.11:14; Ro.13:11; 2Ti.2:10; 1Pe.1:5.
\textsuperscript{171} Lk.1:69; 2:30; 3:6; Lk.19:9; Ac.4:12; Ac.13:47; Heb.5:9; 2Pe.3:15.
\textsuperscript{172} Ep.2:5; 2Ti.2:10; Heb.7:25.
\textsuperscript{173} Tit.3:5.
\textsuperscript{174} Ro.5:9.
\textsuperscript{175} Ro.5:10.
\textsuperscript{176} 2Th.2:13.
methodical process of ‘ordo salutis’ does not save.\(^{177}\) Having faith saves,\(^ {178}\) however, this faith requires an object, and that object is not salvation as an entity rather the person of Christ. The exercise of faith, as previously developed cannot remain at a basic level of assertion of truths, even Satan and demons believe that Jesus is the Saviour the Son of God, they are not saved on that basis of confession. Faith must mean more, it is therefore a reflection of dependency upon Jesus Christ, faith in Him, a faith that leads one into Him where union is formed. The final means that leads to Christ-Salvation is the word. In Jesus’ and in Paul’s Gospel and teaching,\(^ {179}\) it is not faith in the word but the word that leads to Christ, the object of faith.

The security of salvation for the believer is that salvation in Christ is being worked out in the present, founded upon the incarnate Christ exercising his salvation into each of the seven components of human nature as the believer moves between the poles of having been saved and will be saved. This ontological perception of salvation in time by necessity implicates a continual growth process of incarnate salvation.

v. Eternal life

‘ζάω’ and derivatives take meaning from being alive, or living, breathing; refers to the qualities of: genuine, true, active, vital or vigorous, fresh, efficient; also referring to the manner of living, with an ethical connotation. ‘ζωοποιέω’ adds causation: to produce, to cause or engender, to make alive or give life; characterized by: arousal, invigoration, quickening, restoration, growth and increase.\(^ {180}\) When the Scriptures say that Christ gives life, the meaning is a causal origin and a divine quality of life.\(^ {181}\) Scripture describes salvation, as the fruit of reconciliation through Christ’s atonement, this salvation in His life.\(^ {182}\)

---

\(^{177}\) Ep.2:5, 8; Ac.15:11; Tit.2:11.

\(^{178}\) Mk.16:16; Lk.8:12; Jn.3:16-17; Ac.15:11; 16:31; Ro.10:9-10; 1Ti.4:10; 1Pe.1:5, 9.

\(^{179}\) Jn.4:42; 5:34; Jm.1:21; Ro.1:16; Ac.13:26; Ep.1:13;1Co.1:21; 2Ti.3:15; 1Co.15:2.

\(^{180}\) ‘ζωοποιέω’ TGE 2016.

\(^{181}\) Jn.5:21; 1Co.15:22; likewise of the Spirit: Jn.6:63; Ro.8:11; 2Co.3:6; 1Pe.3:18 and the Father: Jn.5:21; Ro.4:17; 1Ti.6:13.

\(^{182}\) Ro.5:10.
Jesus is life, and life is in Him. This concept shakes the philosophical understanding of life as a transcendent cosmic energy, a source that animates natural humanity, a sense of being and self. For the Stoic’s authentic human nature is life striving for moral virtue, anything less is death. Neo-Platonists relate “life” as eternal and transcendent, achieved by the corporeal and material to the pursuit of not ‘having’ life but ‘being’ life. Gnostic’s perceived the eternal character of life as divorced from natural life, through mankind’s spirit it is the spiritualization or deification of mankind, in an attempt to relate to pre-matter and pre-Fall primal pure essence of Life (Kittel and Friedrich @282). From eternity, God, Jesus, and Spirit are ‘Life’, the essence of being and being alive and divine relating, demonstrates life. While life can be easily demonstrated by works and acts such as: creation, birth, thought and speech, breathe, respiration and movement, of which these are only a few manifestations of ‘life,’ the essence of life, being alive then is demonstrated in human form and incarnate in the Person of Jesus where perfection of divine and human life dwell in One.

He dispenses life from within Himself to whom he will, seen in giving His life as a ransom, in resurrecting to life, (although in the Gospel personnages, is only to mortal life). While some biblical texts speak in hope of an eschatological realization or fulfilment of eternal life at the ‘παρουσία’, Jesus’ words indicate an ontological reality

---

183 Jn.14:6; Jn.11:25.
184 Jn.1:4.
185 1Ti.6:16; Mt.16:16; Jn.1:4; 6:63; Gal.6:8; Heb.9:14.
186 Ge.1:1, 3.
187 Ge.2:7.
188 Ac.17:24-25, 28; Paul possibly quoting Epimenes of Crete (Bruce 338-339).
189 Ro.3:23.
190 Jn.5:21.
191 Jn.5:21, 26.
192 Mk.10:45.
193 Lk.7:11-17 Widow of Nain; Mk.5:23, 35-36, 41-42 – Tabitha; Jn.11 – Lazarus.
194 Lk.18:30; Jn.6:40, 54; 11:23-24; Tit.1:2; 3:7.
outside of time and process, “… I am the resurrection and the life. He who believing in Me, though he may die, he will live. "And whoever living and believing in Me shall never die. Do you believe this?"” (TLT Jn.11:25-26). The development of the text begins by stating the normative Jewish belief of Mary and Martha. Nothing would change this statement if Jesus had not spoken the following phrase in the present participle; 'the one in union and in faith in Christ and His life will absolutely not never die’. The text suggests that eternal life is present, continuous upon uniting to the indwelling Christ; it is eternal life that is generated in the believer because of Christ’s nature. The emphatic antithesis to the death statement is realized in the believer, in that eternal life is a present reality. It guarantees that no believer in Christ will die in the essence of his nature, his identity. A body dies, worn out, whereby the believer is realized with finality in a resurrection body conform to Christ, to His Life, and to the nature of the perfected believer.

The call is that unless a believer eats and drinks Jesus, he has no life in him, that is to say that the natural life in Adam that dies is superseded by “in the same manner also in Christ all will be made alive” (TLT 1Co.15:22). Christ and the life that is in Him in union with the believer establishes a unique source of Christological life for all of life.

Murray suggests that “only perfect righteousness can provide the basis for a complete, perfect and irreversible justification … gives a title and secures eternal life” (Redemption 132), however, the Gospels particularly employ the phrase, “… He who believes in the Son has everlasting life …” Christ precedes justification, Christ who is Life will be his/her justice. If the ‘ordo salutis’ does not emanate from the person and ministry of Christ manifested in the believer, but from a logical sequence of stages acquired by imputation rather than incarnation and union, then that vision of salvation is questionable, from an ontological point of view.

195 The double negative “οὐ μὴ” combines the ‘absolute’ with the ‘qualified’ negative to produce a compounded and intensified emphasis.

196 Jn.6:53.

197 1Co.15:22.

198 Jn.10:28.

199 Jn.3:15, 16, 36; 6:40, 47; 20:31; 1Ti.1:16; 1Jn.5:13.
To separate the exercise of faith from union, is to lose the ontological in favour of a suppositional approach whereby if one believes in God and Jesus the sent One, therefore him/her have eternal life. Paul unites faith and union in the phrase “… it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me, and the life I now live in the flesh, I live by faith in the son of God…” (NKJV Gal.2:20), demonstrating that union in Christ determines the source of life. Paul’s choice is to no longer live according to any other life source in that his being and the seven constituent parts are singularly sourced in the life that is in Christ. 200 He rightly says, “I no longer live,” understanding the words of Jesus, “unless you eat my flesh and drink my blood you have no life in you” (TLT Jn.6:53). If this is an accurate interpretation, then faith or belief is exercised from a place of union in Christ for eternal life. Christ, who is life, in the believer then is not transfusing or diffusing life but is in His indwelling Person, like that of the Father and the Spirit, is generating eternal life. 201

vi. Death, Burial and Resurrection

The federal interpretation is summarized in the phrase “whatever Christ did as our representative, God counted it as being something we did too” (Grudem 842). Likewise, Murray commenting on election in eternity in Christ comments, “the people of God were in Christ when he gave his life a ransom and redeemed by his blood that salvation has been secured for them; they are represented as united to Christ in his death, resurrection, and exaltation to heaven” (Murray Redemption 172-3). 202

The references quoted to support this position refer to the death and burial and resurrection, with Him in baptism,

Anyone we who die to sin, how even now we will live in it; or are you ignorant that how ever many are baptised into Christ Jesus, into his death are baptised; buried together consequently with him through the baptism into the death; in order that just as is raised Christ out of [the] dead through the splendour [of] the Father, in this same manner also we in new quality of life (TLT Ro.6:2-5).

200 1Jn.4:9.

201 1Jn.1:1-2; 5:11, 12, 13.

202 Supporting references Ro.6:2-11; Ep.2:4-6; Col.3:3-4.
Paul is responding to the dilemma of sin increasing in order that grace increase, addressed to believers who are already in Christ. Paul consistently deals with the complexities and contradictions of Christian life and service, as he writes with the death, burial and resurrection of Christ as the primary reference203 “always carrying in the body the death of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus may also be manifested in our bodies” (ESV 2Co.4:10). Out of mercy and love, and grace, through union with Christ, joined to Him, God made us alive, raised us up, made us sit in the heavens in Christ Jesus (Ep.2:5-6). The latter text explicitly puts a believer joined in union ‘σύν’ Christ. The verbs are in the active emphasizing that this is uniquely a work of God in Christ. The other supporting text cited from Romans six reflects a mode of life rather than a salvific event. The key verbs baptize, bury and raise are in the passive voice, that indicate this is the unique work of Christ in the believer. The verbs are in the Aorist tense which is a verb with no connection to time, past, present, future, it is an event word, (intensified and accentuated when in the second aorist form). If Christ indwells the believer in union, he carries in Himself death, burial and resurrection, and power or authority over them.204 Jesus in him/her operates death to burial to resurrection, in a continuing process of events that generates Christ in the believer. It is accordingly, a mode of life in which the initial event of being in Christ: in the heavens, through Christ incarnate, and indwelling the person, operating this mode of life. Berkhof puts this mode of life in the context of sanctification of the body (533) just as Murray suggests, “continuance of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ is the grounds of continuance of process of sanctification” (156-157). The ontological significance is that this mode of generating Christ in His person and substance into the believer necessitates a vision that transcends the theological categories evoked, while that is not to ignore the significance of this mode in sanctification or justification, etc.

In a context where sin would not abound,205 the sinlessness that John affirms206 as the fruit of the seed that is Christ207 in the believer, is contextualized in this cycle of death-

203 Ro.6:5-8; Col.6:15; 3:1-11; 2Co.4:10-12; 12:9; 13:4; Gal.3:27-28; 5:24-25; Ph.2:2, 5-11; 3:8-11.

204 2Ti.1:10; Ro. 5:10; 6:9; Ac.2:24; Jn.11:25-26.

205 Ro.6:1, 15.

206 1Jn.3:5-6, 9; Ro.6:10-11.

207 Gal.3:16.
burial-resurrection in Christ. The seed of Christ cannot sin, therefore the believer indwelt by Christ cannot sin, that is to distinguished from the process of perfection which is not analogous with sin, a point often confused (Grudem 751). Christ is applying the benefits of his Person and work; in this cycle, union is experienced and perfected.

vii. Baptism
The above-mentioned texts put the cycle of death-burial-resurrection in a context of baptism, “baptised into Christ Jesus, into his death are baptised; buried together consequently with him through the baptism into the death” (Ro.6:3-4),

… in the putting off the body, the missing the mark of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ, being buried together with Him in the baptism, in the is raised up together through the faith the operative power of God, raising up Him out of the dead. And you, being dead in the falling beside through misdeed and the uncircumcision of your flesh, makes you alive joined together, joined to Him (TLT Col.2:11-12).

It is necessary to consider the biblical texts rather than the religious sacrament or practice of baptism. The term ‘βαπτίζω’ describes the act of immersing whereby the result is a permanent change. The term employed in the texts cited is synonymous with union itself. Baptism is into the person of Christ,208 from a relationship of union: a new relationship and new existence, and new source of life; the same effect is extended as Jesus writes the cycle of death-burial–resurrection into a believer’s being. He employs the same baptismal language concerning his death, burial and resurrection.209

This ‘βαπτίζω’ then is experienced through union in Christ, the salvific understanding is integrated into the ontological, whereby the whole person is swallowed up in Christ, and therein the cycle is implemented to engrave experientially Christ in the person. To reduce baptism to a sacramental symbolic ritual or a means of grace or regeneration (Berkhof 477) toward the believer is to obscure the fundamental ontological reality of union.

viii. Regeneration
Regeneration reflects most accurately the New Covenant prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, referred to in preceding chapters, “and I will give you a [new] heart of flesh

---

208 Ac.19:3; Ro.6:3; Gal.3:27.
209 Mt.20:21-23; Lk.12:50.

365
and I will put My Spirit within you …”

Godhead in the believer and the believer in communion with Godhead in Christ finding the means of realization through regeneration, responding to the question, “How can one be likened to Christ?” Regeneration is the means to accomplishing the purpose of union and indwelling of Godhead, likeness. The early reformers held a restricted view of regeneration applying to will and intellect, because therein was the image of God (Berkhof 474), however, the whole ontological person is affected by regeneration, “regeneration is such a radical, pervasive, and efficacious transformation that it immediately registers itself in the conscious activity of the person concerned ...” (Murray Redemption 109). The same reformers held a broad view whereby regeneration and renewal were embraced in the various facets (Gore 145).

The language of the NT is varied; in John’s writings, for example, the use of ‘γεννάω’ drawing the parallel between natural birth and spiritual birth. The apostles Paul and Peter employ the term in a spiritual sense. The derivative ‘γενεά’ refers to generations in lineage, which does not hold particular significance for this treatment of regeneration. ‘γένος’ is employed to identify the origin of someone or something and to identify genre. Jesus dialogue with Nicodemus underscores the distinction of supernatural Spirit birth in relation to the natural order and Jewish religious identity, within this the concept of proselytism, “one that is made a proselyte, is like a child new born,” (Gill @2979). In this instance, Jesus corrects the notion that ‘conversion’ by: faith or adhesion, or intellectual, moral and spiritual ascent, is inadequate. Religious response or conversion

---

210 Ez.36:26-27.
211 Mt.2:1; Lk.1:13; Jn.16:21.
212 Jn.3:3-8; 1Jn.2:29; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1, 4, 18.
213 1Co.4:15; Gal.4:23-24, 29; 1Pe.2:9.
214 Of demons: Mt.17:21; of family: Ac.4:6; 13:26; of birth place: Ac.18:2, 24; of ethnicity: Mk.7:26; 2Co.11:26; Ph.3:5.
216 Gill suggests according to Lightfoot, that Nicodemus was the officer for water during the feasts, a possible contextual reason for Jesus’ use of the imagery (@2981).
to God in this way is void of regeneration, a necessary operation of the Spirit for the person in union in Christ; without union it is void of its purpose in Christ.

The reference to ‘water’ is among several interpretations particularly referring to water baptism (Murray Redemption 101). Water is used figuratively of the Holy Spirit and of regeneration,\(^{217}\) which suggests that both terms apply to the Spirit, one in symbol and specific function of washing and cleansing and the other to his Person.\(^{218}\)

A broader analysis of Scripture reveals an expansive comprehension of regeneration than the ‘new Spirit engendered birth’ albeit this birth establishes origin ‘ἐκ’ Spirit and the symbolic washing transformation of the old order. The passive voice, used widely of the believer\(^{219}\) in this context, explicitly identifies an active work of the Person of the Spirit. It cannot be humanly induced, only ontologically can it be experienced because Jesus lifts it out of religious understanding, “there is no room for human co-operation … it produces new life … man, made alive with Christ …” (Berkhof 465).

Etymologically, Scripture reveals that Jesus’ experience of being is directly replicated on the believer, “beginning in the ‘μορφή’ God … taking hold of the ‘μορφή’ becoming a slave in the ‘ὁμοίωμα’ of men” (TLT Ph.2:6-7). ‘μορφή’ is the essential, intrinsic, inherent nature or substance which in Christ designates his perfect divinity and humanity; in contrast to ‘σχῆμα’ the antithesis referring to all that is transient, external appearance and shape.\(^{220}\) Paul appeals to the Galatians that Christ be ‘μορφόω’ in them.\(^{221}\) If Christ is the substance of divinity and Godhead, then regeneration causes indwelling of Christ substantially in the believer. This text also contradicts the premise that the ‘μορφόω’ of Christ in a believer is not a singular initial supernatural act of the Spirit but rather is an ongoing relationship. Berkhof affirms, “[regeneration] is an instantaneous change of man’s nature, affecting at once the whole man … it is not a gradual process like sanctification … (468) “… a man cannot be more or less regenerated; he is either dead

\(^{217}\) Jn.4:14; 7:37-39; Tit.3:5; 1Co.6:11; 1Pe.1:22.

\(^{218}\) Ps.51:10-11; Ez.36:25-26.

\(^{219}\) Ro.6:4-5; 12:2; 2Co.3:18; Gal.4:19; Ep.4:22-24; Col.3:10.

\(^{220}\) ‘μορφή’ ‘σχῆμα’ TGEL 2016.

\(^{221}\) Gal.2:20.
or alive spiritually.” (Ibid. 536) to which Grudem agrees, “it is an instantaneous event. It happens only once. (701). In Paul’s address to the Galatian believers, the ‘μορφή’ of Christ has been lost due to their return to Law rather than remaining in Christ and in Spirit. Paul expresses a sense of engendering paternity, \(^{222}\) in this context it is not he who engenders human nature, rather it is Christ, in the Spirit’s workings. Regeneration therefore has a beginning, but it is written into a continuous process whereby if a change of source occurs, as with the Galatians, the regenerative source in Christ and the Spirit is lost, reducing to another state of being. The substance and nature of Christ is then to be metamorphosed in the believer, transformation into a permanent state of existence, the new humanity in Christ.

In the same way that Christ took ‘ὁμοίωμα’ of men, \(^{223}\) so in Christ the believer is, “… predestined ‘σύμμορφος’ to the ‘εἰκών’ of the Son …” (TLT Ro.8:29). The substance and nature of the believer is transformed by union to Christ the Son in His nature. The antithesis ‘συσχηματίζω’\(^{224}\) describes what is transient and changeable, conform to trend or mode. The verb in middle and passive voice indicates that this is a collaborative or passive subjected action; contrasted with the permanent and durable essential nature in Christ, applied in transformation.\(^{225}\) The intensified verb ‘μεταμορφόω’, \(^{226}\) is employed in Jesus transfiguration\(^{227}\) where potentially the fullness of His nature is tangibly seen, and the voice of approbation heard. While He remained physical and recognizable, He emanated the glory of His divine nature.\(^{228}\) According to Barnes, “all this splendour and glory was a change in appearance only” (@558), Gill elaborates, “he did not put off his clothes, nor were the nature and substance, and fashion of them changed; but such rays of glory darted through his flesh, and through his clothes, as made them as bright and shining, as the light of the sun …” (Ibid.).

\(^{222}\) See also 1Co.4:15.

\(^{223}\) Ro.8:3.

\(^{224}\) Ro.12:2; 1Pe.1:14.

\(^{225}\) ‘Συσχηματίζω’ TGE\text{L} 2016.

\(^{226}\) Mt.17:2; Ro.12:2; 2Co.3:18.


\(^{228}\) Jn.17:5; Heb.1:3.
Similarly, the term is applied as an imperative to the believer, “be transfigured or metamorphosed” (TLT Ro.12:2). In this regard “… we all having faces been unveiled, reflecting in a mirror the glory of the Lord we are metamorphosed permanently ‘ἀπό’ the glory to glory even as ‘ἀπό’ the Lord the Spirit” (TLT 2Co.3:18). The active ministry of Christ and Spirit, both in perfect oneness and unity of purpose, confirms that this is a unique but continuous work in the believer. It begins with a disclosure of all that the believer is, and the ability to see according to the ‘reflected image’ of Christ (‘κατοπτρίζωμαι’). The participle suggests a continuous process, an ever-increasing measure of the glory of the image of Christ is [re]generate in the believer. To circumscribe this reality of Christ to a reflected external image, is to undermine the significance of being transfigured, metamorphosed, or transformed permanently in Christ, by Christ and the Spirit. The reflection is not similarity, but resemblance where in the perfect and infinite glory of Christ is generated in the believer whereby the incarnate nature of Christ, albeit in a finite human being, incrementally reflects the glory of His person and nature. Nowhere is the glory of the nature of Christ more evident than in His transfiguration experience; the true substance and nature of Christ regenerate finitely in the believer in the New Age of Christ and the Spirit in union. On these grounds, regeneration is void of human cooperation it is not a moral or dynamic change however radical, rather it is a new metaphysical state unknown to those outside of Christ (Berkhof 465, 467).

The response to ‘συσχηματίζω’, from Romans chapter twelve, is not combative of external environment or context, it is an inner regenerative transformation, the biblical response. The context of writing these texts is to those who are already in Christ, and therefore regeneration cannot and should not be limited to an initial divine act to do so is to undermine the significance of a process where in conformity to the image and nature of Christ is frustrated, the believer is disempowered, the effect is a Gospel of ideas void of power to change. Regeneration advocates a Gospel of experiential and demonstrable regeneration; it is the unique effect of ontology in Christ.

In Romans twelve Paul considers renewal as a means of regeneration in process as he does in his letter to Titus, and as Jesus understands in the Gospels.229 In Titus, Paul repeats God’s intention, “… according to his mercy he saves us through the washing of

229 Ro.12:2; Tit.3:5; Mt.19:28.
‘παλιγγενεσία’ and ‘ἀνακάινωσις’ of the Holy Spirit” (TLT Tit.3:5). ‘παλιγγενεσία’ from ‘πάλιν’ to repeat or renew action and ‘γένεσις’ of source or origin of existence, of birth, translated as re-generate, re-new, re-create or restore as the means to affect permanently and gloriously a person’s nature.\(^{230}\) Berkhof defines,

Regeneration consists in the implanting of the principle of the new spiritual life in man, in a radical change of the governing disposition of the soul, which, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, gives birth to a life that moves in a Godward direction.

In principle this change affects the whole man (468);

Which gives preference to a sense of renewal, whereas Paul’s text undeniably refers to regeneration and renewal conjointly. Regeneration inclusive of renewal defines the creation of life and the transforming of existing life. Paul, to ‘παλιγγενεσία’, enjoins ‘ἀνακάινωσις’ from ‘ἀνα’, meaning in the middle of, and ‘καινός’ referring to a new quality of life, from a new source.\(^{231}\) To the incarnate nature of Christ in the believer, both are expressed; both terms share in definition, to re-create. The former strengthens origin and source, enjoining the new quality of life that proceeds. The latter emphasizes particularly the process that is not to say that the former is defined by an event, it is not. Jesus will apply this latter term to the restoration or renewing of all things in the Kingdom reign of Christ. The process of recreation into which the believer in Christ is introduced, of which he or she is a first fruit, is the same process whereby the entire universe will be restored. It is for consideration whether this will be an event and or a subsequent process, or simply a continual process, consummate in Christ’s reign.

The New Creation in Christ is the nature produced by regeneration and as such, is foundational to this truth. The new creation in Christ is the aggregation of: reconciliation, redemption, salvation, regeneration, and death, burial, and resurrection in the baptismal understanding. “Because if we have become born together of the same origin in the likeness, of his death, moreover also the resurrection will be; this thing we are knowing by personal experience (TLT Ro.6:5). An examination of three critical texts will establish the nature of the ‘new creation’.

\(^{230}\) ‘παλιγγενεσία’ TGLEL 2016.

\(^{231}\) ‘ἀνακάινωσις’ TGLEL 2016.
“Therefore, if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation. The old has passed away; behold, the new has come.” (ESV 2Co.5:17). The departure point is the believer in Christ. The ‘καινη κτισις’ reflects the regenerate and spiritual believer.

The ‘καινός’ in this context refers to a new quality of life that is created in the believer because of new source and nature. The ‘ἀρχαῖος’ refers to the natural, original, or primal quality of someone, something, or circumstances. This natural or creatural order is being replaced. The, ‘καινη κτισις’, as with the new condition in contrast to the ‘ἀρχαῖος’, refers to a new quality of life without precedent, implicitly better or superior to the old. The ‘ἀρχαῖος’ is the natural person by their origins, without adequate or inherent means to change themselves. The text is often applied to a fixed and specific moment in time when a believer is no longer ‘ἀρχαῖος’ and in an instant becomes ‘καινός’. The use of the second aorist verb is not perceived as bound to time: past present or future, but one or several significant events. It is plausible that this truth may apply to an initial event and that it inaugurates a mode of life that enjoins with the death-burial-resurrection mode. It is suggested that the term describes a continuing process of definite events that are by nature regenerative according to the new creation. This provides a homogeneous reading of all the relevant texts.

“… you have put off the old self with its practices and have put on the new self, which is being renewed in knowledge after the image of its creator” (ESV Col.3:9-10).

The putting off and putting on, is about the nature of ‘παλαιώς’, which refers to what is used and worn out.232 In view are the states of man that are other than ‘πνευματικός’ and in Christ. The insufficient and the obsolete through use, renders ineffectual, no longer fit for purpose. The ‘νέος’ is brand new, recent, newborn. This term is qualified in that nothing remains ‘νέος’ in this way. From the beginning, it then ages with time and use. In the text, the dimension of ‘renewal’ finds purpose in feeding continually the ‘νέος’ in process, yet the thought underlines the importance of the point of regeneration through the indwelling Christ and action of the Spirit, implanting through their Persons a ‘νέος’ life, for it does not exist outside of the indwelling Christ.

The putting off and on of the ‘παλαιώς’ and ‘νέος’ man, are in the middle voice and suggest a collaborative work between the believer and Godhead. The act of renewal is a

---

232 See Jesus usage: Mt.9:26-27; Mk.2:21-22; Lk.5:36-39.
continuous work uniquely of Christ into the passive believer, “Christ is all and in all” (ESV Col.3:11), thereby putting the believer before the incompatibility of any other mode of existence. This concurs with Paul’s parallel thought to the Ephesians, “… to put off your old self, which belongs to your former manner of life and is corrupt through deceitful desires, and to be renewed in the spirit of your minds, and to put on the new self, created after the likeness of God in true righteousness and holiness” (ESV Ep.4:22-24). In this text the mode of the new existence replicates that given to the Colossians and the Corinthians. Paul contrasts ‘ἀρχαῖος’ life with ‘κανόνς’ life.

This vision of regeneration in event and process in Trinity, reflects the divine means because of their Persons and their natures, whereby the glorious image, a reflection of the nature of Christ God’s glory, is being created and perfected in the finite human being. This is the mode of life of the ontological existence of conformity in Christ.

ix. Justice, Justification, Righteousness

An etymological synthesis of the terms in the NT to define and describe this work of justice and justification are principally found in the same root family of which three key terms are found in the following passage:

But at this very moment separate from the law righteousness (‘δικαιοσύνη’) of God has been demonstrated, being witnessed to by the Law and the Prophets; moreover the righteousness (‘δικαιοσύνη’) of God through faith Jesus Christ to all and on all those believing absolutely not because a distinction is, because all have missed the mark and are wanting of the glory of God, being justified (‘δικαιόω’) the gift [of] Him, grace through the redemption Christ Jesus who set publically before God a propitiation through the faith his blood, to demonstrate his righteousness through the passing over233 the sins being committed previously, in the toleration of God towards His righteousness (‘δικαιοσύνη’) demonstrated in the present season Him to be Just (‘δίκαιος’) and justifying (‘δικαιώσω’) this Jesus out of faith (TLT Ro.3:21-26).

Each of the three terms contain meaning that is common, the integrity and character of a person as just, righteous, or not. ‘δίκαιος’ refers to moral quality whereby a person is

---

233 ‘πάρεσις’ disregarding, letting pass.
integrally righteous, characterized by innocence, an absence of guilt, fault, or blame in thought, emotion and action, “One conform in his actions to his constitutionally just character” (Zodhiates 457-458). This absence of ambiguity between being and doing defines integrity.\(^{234}\)

The usage is employed of non-salvific moral character,\(^{235}\) as evidenced by the righteous who will not enter the Kingdom and the righteous who will.\(^{236}\) The term applies to those perceiving Christ to be righteous\(^{237}\) “… There is none righteous, no, not one … (NKJV Ro.3:10), indicates that even moral righteousness in a blameless character is lacking when faced with a righteous God, it is the product rather than the origin,\(^{238}\) as Murray insists, “… the emphasis upon divine action would make it … inconsistent for any activity of which we are the agents to be given any instrumental or efficiency in connection with justification” (Redemption 135). Therefore, righteousness or justice finds its origin out with a person. The term is used to qualify God’s nature and that of Christ,\(^{239}\) as it is used to describe the nature of the believer, “the ‘δίκαιος’ live out of faith” (TLT Gal.3:11).\(^{240}\)

‘δικαιοσύνη’ likewise reflects moral character and action. God is demonstrating his own Righteousness. His righteousness is his uprightness (Zodhiates 459); it also emphasizes a standard of justice that is not one’s own but of another, in this case God who is Just, who is His own standard and that of believers (458). As human integrity in justice has been mentioned, this term portrays God’s integrity, revealing and demonstrating his justice in character and in act.\(^{241}\) Likewise, the Holy Spirit is righteous and acts accordingly;\(^{242}\)

\(^{234}\) Ac.4:19; 10:22; Jn.5:30; 7:24; Ro.2:13; Ph.4:18; Ro.6:13, 16; 1Ti.6:11; 2Ti.2:22; 1Jn.2:29; 3:7.

\(^{235}\) Mt.1:19; 13:17; Lk.1:6, 17; 23:50.

\(^{236}\) Mt.25:37, 46.

\(^{237}\) Mt.27:19; Lk.23:47.

\(^{238}\) 1Co.15:34; 1Th.2:10; Tit.2:12.

\(^{239}\) Jn.17:25; Ac.3:14; Ro.3:26.

\(^{240}\) See also Ro.1:17; Heb.10:38.

\(^{241}\) Ro.1:17; Ro.3:21, 26.

\(^{242}\) Jn.16:8; Gal.5:5; Ro.14:17 ‘εν πνεύματι αγιῳ’; 1Co.6:11 ‘εν το πνεύματι’; 1Ti.3:16 ‘εδικαιωθη εν πνεύματι’.
Christ is represented as Just and Righteous in His Person,\textsuperscript{243} which means that He is perfectly just, He is justice, “… being justified (‘δικαιόω’) the gift [of] Him …” (Ibid.), suggests that the ‘δωρεάν’ is the Person of Christ in His righteous nature.\textsuperscript{244} The gift of Righteousness is synonymous with the gift of Christ indwelling the believer.

‘δικαιόω’ means to make, show or render righteous, that is just and innocent. The verb ending ‘όω’ is indicative of “bringing out that which a person is …” (Zodhiates 462), “to declare just what is just in character” (464). In the usage of the word in the NT this tension between ‘being’ and ‘expressing’ or ‘doing’ in accordance with the true nature, reinforces the integrity and the nature of justice.\textsuperscript{245}

This being the case the definition of ‘imputation’ (‘λογίζομαι’) requires clarification as ‘δικαιοσύνη’ is employed to described Abraham’s righteousness by faith.\textsuperscript{246} The term ‘λογίζομαι’\textsuperscript{247} has several meanings:

\begin{enumerate}
\item to take an inventory,\textsuperscript{248}
\item to calculate or reckon,\textsuperscript{249}
\item to weigh up in the balance,\textsuperscript{250}
\item to gather together all the reasons,\textsuperscript{251}
\item to conclude, judge or decide.\textsuperscript{252}
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{243} Ro.10:4; 1Co.1:30; Ac.17:31.
\textsuperscript{244} ‘δωρεάν’ applied to the “Person of Christ Ro.5:15; Ep.4:7.
\textsuperscript{245} Mt.11:19; Lk.18:14; Ro.5:1; 1Co.4:4; Ro.8:4.
\textsuperscript{246} Ro.4:3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 22.
\textsuperscript{247} For the most part translated as ‘counted’ or ‘accounted’ or ‘imputed’ in the NKJV. The more recent ESV generally translates as ‘count’.
\textsuperscript{248} Ro.2:3; 2Co.10:2.
\textsuperscript{249} Mk.15:28; Ro.4:4.
\textsuperscript{250} Mk.11:31; Ph.4:8.
\textsuperscript{251} Ro.6:11; 2:26.
\textsuperscript{252} Ro.81:18; 3:28.
There are multiple possibilities for the references to ‘λογίζομαι’:

verse three, five, and nine: i, ii, iv, v
verse four: ii verse six and twenty-two: i, v
verse eleven: iv, v

Non-salvific passages are applied to personal relations, personal dispositions, and moral character. As Paul looks at himself, he uses this term to evaluate the evidence of his life and principles in the exercise of ministry.

... Consider us, as servants of Christ and stewards … (NKJV 1Co.4:1) Not that we are competent of ourselves to think of anything as of ourselves, but our competency is of God, (DBY 2Co.3:5) For I consider that I am not at all inferior to the most eminent apostles, (NKJV 2Co.11:5). For though I might desire to boast, I will not be a fool; for I will speak the truth. But I refrain, lest anyone should think of me above what he sees me to be or hears from me, (NKJV 2Co.12:6).

These exemplary texts show that Paul seeks an accurate understanding of Himself in spiritual and human terms, void of exaggeration or of underestimation. The point being that the evidence demonstrated by him is congruous with his estimation of Himself. This is a perfect example spiritual integrity, what I am, is what I say, is what I do, in stark contrast to the Pharisees and scribes ‘reasoning’ regarding Jesus’ question concerning John the Baptist.

In the domain of morality and character several Bible texts exemplify the meaning:

And do you think this, O man, you who judge those practicing such things, and doing the same, that you will escape the judgment of God? (NKJV Ro.2:3). Finally,

253 2Ti.4:16; 1Pe.5:12.
254 Ro.8:18; 1Co.4:1; 2Co.3:5; 10:2, 7, 11; 11:5; 12:6; Ph.3:13.
255 Mk.11:31; Ro.2:3; 14:14; 1Co.13:5, 11; Ph.4:8.
256 Ex. Isa.44:6-8.
257 Mk.11:31-33 “And they reasoned among themselves saying, “If we say, ‘From heaven,’ He will say, ‘Why then did you not believe him?’ But shall we say, ‘From man’?” – They were afraid of the people… So, they answered Jesus, “We do not know.”
brothers, whatever is true, whatever is honourable, whatever is just, whatever is pure, whatever is lovely, whatever is commendable, if there is anything worthy of praise, think about these things, (ESV Ph.4:8).

The principle is the same as the integrity applied by Paul in his case, the emphasis being upon the true nature of one’s disposition weighed in the balance with what that person says or does, thereby revealing what is in contradiction, which is hypocrisy. There are notions of: gathering together and weighing up in the balance, of the nature and quality of someone, or something said or done, taking an inventory or estimating, and of a judgment of the balance. This should be born in mind when considering the salvific references, the majority of which are found in Romans chapter 4, (although there are others258). They are summarized in the phrase “Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.” (NKJV Ro.4:3). Verse nine clearly states, “For we say that faith was accounted to Abraham for righteousness” (NKJV). The text also makes it clear that it was not just for Abraham but for us “… to those who are of the faith of Abraham, who is father of us all,” (TLT Ro.4:16). Faith, analogous with that of Abraham,259 is measured, inventoried, and in Abraham’s case, bore all the right characteristics for a ‘righteous’ appellation. In the same way God has, in Jesus Christ, demonstrated His righteousness.260 G.E. Ladd comments, “… Paul never expressly states that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to believers” (491). To substantiate this statement, the term employed here ‘dikaiοδ’ (‘δικαιοσύνη’) refers to righteous character not the act of God justifying, which is found in verse twenty ‘dikaiοσις’ (‘δικαιώσις’); a term employed twice in the NT.261

The transactional inferences consider that the redemption at the cross caused Christ’s justice to be ‘imputed’ to us. While it is true that salvation, particularly justification, is utterly reliant upon the finished and perfect expiation and propitiation of Christ, the ‘λογίζομαι’ points to a reality that is internal to mankind. Likewise, the positional view

---

258 See also Ro.3:28; 4:5, 9, 11, 22, 23; Gal.3:6; Ja.2:23.

259 Verses 16-21 expound the exact nature of that faith.


261 Ro.4:25; 5:18.
whereby the believer passively receives Christ’s own righteousness as an automatic attribution; void of incarnation, is in part true, but fails to build an adequate ontological vision of salvation.

Given the definitions of righteousness described and the meaning of ‘λογίζομαι’ it is difficult to impose a notion of God in Christ who is Righteousness attributing a justice of ‘covering’ while leaving the human nature unaffected. Murray says, “justification does not mean to make righteous, or good, or holy, or upright” (Redemption 125). Grudem equally in referring to humanity, “if justification changed us internally and then declared us to be righteous based on how good we actually were, then we could never be declared perfectly righteous in this life” (727). Yet Paul affirms robustly that sin in the body opposes righteousness.262 The text of Romans four suggests that God looks at the qualities of Abraham’s faith, of which there are seven, and estimates Him righteous on the basis of the quality of his faith in God, “through also was estimated him to equity” (TLT Ro.4:22). When the justification is considered forensically or judicially, it is separated from effect upon human nature, particularly reflected in the Reformed view (Murray Redemption 129; Berkhof 514; Boice 419; Grudem 724). This creates a dualism of imputed justice without the implications of union within Trinity who are Just, Justice, Justifier and Righteous.

‘δικαίωσις’ is only employed twice in Romans,263

Absolutely not was written but for him alone, that it was estimated him but even also for us, whom it is about to be estimated, those believing on the raising up Jesus the Lord of us out of dead, who was surrendered through our lapses into sin, and was raised up through the acquittal (‘δικαίωσις’) (TLT Ro.4:24-25).

And absolutely not as through one sinning, that the free gift truly because judgment out of one to condemnation moreover a grace gift out of many faults to righteousness (‘δικαίωσις’) (TLT Ro.5:18).

The term means, God declaring one free from guilt and acceptable to Him. While justification is demonstrated and rendered applicable through Christ’s propitiatory

262 Ro.6:16, 18-20; 8:10.

263 Ro.4:25; 5:18.
atonement to believers through faith in the person of Christ,\textsuperscript{264} “He made Him who knew no sin to be sin on our behalf, so that we might become the righteousness of God in Him” (NAS 2Co.5:21). This enables understanding that the resurrection is essential to the indwelling of Christ who is Just and Righteous, having accomplished the work of demonstrating the Father as Just and Justifier.\textsuperscript{265} He establishes that justification is ours as we are ‘in Christ’ in which His life becomes identified with ours, and ours with His (identification or incorporation); Christ’s acts are repeated in us (Zodhiates 468).

Paul relates justification as one product of grace,\textsuperscript{266} but the relationship of faith to justification is important to highlight. Paul refers to justification that finds its origin in faith,\textsuperscript{267} while other verses refer to faith as the means to justice,\textsuperscript{268} and further still, others that clearly put faith in the person of Christ Jesus.\textsuperscript{269}

“… [to] be found in Him, not having my own righteousness, which is from the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is from God by faith (NKJV Ph.3:9). Faith itself is not the origin of righteousness; faith requires an object, that is Christ. Faith in Christ is the means to union in Christ; union in Christ is the source of justice and justification demonstrated in the believer. He is Righteousness and as He manifests His nature in the believer, it is His Justice that is manifest, not of Law, nor of self, but Christ causing the believer to be the righteousness of God in Himself, (NKJV 2Co.5:21). Gore employs the terms “analytic justification” to refer to the inward effect of justification and “synthetic justification” to refer to the imputation of justice (158-159). However, the polarity is not resolved, the extremes of forensic justification that remains external and theoretical in application in reaction against the assumption of being righteous based on regeneration as a single act. The ontological thesis postulates the perfect righteousness of Christ in Trinity, but because of indwelling and union manifests

\textsuperscript{264} Ro.3:25; 5:9; 8:10; 1Pe.2:24.
\textsuperscript{265} Ro.3:26.
\textsuperscript{266} Ro.3:24; 5:17; Tit.3:5.
\textsuperscript{267} Ro.1:17; 3:26, 20; 5:1; Gal.2:16; 3:8, 11, 24.
\textsuperscript{268} Ro.3:22, 30; 4:13, 16; 5:1; Gal.2:16; Ph.3:9.
\textsuperscript{269} Ro.3:26; Gal.3:17, 26; Ph.3:9.
His justice in the believer. Union with Christ does not proceed from righteousness in Christ (Berkhof 522), the inverse is however true. The positional perception that the forensic view expresses “justification is an instantaneous legal act of God in which he thinks of our sins as forgiven and Christ’s righteousness as belonging to us, and he declares us to be righteous in his sight … [but] does not make someone good internally” (Grudem 723-724). In this view justification has no effect and seemingly no power to affect the condition of a man in relation to sin or guilt, whether singular or repetitive. The result is not much improved than under the law and diminishes the effect of Christ’s atonement in justification. This weakness in judicial or forensic justification admits, in and of itself, that it is insufficient to explain the effect of Christ’s justifying work at the cross.

Based on the biblical exegesis in this section, the ontological view seeks to resolve the bi-polarity of divine imputation and inherent human nature, whereby the perfect righteousness of Christ, of which every human is void, through the indwelling union with Christ, He who is Righteousness and Justice, generates progressively His nature into the believer whereby that which belongs to Christ is that which is engraved into the seven constituent parts of the believer. If justification addresses guilt, then innocence results for there is no condemnation for those in Christ Jesus.270

The ontological proposition addresses the dualism of justified and yet sinner because Christ in the new existence in Him, in Trinity, has for a unique source His person in whom is found righteousness, of whom Paul says we become righteousness. It is in the ontological thesis that conciliation occurs and the integrity of God and the believer are preserved, in the words of Thomas Aquinas, “[justification is] … something substantial, into the human soul … by which the soul is lifted to a new level or a higher order of being” (quoted in Berkhof 529).

Peace is Christ, produced in Christ and in reconciliation, relational peace is experienced in Christ both individually and corporately.271 Peace is created in Christ in the believer through justification.272 This peace is propitiatory in character, God being satisfied in His

---

270 Ro.8:1.
271 Col.1:19-20; Ep.2:14-17.
272 Ro.5:1; Jm.3:18.
Justice and righteous requirements in Christ. The peace of justification authenticates union in Christ, and His justice and righteousness established in the believer.\textsuperscript{273}

\textbf{x. Sanctification}

‘\textgammaio\varsigma’ primarily defined by separation and consecration used in moral, religious, and ritual contexts,\textsuperscript{274} with reference to “sharing God’s purity and abstaining from earth’s defilement” (Zodhiates 70). This term refers to the Spirit, personalizes divine qualities in Him. It is also applied to Jesus Christ,\textsuperscript{275} and to the Father.\textsuperscript{276} The word is also used of: angels\textsuperscript{277} particularly of John the Baptist,\textsuperscript{278} apostles\textsuperscript{279} and prophets.\textsuperscript{280} The term is employed to describe physically, the earthly and heavenly Jerusalem, the temple, and the land.\textsuperscript{281} It also characterises the church,\textsuperscript{282} in Acts and the epistles, believers are greeted and exhorted as saints. The term sets apart and in doing so accentuates the central aspect of ‘distinctiveness’. This is not a reaction against, nor protective separation which would be indicative of deep insecurity; ‘\textgammaio\varsigma’ refers to a distinctiveness in nature demonstrated consequentially in being and expression.

‘\textgammai\sigma\taueta\varsigma’ refers to believers being trained or corrected to be partakers in Godhead’s holiness that is the attribute of holy nature;\textsuperscript{283} the distinctiveness should be kept in view. Peter echoes this thought, “He calling you [is] holy become holy in all your manner of life on this account … Become holy because I Am holy” (TLT 1Pe.1:15-16). The threefold cry of ‘holy’ from around the throne of God, reinforces the distinctive message,

\textsuperscript{273} Jn.16:33; Ph.4:7; Col.3:15; 1Th.5:23; 2Th.3:16; 2Pe.3:14.

\textsuperscript{274} ‘\textgammaio\varsigma’ TGEL 2016; SECB 2015.

\textsuperscript{275} Mk.1:24; Lk.1:35; 4:34; Ac.3:14; 4:27, 30; 1Jn.2:20; Rev.3:7.

\textsuperscript{276} Jn.17:11; Lk.1:49; 1Pe.1:15-16; Rev.4:8.

\textsuperscript{277} Mt.25:31; Mk.8:38; Ac.10:22; Rev.14:10.

\textsuperscript{278} Mk.6:20.

\textsuperscript{279} Ep.3:5; Rev.18:20.

\textsuperscript{280} Lk.1:70; Ac.3:21; Ep.3:5; 2Pe.3:2; Rev.18:20; 22:6.

\textsuperscript{281} Mt.4:5; 24:15; 27:53; Ac.6:13; 7:33; 21:28; 2Pe.1:18; Rev.11:2; 21:2.

\textsuperscript{282} 1Co.3:17; 14:33; Ep.2:21; 5:27.

\textsuperscript{283} Heb.12:10.
God you are different, very different, so completely different; holiness is divine alterity. The passive voice in the first ‘become’ underlines that it is uniquely the divine alterity that is in view. The middle voice in the second mention indicates that becoming distinctive is a collaborative exercise, “… fulfilling holiness …” (TLT 2Co.7:1). Christ is holiness or sanctification in his Person, in the same way that God and the Spirit are.284 Paul reminds the Corinthians that in Christ and originating in Him is the holiness of God; he continues, qualifying the appellation ‘ἀγιος’ attributed to believers, as appropriate to those having been sanctified (‘ἁγιάζω’) in Christ Jesus.285 Where Grudem affirms it is through spiritual disciplines: bible reading, prayer, worship, witness, fellowship and self control that holiness increases (756) or through participation in the sacraments (Berkhof 530), that is to put holiness within human striving. It is Christ in the believer who makes Him holy with God’s holiness wherein Christ causes believers to be partakers of His holy nature.286 Murray rightly perceives sanctification “… is not achieved by a process, nor by our striving or working to that end. It is achieved once for all by union with Christ and the regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit” (151). He sets out the relationship to regeneration, although sanctification is still perceived as an event rather than process. The term ‘ἁγιασμός’ refers to unequivocal requirement for the believer to be what Christ is, with an emphasis on conduct that is contrary.287 The Holy Spirit is perceived as the One operating sanctification in the believer.288 In the ontological conception, sanctification is often confused with regeneration, “whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image of God” (Gore 161), Grudem uses second Corinthians chapter three verse eighteen, which clearly is [re]generative in a sanctification application (747). In the post-reformation Berkhof describes this “as a moral or re-creative work, changing the inner nature of man” (530), in response to the rationalist view of moral self-betterment, exemplified in Kant. It is regeneration that transforms human nature, whereas sanctification communicates a divine destiny to distinctiveness: from eternity past, 

284 1Co.1:30.
285 1Co.1:2.
286 Heb.12:10.
287 Ro.6:19-22; Ep.5:3; 1Th.4:3-4, 7.
288 2Th.2:13; 1Pe.1:2; Ro.15:16 ‘ἁγιάζω’ making holy, distinctive.
chosen and known, in sanctification: to blamelessness, to salvation, and to atonement.\textsuperscript{289}

From eternity this perspective transcends time to Christ’s ‘παρουσία’ for which the distinctiveness will have produced blamelessness.\textsuperscript{290}

It is clear upon the biblical evidence presented that making distinctive or holy, and sanctified, precedes atonement, redemption, salvation, and justification.\textsuperscript{291} Holiness is operative throughout the ‘ordo salutis’ and is the resulting Christian maturity. Distinctiveness should be perceived above all as an immediate and continuous work in Christ; a setting apart to every aspect of salvation that is in Christ. Ontologically, the distinctiveness of Godhead’s nature in Christ is generated in the believer. He/she thereby shares the alterity of God because of origin and source in Christ, in Godhead. Any resulting mode of life is only a measured expression of the continuous distinguishing work of Trinity indwelling. Ontological sanctification is measured and increases by the degree of union of every believer – a dynamic relationship. Similarly, church is organically the extension of the Trinitarian holiness at work in every believer in Christ. The collective experience intensifies and is tangibly demonstrated in the world.\textsuperscript{292}

xi. Cleansing

‘καθαρός’ refers to something or someone clean, pure or clear. The ethical dimension refers to nature or character with an absence of corruption, sin, guilt, falsity, or admixture. The verb ‘καθαρίζω’ reflects the same meaning with the added notion of purging.\textsuperscript{293} The other derivatives emphasize the ritual and expiatory aspects of cleansing and washing.\textsuperscript{294} There is ontological significance in distinguishing cleansing from the atonement. While

\textsuperscript{289} Ep.1:4; 2Th.2:13; 1Pe.1:2.
\textsuperscript{290} Ep.1:14; Col.1:22; 1Th.3:13; 5:23; 2Ti.1:9; collectively of church Ep.5:27; See also Ph.2:15; 1:10 ‘un-blameable and unadulterated’; 1Ti.6:14; 2Pe.3:14.
\textsuperscript{291} 1Co.1:2; 6:11; 2Th.2:13; Heb.10:10; 1Pe.1:2
\textsuperscript{292} 1Co.3:17; Ep.2:21; Ep.5:26-27; 1Pe.2:5, 9.
\textsuperscript{293} ‘καθαρός’ and ‘καθαρίζω’ \textit{TGEL} 2016; \textit{SECB} 2015.
\textsuperscript{294} ‘Καθαίρω’ cleanse or purge from impurity Heb.10:2; ‘καθαρότης’ Heb.9:13; ‘καθαρισμός’ Heb.1:3; 2Pe.1:9; ‘ἐκκαθαίρω’ thoroughly 1Co.5:7; 2Ti.2:21; ‘λούω’ to wash clean Heb.10:22; Rev.1:5; ‘λουτρόν’ Ep.5:26; Tit.3:5; ‘ῥαντίζω’ sprinkle to cleanse Heb.9:19, 21; 10:22.
the term does not figure in the ‘ordo salutis,’ it holds particular significance. The blood of Christ obtaining eternal redemption is central to ‘cleanliness’, washing, or purifying.

And not through the blood of goats and calves, but through His own blood, He entered the holy place once for all, having obtained eternal redemption … how much more will the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without blemish to God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? (NAS Heb.9:12, 14).

The purpose of Christ’s offering of Himself without fault, and because of the perfection and eternal quality of the offering, is able to cleanse the physical and the non-physical in a person. 295 If Christ is without fault and spotless, the ontological inference is that the believer, cleansed by Christ, will become without fault and blameless, if Christ is “to cleanse us from all unrighteousness” (NKJV 1Jn.1:9), as Grudem states, “God’s own absolute moral purity is the standard toward which we are to aim and the standard for which God holds us accountable” (751). The writer of Hebrews in contrasting the Levitical rituals for cleansing and sanctifying states, “they not have ceased to be offered, since the worshipers, having once been cleansed, would no longer have any consciousness of sin?” (ESV Heb.10:2), implicitly suggesting that, having been purified through Christ’s blood the consciousness of sin is no longer. This advocates the believer being without: guilt, sin, defilement, falsity, admixture and impurity. Peter makes the connection between living as a partaker of the divine nature producing good character and attribute in the believer, but clearly states the contrary, “for he who lacks these things is shortsighted, even to blindness, and has forgotten that he was cleansed from his old sins” (NKJV 2Pe.1:9). If purification has not purged guilt, sin, blame, and fault, then the nature of Christ will not be demonstrated in the believer which is the intent of purification in His blood. It is not that a person tries to produce good character and attribute, it is uniquely the benefit that Christ’s nature produces in the believer. There are several references to character or internal purity. It is not these characteristics that create purity and cleansing, they are the product of the cleansing of Christ.296

295 Heb.10:22; 2Co.7:1; Jm.4:8.

296 Mt.5:8; Ac.20:26; 2Pe.2:3-8; of love 1Ti.1:5; 1Pe.1:22; of justice, faith, love, peace 2Ti.2:22; Ac.15:9; 1Ti.3:9.
Paul, like Peter, addresses the dilemma whereby the purging and purifying of Christ has not fulfilled its purpose, “do you not know that a little leaven leavens the whole lump? Therefore, purge out the old leaven, that you may be a new lump, since you truly are unleavened. For indeed Christ, our Passover, was sacrificed for us” (NKJV 1Co.5:6-7). On the basis that Christ accomplished cleansing, having done his part, the believer is also active in purging or cleansing him/herself in light of hypocrisy.\footnote{297} Paul stresses the inconsistencies and incompatibility of the ‘old’, contextually referring to sexual sins, but with broader intent.\footnote{298} It is not the impotence of Christ’s cleansing, rather it is the believer who has not experienced the full measure of Christ’s work from within and therefore by necessity requires process.\footnote{299} The Word of God is also a means of washing as is faith in Christ.\footnote{300} The scriptural witness is that purification, like sanctification, holds unique importance and also inscribes into the whole ‘ordo salutis’. Murray for example states, “Regeneration … must cleanse from sin as well as recreate in righteousness” (Redemption 102).

The biblical texts do not explicitly provide an order but they do relate relationship with other aspects of union in Christ: having been sanctified one cleanses him or herself;\footnote{301} from atonement a person purifies themselves;\footnote{302} cleansing accompanied by character transformation confirms election;\footnote{303} sanctifying and purifying are simply not dissociable. Murray confirms, “the purificatory and the renovative must not be regarded as separable

\footnote{297} 2Co.7:1; 2Ti.2:21; Jn.4:8; Tit.1:15; Ac.15:9
\footnote{298} Mt.23:25-26; 2Ti.2:22-26; Tit.1:10-16.
\footnote{299} Employing the verb in the participle: Ep.5:26; Ac.15:9; 2Co.7:1; 2Ti.2:21; Rev.1:5.
\footnote{300} Ep.5:26; Jn.15:3; Ac.15:9 (TLT) “faith purifying their hearts….”.
\footnote{301} 2Ti.2:21.
\footnote{302} 1Co.5:7.
\footnote{303} 2Pe.2:9-10.
events” (Ibid. 105). Atonement bringing redemption and purification to His people; likewise regeneration through the means of washing.

The ontological cleansing has a special relationship in tension between sin and union in Christ; especially in the light of the previous references to the impotence of the believer, whereby resigning to dualism, such as Berkhof observes in justification,

\[\text{God \ldots removes the guilt but not he culpability of sin, that is He removes the sinner’s just amenability to punishment, but not the inherent guiltiness of whatever sins he may continue to perform. The latter remains and \ldots always produces in believers, a feeling of guilt and separation from God, of sorrow, of repentance \ldots} (515).\]

This leads to contradiction regarding all aspects of the ‘ordo salutis’ in that the positional imputation approach estranges the believer from the experience of salvation in a perfecting vision of humanity, as previously developed as the state of the ‘πνευματικός’ believer. The raison d’être of the ‘ordo salutis’ is to address directly sin in the body. The divine seed does not correlate, they are opposites, “remaining indwelling sin is therefore the contradiction of all that he is as a regenerate person and son of God. It is the contradiction of God Himself, after whose image he has been recreated” (Murray Redemption 152-153). The purpose of salvation in Christ is to extirpate sin from man’s ontological being in order that the divine seed may produce sinlessness for the παρουσία of Christ. Sinlessness is distinct from being perfected, “The excuse of 1Jn3:6 relates to sin not to perfection. It is the incompatibility of God indwelling and sin being exercised…” (Grudem 751).

The former is the proof of the indwelling Christ and the efficacity of His washing and purifying in the believer. The latter is proof that sin has been expelled and that human and divine nature of the believer is in the process of being perfected by the causal and agency

304 Ep.5:26; Jm.4:8.
305 Tit.2:14.
306 Tit.3:5.
307 Ro.6:5-6, 12; 8:10; 1Co.6:18-20.
308 Gal.3:3; Ep.4:13; 2Co.12:9; Col.1:28; 4:12; Heb.12:23; 1Pe.5:10
of the indwelling Trinity, producing their nature in the believer. The demands of
sinlessness do not reside in human effort but in the power and authority of the indwelling
Christ to apply salvation. The ontological view disagrees with “the justified man remains
a sinner, thought a justified sinner” (Berkhof 514). The use of Romans seven to describe
the normative state of the Christian in turmoil and incessant warfare with sin (539) is to
deny the benefits of no condemnation because the law of the Spirit in Christ Jesus…”309
(Gore 163).

xii. Adoption

“I will be your God you will be my people”310 – the intention of God was always a people
for Himself. Inherently formulated is: a filial parental relationship rather than a religious,
positional or functional pattern; mutual belonging where infinite God concentrates a
special attachment, commitment – a covenantal reflection, is in view,311 “But now, thus
says the LORD, who created you, O Jacob, And He who formed you, O Israel: "Fear not,
for I have redeemed you; I have called you by your name; You are Mine” (NKJV Is.43:4).
From within the covenant relationship, God is revealed as Father, Paul reinterprets the
language of the covenant filial relational bond in paternal terms, “I will be a Father to
you, And you shall be My sons and daughters, Says the LORD Almighty” (NKJV 2Co.6:18), both individually312 and collectively.313 Much of the poetical sections of the
prophets reflect the parental tension of a Father and his children in this relationship and
often related to the stages of natural child development.314 Israel as an entity is figured as
a firstborn son.315 The ransom of the first born,316 is significant as the firstborn in Egypt
lost life, the firstborn in Israel are also ‘taken’ in order to belong to God as sons, “… but

309 Ro.8:1-3; 1Jn.3:8-10.
310 Ex.6:7; Jer.24:7; 32:38.
311 Jer.31:14, 33.
312 1Ch.17:13; 22:10; Ps.89:26.
313 Ex.4:22; Ho.11:1; 1Ch.29:10; Dt.32:6; Is.63:16; 64:8; Jer.31:9.
314 Ez.16; Ho.11; Jer.31:15-20; Is.63:7-14.
315 Ex.4:22; Jer.31:9; Ho.11:1.
316 Ex.13:2, 15; Dt.34:19.
all the firstborn of my sons I redeem” (NKJV Ex.13:15). The Father expressed the sense of paternal belonging in redemption. Families could pay a ransom offering to God to redeem the firstborn; the primary collective redemption of the firstborn that God inaugurates is with the Levites taken as redemption price, to belong solely to God, consecrated to the priestly service to God.317

“All I will make him My firstborn, The highest of the kings of the earth” (NKJV Ps.89:27), occurs in a Davidic and Messianic context that transcends David’s earthly kingship, where although the youngest son of Jesse, spiritually, he is the first king of the eternal Kingdom that reaches Christ, described as the firstborn;318 Jesus being the firstborn Son of Man by Mary and of God, by the Father and the Spirit.319 Christ accomplishes perfectly the paternal filial relationship to the Father. He serves as redeemer and redemption, “that He might be the firstborn among many brethren” (NKJV Ro.8:28), “… that we might receive the adoption as sons” (NKJV Gal.4:5).

While the desire of God is established, from His eternal counsel whereby the believer is predestined to adoption;320 the means of attaining adoption to son and daughter-ship are uniquely found in Christ. Any sense of a special relationship with God, is based upon what Christ accomplished in His person and in relationship to the Father.321 It is because Jesus became Son that in union with Him, the believer becomes a son or daughter of God. This ontological understanding moves radically beyond a positional perception of adoption to sonship in fact, rather it is a profound expression of the measure of union between the believer and Christ.

John’s Gospel particularly emphasizes the Father-Son relationship between Jesus and His Father. Hebrews indicates that Jesus became Son.322 It is to be understood that Jesus is

317 Num.3:45; 8:14-19.

318 The previous chapter provides adequate critic of the concept. Consideration is given uniquely in the context of the believer’s adoption and sonship.

319 Mt.1:25; Col.1:15, 18; Gal.4:4; Heb.1:6; Rev.1:5.

320 Ep.1:5; Ro.8:29.

321 Gal.3:26; Ep.1:5; Jn.14:6; Mt.11:27.

322 Heb.1:5; 5:5; Ga.4:4-6.
more than Son in the eternal ontology of Godhead, rather He has manifested perfect sonship as a partial revelation of Himself. Jesus then articulates what this relationship is substantially; suggesting that the purpose is to “… bring many sons to glory …”\textsuperscript{323}

The Fatherhood or Parenthood of God, while is recognized universally of all, as individuals and as families and as people groups.\textsuperscript{324} Specifically, regeneration demands a new parenthood and in that adoption is the means to parenthood for God and to legitimacy for believers as sons and daughters of God.\textsuperscript{325}

The Scriptural witness testifies that adoption as a son in union in Christ: proceeds from: election;\textsuperscript{326} baptism into union with Christ; as firstborn of the resurrection believers therefore also become sons of the resurrection,\textsuperscript{327} of regeneration\textsuperscript{328} and of redemption,\textsuperscript{329} and glorification.\textsuperscript{330} It could be argued from Romans chapter eight that verse twenty nine is the outcome of verse thirty which illustrates the ‘ordo salutis’. Paul presents two approaches in Galatians and Romans, to the reception of adoption to sonship: The ‘πνευματικός’ person in whom the Spirit indwells and in whom Spirit is the origin of life, this one takes hold of the same Spirit of adoption, witnessed by the instinctive cry “Abba Father”.\textsuperscript{331} On the other hand Paul to the Galatians writes, that Christ redeems from the Law and secular principles, figurative of servitude, to take hold of adoption originated in Christ, (‘ἀπολαμβάνω’).\textsuperscript{332} It is because of this adoption that God sends the Spirit of the

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[323]{Heb.2:10.}
\footnotetext[324]{Ac.17; Ep.3:15-16.}
\footnotetext[325]{Jn.1:12-13.}
\footnotetext[326]{Ep.1:5; Ro.8:29-30.}
\footnotetext[327]{Gal.3:26-27; Lk.20:36.}
\footnotetext[328]{Ro.8:29.}
\footnotetext[329]{Gal.4:5.}
\footnotetext[330]{Ro.8:17.}
\footnotetext[331]{Ro.8:13-16.}
\footnotetext[332]{See also Jn.1:13.}
\end{footnotes}
Son into hearts, issuing the filial and paternal cry which in effect does not relate to correct thinking but to a heart cry whereby union creates this reality.\(^{333}\)

The logic continues in that if Christ is Son and Heir, then the believer in Christ and the Spirit becomes a son or a daughter and in turn shares the inheritance in and through Christ.\(^{334}\) The joint import of being ‘υἱός’ (legal, ethical and internal resemblance) and ‘τέκνον’ (descent, and physical and external resemblance) affirms divine parentage and the legitimacy of divine sonship,\(^{335}\) and conditions or leads to being ‘συγκληρονόμος’ in, through and with Christ. The conclusion is that in union in Christ the believer ontologically enters the same relationship, parentage, and destiny in Christ. Murray comments, “by adoption men share in Christ’s sonship and thus enter into the divine life of the trinity. This is confusion the eternal son of god is the only-begotten and no one shares in his sonship. God the Father, of the Son …. Eternal generation must not be equated with adoption. (Redemption 142, 147). Christ is the unique eternal Son, in consubstantiality, equality and divinity. However, the ‘πρωτότοκος’ is to bring others into share through union the relational benefits of Sonship that were primary to the Son-Father witness in John. The unique attributes of eternal relationship as Son, remain distinct to Christ; however, the believer is introduced to the same relational fullness, in which alienation finds fulfilment (Boice 442).

### xiii. Glory

‘δόξα’\(^{336}\) synonymous with the Hebrew ‘kāḇōd’ referring to honour, splendour, excellence, pre-eminence, dignity, abundance, reverence, majesty, perfection, and worship.\(^{337}\) The verb ‘δοξάζω’ replicates the provided meaning of the noun, to make,
render, esteem, or impart; \textsuperscript{338} ‘kāḇēd’ in Hebrew refers primarily to a weight which also applies in the context of glory. \textsuperscript{339}

In the OT particularly ‘kāḇēd’ is understood through representation: e.g. cloud and fire depict the manifestation of the glory of God, \textsuperscript{340} in a pillar, \textsuperscript{341} on a mountaintop, \textsuperscript{342} on and in an ark, a tabernacle, in a temple sanctuary, or the Zion city; \textsuperscript{343} of the voice that speaks with men. \textsuperscript{344} These examples were indicative of God tangibly present among His people. The macro vision is of God’s glory filling the whole earth; \textsuperscript{345} a glory that is beyond the earth and beyond the heavens; \textsuperscript{346} differentiated from the representations, it is the personal glory of the Person of God. \textsuperscript{347} This personal glory is also found in the Person of Christ, \textsuperscript{348} and in the Spirit. \textsuperscript{349} The glory of the Person is an attribute shared perfectly, demonstrated through reciprocally and mutual glorifying between the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. \textsuperscript{350} Jesus does not glorify Himself, but glorifies the Father; \textsuperscript{351} it is the Father who glorifies

\textsuperscript{338} ‘δοξάζω’ TGEL 2016; SECB 2015.

\textsuperscript{339} ‘kāḇēd’ BDBHEL 2017; SECB 2012.


\textsuperscript{341} Ex.16:10; Num.14:14.

\textsuperscript{342} Ex.24:16-17.

\textsuperscript{343} 1Sa.4:21-22; Ex.29:43; 40:34-35; Num.14:10; 1Kg.8:11; Ps.26:8; 63:2; 102:16; Is.4:5; Hg.1:8.

\textsuperscript{344} Dt.5:24; Ps.29:2, 3, 9.

\textsuperscript{345} Num.14:21-22; Ps.72:19; Is.6:3.

\textsuperscript{346} Ps.108:5; 113:4.

\textsuperscript{347} Num.14:22; 16:42; Ex.33:18-22; Ps.145:5; Is.35:2; Ac.7:55; Ep.1:17.

\textsuperscript{348} Ps.8:5; 112:9; Is.4:2; 40:5; 49:5; 60:1-2; Lk.2:32; 9:31-32; 24:26; Jn.1:14; 2Co.4:4; 8:32; Heb.1:3; 2Pe.1:17; 1Pe.2:7.

\textsuperscript{349} 1Pe.4:14; 2Co.3:8; 1Co.2:7, 12; Ep.1:14.

\textsuperscript{350} Jn.16:14.

\textsuperscript{351} Jn.7:18; 11:4.
Jesus.\textsuperscript{352} This reciprocal cycle of glory\textsuperscript{353} indicates the union between the Father and Christ in particular, and the Spirit.

The atmosphere of glory is not circumstantial in that it reflects the ontological relationship and therefore imposes itself upon every situation, as seen in the miracles, the debates, and the expiatory suffering of Christ. This provides the foundation into which the believer in union in Christ is introduced through Jesus words, “and the glory which you gave me I have given them, that they may be one just as we are one” (NKJV Jn.17:22) or “And all Mine are Yours, and Yours are Mine, and I am glorified in them” (ESV Jn.17:10) designates Christ who is glory as the expression of the believer’s glory, “… So to seek one’s own glory is not glory” (NKJV Ps.25:27). Glory is thereby not reserved as an eschatological hope or reality, rather it is a present reality in the believer in Christ; in Christ and seated in Him and with Him in the heavenly places, introduced into the heavenly atmosphere and presence of the Father and of Christ reigning in glory. The believer is also a bearer of internal glory through the indwelling Christ. The celestial experience is the absolute of glory, the infinite and eternal perfect fullness of Godhead.\textsuperscript{354}

The transfiguration of Christ, reflecting His glory which he had with the Father from eternity, is only a reflection of the heavenly reality.\textsuperscript{355}

The earthly reality is a present state of glory because Christ indwells the believer, “For I consider that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us” (NKJV Ro.8:18), reinforces the indwelling of glory, while ‘ἀποκαλύπτω’ in the passive voice suggests the disclosure of Christ in the believer.

Moreover, the Lord is the Spirit; where moreover the Spirit [the] Lord, in that place there is true liberty. We all moreover, having been unveiled face the glory of [the] Lord reflecting in a mirror, the image [of] him are metamorphosed originated from glory to glory, just as originated from Lord [the] Spirit (TLT 2Co.3:18)

\textsuperscript{352} Jn.5:44; 8:50, 54.

\textsuperscript{353} Jn.12:28; Jn.13:31-32; 17:1,5.


\textsuperscript{355} Lk.9:31-32; Jn.17:5.
While theologians generally have an eschatological view of glorification, (Grudem 831-832; Murray 185-186), the argument developed renders evident glory now. From the citation, the glory of the indwelling Christ is now to be generated in the nature of the believer. If this glory originates in glory, then it is in the Person of Christ in whom is the glory of the Father, then the Father is glorified by the fruit of the glory of Christ generated in the believer. It more than having the glory of Christ indwelling in presence, it is the nature of the believer generated out of Godhead’s glory to every increasing glory. Glory is present, continuous and increasing to perfection to Christ’s ‘παρουσία’. Paul says, “And as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly Man” (NKJV 1Co.15:49); in the same way that Christ’s bears the likeness or image of man, by becoming truly man, Christ being God and of a divine origin and substance takes upon Himself, perfect human nature. The ‘likeness’ for the believer being generated in the glory of Godhead, is that being of human origin, he or she is taking on the heavenly glorious nature of Christ in increasing measure from the divine origin thereby redefining humanity according to glory of Godhead’s personhood. Paul’s ontological exhortation, “For you were bought at a price; therefore, glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God’s” (NKJV 1Co 6:20), substantiates this; likewise, the ministry of the Spirit “according to the valued abundant richness [of] the glory, the dignity of him, inherent enabling power to being prevailed by means of His Spirit into the inner man…” (TLT Ep.3:16).

“... The riches of the glory of His inheritance in the saints ...” (NKJV Ep.1:18), contextually leads one to understand that the whole of the ontology of “union in Christ” is perceived as part of the glory of God to the believer. In the believer’s salvation is God’s

357 Jn.15:8; 17:10.
358 Ph.2:7; Heb.2:14, 17; 4:15.
359 See also Ph.1:20.
glory, adopt contextually of election, adoption to sonship, and redemption to forgiveness, and salvation, are the glorious inheritance of the saints. 

Future glory only exists in the Person of Christ. The believer in Christ participates in His glory, more than participation it is conformity in a body to His glory, experienced perfectly and corporeally. The identification with Christ in suffering, affliction, and tribulation with the eternal glory in view is the eschatological hope of glory shared; more than this, it is a Christological perspective whereby these traits are the glory of the believer, culminating in the glorious Kingdom reign inauguration.

In summary, the glory of Christ which believers have is not only an eschatological hope, nor a heavenly spiritual consciousness, but is an integral part of union in Christ, a present and ever-increasing process of the divine glory generate in the believer. He/she lives life ontologically from a place of communion with the Godhead’s glory. The glory of God in this New Age of Christ and Spirit is principally found in the believer, and in this, the glory that fills the earth could be conceived as the multiplication of believers in union with Christ. The church is the glory of Christ, and as such the gathered believers form an intensification of the transforming glory.

---
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xiv. Victorious life

Ontologically, victorious life is neither circumstantial nor contextual, it reflects the victory expressed in union in Christ as much as Christ is victorious, union in Him is the believer’s victory. If Christ has set believers free from: the Law, from sin, from death, from secular philosophies and principles, then the believer’s victory is not only to be free from these things rather it is the victory of living the fullness of union in Christ throughout life, “You are from God, little children, and have overcome them; because greater is He who is in you than he who is in the world” (NAS 1Jn.4:4). If Christ is in union indwelling the believer then He will manifest through His Person His victorious life. The final perspective is, “… a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ” (NKJV Ep.4:13). This fullness or perfecting that is Christ in the believer, is perceived as an ongoing process whereby Christ is active within; victory consists in the fullness and perfecting of Christ in the believer. The sufficiency of who He is, demonstrated as an ultimate source manifest in ‘Christ-ness’ permeating all seven constituent parts of the believer’s unity, “But thanks be to God, giving us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ” (TLT 1Co.15:57).

The enabling of the believer in victory is found in Paul’s words, “for all things I am potentially strong in Christ who inherently empowering me” (TLT Ph.4:13). Exegetically, the phrase makes clear, that the potential power in the face of whatever circumstance belongs to Christ. Him indwelling the believer is the inherent ability or capacity to face, traverse and exit the other side by this means. The believer is therefore not defined nor determined in disposition, in action or in reaction nor by circumstance, but by the measure of Christ in Him; His potential power, and the corresponding inherent ability, measured and demonstrated, according to the situation. This is the ontology and psychology of the

371 Ro.7:4, 6; 8:2-3; Gal.3:13; 4:4-5; 5:1-4.
372 Ro.6:7, 18, 22; 8:2-3.
373 Ro.5:17; 8:2-3; 2Ti.1:10; Heb.2:9, 14-15; 1Pe.3:18.
374 Jn.16:33; 1Co.1:20-25; Col.2:8, 20.
375 Ep.2:15; Col.2:8, 16-18; Ph.3:4-8.
376 Col.2:10.
377 See also 2Co.13:9; Ph.1:6; Col.1:28; 2:10; 4:12; 2Ti.3:17; Heb.12:22-24; Jm.1:4; 1Pe.5:10.
spiritual believer in union in Christ. Paul bears witness through declarations of insufficiency and weakness contrasted by his enabling sourced in God and in Christ. He expresses this as proof of Christ ministering in and through him. Victory is then redefined by this new relationship to power.

Victory is also referenced to being established, making firm and sure, (‘βεβαιώ’) The biblical texts make it clear that God actively establishes the believer in union with Christ, the participle implying perpetual process to perfection. Paul exhorts to stand fast or firm in the Lord; Peter’s exhortation explicates using the optative verb form which expresses the strongest desire whereby God will perfect, make stable, make strong and make a foundation in Christ. This ministry of the Father in Christ is not just that He is these things in His nature, but that through union in Christ the believer becomes them, e.g., where Christ is the foundation stone, Christ in the believer makes the believer a foundation in Himself, according to Peter’s text.

Victorious living in Christ is also concerned with His characteristic attributes manifest in union such as: love, peace, joy or light. Paul states, “But in all these things we overwhelmingly conquer through Him [who] loving us … who will be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.” (NAS Ro.8:37, 39). If God is love, and Christ is the perfect expression of love; if the believer in Christ is to be perfected in that love, the victorious living is union in Christ whereby the perfect love demonstrated in the incarnate Christ, becomes the display of inseparability of union in

378 2Co.4-6; 4:7; 10:10; 11:30; 12:5, 9; 13:3-4.
379 2Co.1:21; 1Co.1:6, 8.
380 1Th.3:8; Ph.4:1.
381 ‘καταρτίζω’ see also 2Co.13:11 ‘be perfected’; Lk.6:40; Ep.4:11; Heb.11:3.
382 ‘στηρίζω’ see also 1Th.3:13; 2Th.2:17; 3:3; Ro.16:25.
383 ‘σθενόω’.
384 ‘θεμελιώσω’ see also Ep.3:17; Col.1:23; Heb.1:10.
385 1Pe.5:10.
386 Mt.7:25; Mk.12:10; 1Co.3:11; Ep.2:20; 1Pe.2:4-8.
387 1Jn.4:9, 16, 18.
love; the absence of fear being the absolute proof of union and of love. In the same manner, Jesus says He is Peace, He is Joy, He is Light. These existential and moral attributes that define the nature of Jesus Christ, because of union in Him they are His nature in the believer, and are to become his/her nature. Again, union expresses inseparability in the attributes of character and nature. These being perfected are victorious living.

In conclusion Paul expresses this victorious life in the following terms, “… but grace to God who at all times we triumphing with celebration in Christ and fragrance of the experiential knowledge of Him demonstrating through us in every place or situation since the sweet-smelling fragrance of Christ we are to God…” (TLT 2Co.2:14-15).

This concludes the consideration of union in Christ and the ‘ordo salutis’ in which has been demonstrated the ontological substance and significance to a renewed theological perception of the ontological believer existing in Christ.


389 Jn.15:11; 17:13; Ro.15:13; Jude 1:24.

390 Lk.2:32; Jn.1:4, 9; Jn.8:12; Mt.17:2; Mt.5:16; 6:22; 2Co.4:6; Ep.5:8; Col.1:12; 1Pe.2:9; 1Th.5:5; 1Jn.1:7.

391 There are other dimensions of union in Christ that have not been fully developed in this chapter, illustrated in appendix II, such as: Covenant, Belief/faith, Grace, Parousia, Revelation, Wisdom, Morality, Ministry, Life in Spirit, life in the Body. (Figure XIII).
CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has developed characteristics and problematics of the religious person in the light of the ontological development of the biblical metanarrative. Religious practices both biblical and extra-biblical have been examined and considered to better understand the extent of the paradigmatic shift that occurs in the person of Jesus Christ. Part of that shift is founded upon the revelation of an existential reality, where belief in Godhead purports intrinsically to an ontological understanding of the believer in Christ. The ensuing chapter addressed the definition of humankind, examining the historical, theological and biblical evidence to clarify and establish the nature of mankind, existentially and ontologically. This proposal develops a fuller understanding of the composition of a human being in the image of God in ontological terms. Upon this perspective the states in which a human being exists, from a biblical perspective, culminating after examination, in the identification of the ‘πνευματικός’ believer as the sole form of legitimate existence that is biblically normalized and warranted. The final chapter considers the ontological and theological ramifications for the ontological believer, founded upon the principle of incarnation, in union in Christ and in Godhead. The nature of that relationship was developed as essential to a renewed theology that provides an opportunity for restoration of the Christian to an ontological understanding of existence in Christ and restores reflective perceptions and practices.
Chapter Four: ONTOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN THE CHURCH

Introduction

Chapter two considered the historical developments of Trinity affirming the ontological nature of divinity, equality, eternity, and unity in relationship. The argument proposed this vision of Trinity, of being and operation, examining six principles that define the nature of inter-Trinitarian relationship to believers and the church. Chapter three addressed the ontology of humankind, particularly the believer depicted by divine intention as ‘πνευματικός’ the ontological state in Christ, demonstrating the ontological significance of union with the indwelling Christ, in Trinity. The assertion is that the Trinity relationship and operation are expressed in and through the believer and the church as an extension of Trinitarian life. This redefines the nature of the believer and the church, which is the argument of this thesis. The purpose of chapter four is to develop, in this light, an ontological perspective of church. It is suggested that the ontological truths revealed through Scripture have been at best assumed, relegated, or at worst deformed or superseded by historical and cultural constructs. This section seeks to restore the importance and primacy of an ontological understanding of church. If church is to be the extension of the Trinitarian community, as scripture suggests, then ontology of being takes ascendancy over the functional, structural, or organizational, as it is demonstrated in the Godhead. This return to the original source offers a profound renewal of church in theology and in expression.
TRADITIONAL THEOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The Nicene Creed (325 AD), extracted from the catechetical writings of S. Cyril of Jerusalem; read and approved at Chalcedon, (451 AD) makes one statement about the church, “In one holy Catholic and Apostolic church” (Bettenson 25-26), attesting four defining principles of Church that have stood through time as standards.

i. One

Refers to unity and immediately tensions arise as to the nature and substance of that unity. Unity of the hierarchal and organized church as a world-wide organization (Berkhof 572), expanded rapidly in the Post-apostolic or Patristic period, particularly under the influence of Cyprian who points to the episcopate as the guarantee of unity. He considered bishops as successors to the apostles, fulfilling ‘offices’ that bore divine election. The bishop’s diocese was perceived as a microcosm of church and deduced thereby that the Church is founded upon, united cohesively together by, the bishops in episcopate, which finds agreement in Papal texts. Cyprian logically postulates his assumption that membership of the unity is no longer by episcopal or apostolic teaching but by submission to the bishop Himself, an opinion Irenaeus is said to have shared, (Kelly 204-206).

The later Reformers … did not find the bond of unity in the ecclesiastical organization of the Church, but in the true preaching of the Word and the right administration of the sacraments and discipline (Berkhof 573). Likewise, David MacKay suggests that communion in Christ has for grounds “means of grace as the word, prayer and the sacraments. This in turn provides the basis for fellowship among God’s people …” (215). Cyril of Alexandria refers to unity derived from ‘the harmony of true doctrine’ (Kelly 402). Mackay quoting G.I. Williamson, has a suggested best modern approach, which places the emphasis, not on the visibility of identifiable people but by the demonstration in act, “to profess the true religion, fidelity to word, sacraments and discipline, which is required of a true visible church …” (Williamson, G.I. quoted in Mackay 208).

A third consideration for the source of unity is the mystical body of Christ, whereby the emphasis is not defined by human hierarchical organization, nor by religious observances and practices, but rather the earthly church defined as a copy of the heavenly one, “the ‘spiritual Church’ which is Christ’s mystical body,” according to Clement (Kelly 201-202). The Patristic fathers describe in varying degrees the nature of this union in Christ,
whereby the believers in union with Him become His body and therefore, unitedly His Church with God in the person of Christ, “… one Church because a single body: a single nature united … to which the Eastern fathers would agree” (Lossky 182). Ignatius refers to “the body of Christ, forming a spiritual unity with Him as close as is His unity with the Father” (Kelly 190-191). In the oriental thought, Athanasius describes the deification of believers in Christ, sharing His nature as being one with him, which is to experience the mystical body of Christ believers in Him and Him in them (403-404; Lossky 182). Both Hilary and Augustine extend this thought further by explaining that Christ is the Church (409, 413), and speak of incorporation into Christ, the unity comes from Trinitarian inseparability and indivisibility.

Berkhof quoting Karl Barth corrects the trajectory of western thought, “the quest for the unity of the church must in fact be identical with the quest for Jesus Christ as the concrete head and Lord of the church …” (574). It is only in the latter perspective that the tension of invisible and visible expressions, the perfect and imperfect, heavenly and earthly, spiritual and human are dissolved by the primacy of union as defining the Church in Christ.

ii. Holy

The nature of church as holy comprises a direct reference to God’s own nature, ‘be holy for I Am holy.’\(^2\) To consider the community as a whole, the mention of the church as the bride of Christ is of particular interest in establishing the principle of holiness, “that He might sanctify and cleanse her with the washing of water by the word, that He might present her to Himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that she should be holy and without blemish,” (NKJV Ep.5:26-27) thereby placing the emphasis upon the act of purifying for distinctiveness, according to the nature of the relationship described. This text commented by Berkhof is one reading of religious supposition of ceremonial, sacramental and ritual holiness by adherence to dogma, precepts, worship, or discipline, (574-575). Optatus, from the Patristic period concerning the holy church, invokes the quality of holiness as not to do with the believer, rather it is founded upon the assumption that holiness is attributed “because it possesses the symbol

---
1 A recurrent theme of the Cappadocian’s Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa (Kelly 404).
2 Lev.11:44-45; 19:2; 21:8; Ep.1:4; 1Pe.1:15-16.
of the Trinity, the chair of Peter, the faith of believers, Christ's saving precepts, and, above all, the sacraments themselves” (Kelly 411). These attributed characteristic of the tradition of the church are said to render her holy.

The sanctification to holiness, as cited, is firstly a reflection on the nature of Godhead; it is separateness to distinctiveness in quality of life. For this reason, it is attributed to the church, describing the exclusive nature of the relationship of Christ to his bride. The principal text demonstrates a process of being perfected in holiness. Clement states, “… those who truly cleave to the Lord and become one spirit with Him form the holy Church in the real sense of the word” (201-202).

This responds in part to the awkward tension between believers and unbelievers, the regenerate and the unregenerate, whereby the distinction between the empirical or outward church and the essential or ideal church, stand upon her holy nature:

Christ's bride must be 'without spot or wrinkle' here and now. This consisted in drawing a careful distinction between the essential Church, composed of those who genuinely belong to Christ, and the outward or empirical Church. Augustine never attempted to harmonize his two conceptions, that distinguishing the Church as a historical institution from the true Church of those really devoted to Christ and manifesting His spirit, and that identifying Christ's body with the fixed number of the elect known to God alone (Kelly 415-416).

iii. Catholic

The catholic or universal nature of the Church, is an expression of believers drawn together from a multiplicity of races and cultures into one entity. “Augustine identifies the Church with the universal Catholic Church of his day, with its hierarchy and sacraments, and with its centre at Rome” (Kelly 413), whereby “… it’s real centre is not found in the believers but in the hierarchy with its concentric circles …” (Berkhof 572).

In contrast to the universal church is the universalism propagated by Origen, through which the whole of humanity, of creation, all creatures, will be saved (Kelly 201-202). From the Patristic period distinctions are maintained between ‘catholic’ and ‘local’, the former being found wherever Christ is present, the latter defined by the governance of a bishop, according to Polycarp, or an individual congregation (189). Further developments led to the Catholic church distinguishing true from heretical (190); consequentially and
inherently, the perfect from the imperfect, reflected in the notion of the invisible and visible church. John Murray holds a strong argument that these distinctions do not exist, “He contends that the NT always speaks of the Church, universal and local, as a visible entity, a body made up of believers” (quoted in MacKay 207).

iv. Apostolic

The meaning attributed to apostolicity of the church is founded upon doctrine, assumed as implicit in Paul’s reference to the foundation laid being the word or the Gospel (MacKay 220). Irenaeus exemplifies the second century thought, that “… the Church is the sole repository of the truth, and is such because it had a monopoly of the apostolic writings, the apostolic oral tradition, and the apostolic faith” Tertullian extends that to embrace the “… teaching guaranteed by the unbroken succession of bishops” (Kelly 192), a reflection on the developing Roman Catholic doctrine of succession by office (MacKay 220). Apostolicity, by this means, was subjugated by organizational administration and governance. The NT definition of apostolicity expressing the substance of Trinitarian and believers body ministry in church has been annulled, replacing Christ by doctrine and spiritual ministry by human office.

The baseness so commonly charged to religion’s account are thus, almost all of them, not chargeable at all to religion proper, but rather to religion’s wicked practical partner, the spirit of corporate dominion. And the bigotries are most of them in their turn chargeable to religion’s wicked intellectual partner, the spirit of dogmatic dominion, the passion for laying down the law in the form of an absolutely closed-in theoretic system. The ecclesiastical spirit in general is the sum of these two spirits of dominion (James 257).

These historical and theological considerations provide adequate insight into the orientation of the church and its ministers in the Post-Apostolic Patristic period. Deliberating the scriptural witness of what God says of His church reveals the true nature of church and will warrant a return to source.
CRITIQUE OF THE FIRST FIVE CENTURIES

Introduction

The significance of identifying the fundamental principles, both historically and theologically, upon which centuries of church belief and practice have been established, is critical to recovery of an ontological vision of church. As time progresses, even in periods of reformation or spiritual awakening, the call to faith is often built upon the foundation of the historical construction or leads to it, that of tradition. Church order tends to drift towards habitual or ritual practices that are explained and justified through church tradition established over centuries. This represents a ‘one step removed’ experience, hallmarked by distanciation, representation and authentication, from direct interaction with the original precepts, considered in chapter two. Periods of reform and awakening, from biblical times through kings\(^1\) and prophets\(^2\), did restore the original foundations of belief and practice, even if only for a time. Through observation of Christian history, it is recognizable that periods of reform and spiritual awakening have not been perennial in nature. God’s intentions in these movements, reflects their true nature, wherein the purpose may not be to live in a continuous exalted spiritual state; rather, attention should be drawn to the deposit that God is communicating through that unique experience. The deposit in revelation, understanding and demonstration,\(^3\) is therefore, what is to be received with perpetual repercussions for the believer and for church. History of revival:\(^4\) in Wales (1649-1794), in Scotland (1742-1839), in Ireland (1623-1641), in China (1921→), in South Korea (1950’s), more recently Algeria (1996 →), some of which continue still; while leaving individual lives indelibly changed, often wane in intensity and particularly at the point of generational crossover. Its effects are weakened, as was the historically case of the Celtic nations, and is a present concern in the Korean context.

\(^1\) In reference to the kings of reform or renewal: Asa 1Kg.15:9-24; 2Ch.14:1-16:14; Joash 2Kg.11:1-21; 2Ch.23:1-24:27; Azariah 2Kg.15:1-7; 2Ch.26:1-21; Hezekiah 2Kg.18:1-20:21; 2Ch.29:3-32:33; Josiah 2Kg.22:1-23:30; 2Ch.34:1-35:27.

\(^2\) Every biblical prophet by the very nature of his relationship and function demonstrated this call back to source.

\(^3\) The three distinct definitions of biblical revelation according to Greek etymology: ἀποκαλύπτω – disclosure or unveiling; δηλος – comprehension of revelation; φανερόω – manifestation or demonstration of revelation.

In Algeria, the move continues, but will inevitably face the same challenge of re-centring on the spiritual deposit which God has placed as foundational to a renewal of his people – his church. It is in this context that an examination of the early centuries is vital to move from a ‘one step removed’ reality to recovery of the enduring principles of ontological church in belief and practice.

How did we get here? The question begs a critical analysis of history, expressly of early church history. The ‘one step removed’ principle when developed leads to a rupture with biblical rootedness, whereby means and methods built on the assumptions of centuries of developed habitual practices are sometimes divorced from the original scriptural intentions. This section seeks to expose crucial reasons in response to the question.

**Adoption by the Church of the Roman Civil Structure of Governance.**

The apostolic period and the first three centuries after Jesus Christ observed exponential growth of the Christian faith and church (Fig.XV). The challenge of this growth was an organizational and a theological one. Confronted by such exponential growth, giving coherence and structure to this movement became urgent. However, decisions taken also led to curbed apostolic growth and intimated a transition towards the management of this momentum. The explicit reasons why this happened, explained by historians, require closer examination.

As part of the managerial conception, ‘ministers’ were redefined in terms of ‘offices’ categorized as ‘permanent’ and ‘temporary’. Ministers of the NT period, (apostles, prophets, evangelists, shepherds, and teachers\(^5\)) who were consequential in the founding of Christian churches, were thereafter qualified as ‘temporary’. Those defined as offices of governance and administration or management were established as ‘permanent’.\(^6\) The exception to the NT ministers, is the pastor or shepherd, (ποιμήν), who was carried over and treated as synonymous with elder and bishop. J.B. Lightfoot in his commentary on Philippians states, “It is a fact now generally recognized by theologians of all shades of opinion, that in the language of the NT, the same officer in the Church is called...

---

\(^5\) Jn.8:42; Mt.13:57; Mt.11:1; Lk.4:18; Jn.10:11; Ep.4:11; 1Co.12:28.

\(^6\) ἐπισκοπὴ – 1Ti.3:2; ἀρχιεπίσκοπος – Ac.15:2; διάκονος – 1Ti.3:10; ποιμήν (treated as synonymous as per J.B. Lightfoot – Ac.20:28.
indifferently bishop and elder or presbyter” (93). In doing so, the term bore thereafter a governance definition as with the other terms of permanent offices.

J.W.C Wand, quoting Professor Harnack, suggests that it is less a question of tension between permanent and temporary rather between the office of human (Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons) and ‘charisma’ (the five ministries of Ep.4:11) of the Holy Spirit (27). Ignatius recognized as ‘prophet’ in the post-apostolic period, attempted to fusion the two, (29). He exhorted the believers not to despise the bishops and the deacons (who had just been newly recognized) who exercised the ministries of prophets and teachers. This seems to be reflected in the ‘Didache’, “appoint, therefore, for yourselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord … for they also render to you the service of prophets and teachers … they are honoured ones, together with the prophets and teachers” (Didache Ch.15). A closer reading distinguishes prophets and teachers as separate from bishops and deacons. What can be surmised is, they are considered among the ministers for the sake of honour, or that they do exercise prophetic and teaching ministries to some lesser degree. Chapters eleven through thirteen address the genuine and false teachers, apostles, and prophets providing practical advice. The apostle is clearly itinerant (Didache Ch.11), and the true prophet and teacher are worthy of support (Didache Ch.13). Harnack explains the progression from local communities where the five charismatic ministries were absorbed into the construction of the episcopate whereby those ‘officials’ were, “promoted to the class of apostles, prophets, and teachers … which enabled the bishops at last to secure the prestige of apostles, prophets and teachers” (286-289).

Clement of Rome is quoted, suggesting that the apostles who recognized in advance the difficulties that would come concerning the direction of the church made provision in the election of the ministers (bishops, elders and deacons). It is recognized at the end of the first century, that there was a significant change in the quality of those who led the churches. Their writings could be measured against the secular authors of the period however, “… they were obviously neither so spiritual nor so lucid as those who wrote the books of the sacred Canon.” (Renwick and Harman 24). The indicators suggest a significant transition from spiritual quality of life and ministry fading, concedes to a distinctly different spirit and approach to church and ministry.

The managerial mind-set is perceived in the vocabulary of succession and transmission, which are indicators that the gift, (‘χάρισμα’) and ministry (‘διακονία’) are no longer
identified by their source and origin but rather by the ability to operate succession and transmission, “… their office was a first-generation phenomenon and incapable of repetition; they had no successors, and in principle there cannot be any”7 (Ferguson and Wright 40). This citation expresses the crisis of the transition from the apostle’s ministry and leadership. The change of vocabulary is also noted: Clement speaks of “an orderly succession in ministry;”8 (431) good order and of submission to the authority of the bishops and elders for Christological reasons of resurrection and expiation. Ignatius reinforces “… a threefold order of ministry consisting of bishops, presbyters and deacons … insistent on the importance of the absolute authority of the single bishop of each church”9 (41). Likewise, Harnack notes, “the local church-authority (or the monarchical and supreme episcopate) within the individual community owed its origin to the “apostolic” provincial authority, by means of a conveyance of power” (382), wherein the succession is communicated implicitly to the elected offices of the local community; which would expand to exercise ‘apostolic authority’ over regions. The key issue is one of authority: who possesses it and who exercises it. For the Western mind the election of Peter, Paul or the other apostles to an ‘office’ remains ambiguous. In an extract of his letter to the Corinthians10 Clement of Rome appears to lean on the sacrificial system of the Mosaic Law and the sacerdotal order. Regarding the apostles of Jesus Christ, through their preaching and the churches planted, thereby establishing bishops (overseers) and deacons (ministers), he suggests that apostolic succession joins the office of bishop as successor. The reason given is “our Apostles knew … that there would be strife over the dignity of the bishop’s office” (Bettenson p62-63).

An attraction towards the formalisation of ‘offices’ and designated nominations is observed; this required hierarchy and secularized structure. Under the influence of Tertullian and Hippolytus, in the second century, these methods produced the professionalization of the priesthood, approved forms, acceptable and conform acts of

10 “Articles XI – XI iv”
adoration, worship, the Lord’s Supper or Holy Communion, and liturgy11 (Ferguson and Wright 431).

The Episcopal Monarchism12

This monarchism was observed by the hierarchal positioning with dominance. Ignatius, (110-117), bishop of Antioch, considered himself inferior to the apostles perhaps, but he imposed strong ideas of authority and control over the church and believers, “Respect the bishop as a type of God, and the presbyters as the council of God and the college of apostles. Apart from these there is not even in name church”13 (Harman, Renwick 26). To this triad were added the deacons who were to serve as Christ.14 Beyond any argument of organization, there is a fundamental error in conception of the Trinity, between ontology and function. This justification of structure, function and form based on a hierarchal Trinity is theologically and functionally erroneous. In one of his seven epistles written before his death in Rome, Ignatius addresses the question of authority and obedience to the bishop. The position of bishop becomes evident, and the reason given is the importance to unity. Unity is defined by allegiance declared to the bishop rather than to Jesus Christ. This mediation of a man demonstrates further estrangement from the unique mediation of Jesus Christ by a hierarchy and a purely human structure upon the administration of an office. A statement from Irenaeus, (130-200) concerning Clement whom he calls the third bishop of Rome, (the first Christian leader in the post-apostolic period), says that Clement’s exercise of spiritual authority did not extend beyond his own community even though he was known and recognized more widely (Renwick and Harman 25). This refers to the characteristic of spiritual men without need to appeal to the authority of office, recognized by men to be received upon spiritual grounds. Such questions as these go back to the era of Eusebius (263-339) bishop of Caesarea, who also perceives unity in the episcopate as a means of defence against heresy, when the succession of office for bishops and their authority were under examination (Wand 64).

12 J.W.C. Wand employs the phrase ‘Monarchical Episcopate’ referring to the sole rule of one bishop p26.
13 Extract of Ignatius’ letter to the Trallians.
The model of the synagogue or the Sanhedrin has found parallels between the council of presbyters and the council of elders established by the apostle Paul and been used as justification for these wider issues under consideration (Wand 30). “As a church, it contained everything the age could proffer, a powerful priesthood, with a high priest and subordinate clergy, a priesthood which went back to Christ and the apostles, and led bishops to glory in their succession and apostolic ordination. Christianity possessed every element included in the conception of ‘priesthood’” (Harnack 263). The accurate appellation in this case is ‘syncretism’ rather than ‘authentic originality’, reflected in the uniqueness of Trinity in church.

In spite of a strong emphasis on hierarchy and structuration under the reigns of Domitian (96) and then in the second and third centuries under Decius (249-251), and Gallus (251-253), and then under Valerian (254-259) who targeted the destruction of the Christian church by attacking the leaders and ministers, the church continued to grow (illustrated in Fig.XV). This demonstrates that something of the apostolic spirit remained enabling a momentum of spiritual growth. The principal reason suggested infers that believers were not entirely subordinate to present day ecclesial structures and governance, for they took a stand individually and collectively for Christ. In the same period the rise of ‘fathers gifted and learned’ (Clement of Rome (99), Justin Martyr (100-165), Tertullian (160-225), Irenaeus (130-200), Origen (185-254), Cyprian (200-258) and Anthony the Great (251-356)), elaborated a comprehensive foundation for the Christian faith.

A demarcation of the church: the first papacy

The epistle of Ignatius to the church in Smyrna lays the foundation which gave lieu to ministerial hierarchy in the form of the papacy. The complete citation follows,

Avoid divisions as the beginning of all evils. All of you follow the bishop as Jesus Christ followed the Father, and follow the presbytery as the Apostles; and respect the deacons as the commandment of God. Let no man perform anything pertaining to the church without the bishop. Let that be considered a valid Eucharist over which the bishop presides, or one to whom he commits it. Wherever the bishop appears, there let the people be, just as, wheresoever Christ Jesus is, there is the Catholic Church. It is not permitted either to baptize or hold a love-feast apart from the bishop. But
whatever he may approve, that is well-pleasing to God, that everything which you do be sound and valid (Bettenson 63-64). 15

Whether consciously or unconsciously, Ignatius responds directly to the dilemma of apostolic succession; and not only on a human level, as he refers to Jesus and the Father who give divine authority or whose authority is equally found in the bishop and the presbyter. The conclusion centred upon the legitimacy of human office as taking the place of God in the church. This position is dangerous for the mediation of Christ has been usurped. The believers faced the deification of the office thus distancing the believer from Christ in favour of allegiance to the office of bishop. The three principles of distanciation, representation and authentication of religion developed in chapter two are preponderant.

The institutionalization of the structural and administrative hierarchy gave birth to another form and expression of church, based upon positional importance, succession and transmission. Much of theology of faith in Christ bears this imprint. Some faded memories remain: when Polycarp of Smyrna, martyred in 156, visited Anicet, bishop of Rome (155-166) in 155 A.D to discuss the date for Easter, they are said to have met as equals. Rome at this point did not exercise extended authority. Irenaeus (180) was the first apostolic father to suggest the idea of apostolic succession of offices in the church, whom he considered as guardians of the faith transmitted to the apostles, in a context of refuting heretics.

We appeal again to this tradition which finds its origin in the apostles and which is safeguarded in the churches by the succession of presbyters…because they [the apostles] desired these men to be perfect and without fault those remaining as their successors and as those who transmitted their own authority of office … (Bettenson p68). 16

There are several remarks to make: firstly, to identify the confusion between the nature of apostleship and the episcopate concerning the statute of ‘office’. To impose upon NT apostleship a notion of ‘office’ is to deny the biblical nature and function of the apostle.

---


Paul refers to himself as an apostle of Jesus Christ by calling not by office,\textsuperscript{17} not according to function but by ontology. Secondly, that authority is transmitted or communicated through the means of office and function rather than directly from Christ as ‘gift’ (‘χάρισμα’ or ‘χάρισ’), demonstrated by spiritual and character criteria, is therefore a deviation from apostolic ministry. Thirdly, transmission by succession in office is devised as the foundation of the institution regarding ministry recognition and authority rather than the biblical criteria of election from eternity through the revealing of Christ in the believer.\textsuperscript{18} Irenaeus was the champion of succession lists, like the one presented for Rome, “… the very great, very ancient and universally known church, founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul” \textsuperscript{19} (Bettenson 68-69). Even though the primary idea was intended for the defence against heretics, the practice bore heavy consequences for the organization and function of church. Likewise, Tertullian sought after the guarantee of a “… succession of bishops proceeding from the apostles who guaranteed the uninterrupted transmission of the doctrine of the apostles… now the apostles are the bishops and vice versa.”\textsuperscript{20}

We ought to obey only those presbyters who are in the Church, who have received their succession from the Apostles … who with their succession in the episcopate have received the sure gift of the truth … The rest who stand aloof from the primitive succession and assemble in any place whatever, we must regard with suspicion, either as heretics or evil-minded; or as schismatics, puffed up and complacent; or again as hypocrites …\textsuperscript{21} (Bettenson 70).

From this period onwards, the expansion of the church of Jesus Christ, required the mechanical pattern of greater structures, more levels of hierarchy to ensure administration and governance.

\textsuperscript{17} Ro.1:1; 1Co.1:1; Gal.1:1.

\textsuperscript{18} Gal.1:15-16; Ep.1:3-5; Jer.1:5.

\textsuperscript{19} “Early Christian Belief”. The History of Christianity Rev. Ed. p120.

\textsuperscript{20} “Early Christian Belief”. The History of Christianity Rev. Ed. p120.

\textsuperscript{21} Irenaeus Adv. Haereses, IV.
When Jerusalem fell in 70AD, this contributed to the centralism around Rome, where the special position and the position of bishop was held and defended by Victor the African (190), who threatened the Asian church with excommunication (Wand 85); followed by Stephen who appealed to Matthew 16:18-19 to defend Himself before Cyprian. The latter pushed in this direction his conception of authority of the bishops and episcopal unity which developed this centralism regionally and nationally in the form of provincial councils. For Cyprian, the bishop was perceived as the legitimate successor of the apostle, church unity and function becoming predominantly ‘bishop-centric’ (Wand 110-111). His vision was received in the West but rejected in the Eastern Church. His belief was that every bishop’s seat was the seat of Rome. During this period the accumulation of riches, goods and property rendered the Church of Rome more powerful. Augustine observed that “the true Church is the catholic Church, in which the apostolic authority is continued by episcopal succession” (quoted in Berkhof 559). Therefore, episcopal unity, meaning the structure of office, is the unity of the church.

The construction of the papal vision finds its origin in Pope Leo’s interpretation of Matthew sixteen verses eighteen to twenty. His declaration conceived that Peter’s apostleship as an office not only as ‘founder’ but also as ‘governor’ present of the church. The office of pope self-declares an authentic and authoritative incarnation of these two Petrine qualities.

You are this Christ this Son this God this living … and I moreover say to you that you are Peter (‘πετρος’) and upon this rock (‘πετρα’) I will build my church … I will give you the keys [of] the Kingdom of heaven and this if you on the earth will be having been bound in the heavens and if you loosen upon the earth will having been loosened in the heavens (TLT Mt.16:16, 18, 19)

---


24 V.16 (TR) συ ει ο χριστος ο υιος του θεου του ζωντος; v.18 (TR) καγω δε σοι λεγω οτι συ ει πετρος και επι ταυτη τη πετρα οικοδομησω μου την εκκλησιαν και πυλαι αδου ου κατισχυσουσιν αυτης; v.19 (WH) δωσω σοι τας κλειδας της βασιλειας των ουρανων και ο εαν δησης επι της γης εσται δεδεμενον εν τοις ουρανοις και ο εαν λυσης επι της γης εσται λελυμενον εν τοις ουρανοις.
That Peter be ‘πετρος’ meaning stone, or pebble contrasts with ‘πετρα’ meaning rock, foundation, or bedrock. Four possibilities remain for the signification of ‘petra’ (Edersheim 529-):

i. Jesus spoke of Himself

ii. Jesus spoke of another person – Peter

iii. Jesus spoke of Peter’s confession ‘You are the Christ, the son of the living God’.

iv. Jesus spoke of ‘πετρα’ in Peter: his faith, revelation, comprehension of Jesus Christ given by the Father.

There are several texts employing similar language, which are confirmed in several NT texts. Acts chapter four verse eleven contains the most explicit reference by Peter who identifies Jesus Christ as the rock. Peter makes no reference to himself, nor his own importance since being redefined in ‘papal’ terms. Romans chapter nine verses thirty-two and three refer to the stone of scandal (‘λιθω του προσκομματος’) as the person of Jesus Christ Messiah for Israel. Paul again draws attention to Jesus Christ as foundational rock. Even if Peter did not comprehend the suffering Messiah, the sense of rock is directed to Christ. Peter’s own epistle carries the meaning of Christians figured as living stones built upon the rock personified as Jesus Christ.

Some observations:

i. It is difficult etymologically to affirm Peter as ‘πετρος’ and ‘πετρα’

ii. Peter does not affirm his identity or function as such, even if by his role is perceived: preponderance, initiative, and leadership as ‘αποστολοι’ and

25 ‘Stone’ and ‘Bedrock’ are terms employed by J.M. Boice Foundations of the Christian Faith. Rev. Ed. p689. It must be said that in the NT ‘λίθος’ is employed for stone. ‘πετρος’ is a proper name ‘Peter’.


27 Ac.4:11; Ro.9:32-33; 1Co.1:23; 1Pe.2:4-6.

28 1Co.1:23.

29 1Pe.2:4-6; Is.28:16.

30 The NT distinguishes ‘αποστολοι’ as eyewitnesses to Jesus-Christ life, death and resurrection from ‘ἀπόστολος’ such as Paul employs for Himself, Timothy and others.
pioneer. A demonstration found in his temperament, passionate and unbending, and corrected. Peter’s address, “Elders, among you I exhort, he being a fellow-elder and witness of the Christ” (Green 942; 1Pe.5:1), communicates a principle of ‘one in communion with and among others like I’. Any other approach implies the place for hierarchy and positional authority of office over others among co-elders.

iii. Every text considered evidences the direct prophetic link focused upon the person of Jesus Christ.

iv. The coherence of believers, living stones, built upon Jesus Christ the foundation stone, reinforces the Christological interpretation.

To depart from this apostolic foundation by imposing a thought of succession and transmission of authority and apostleship, of ecclesial politics of control and power, have had irrecoverable consequences for the apostolic church. Biblical justification is difficult to attribute. From the birthing of these principles with Cyprian through the centuries to the present generation, the church struggles under the weight of this inheritance.

The self-declared papacy in the fourth century, began in the second century under Cyprian. This construct progressed towards a perceptible conclusion – papacy, “Therefore in as much as the pre-eminence of the Apostolic See is assured by the merit of S.Peter, the first of the bishops, by the leading position of the city of Rome, and also by the authority of the holy Synod, let not presumption strive to attempt anything contrary to the authority of that See” (Bettenson 22-23). More than a seat it is a mind-set, a human comprehension, highly influenced by Roman culture and government, in a centralized empire. It is observed historically that the more this culturally influenced interpretation imposes itself, the further removed church is from the apostolic simplicity.

**Consequences of Constantine’s conversion**

A brief contextual summary: Diocletian (284-605) is emperor, he realizes that it is the army that governs and not the Senate given the expansion of the empire and the resulting conflicts. He names Marcus Aurelius second ‘Auguste’ with oversight of the West and Diocletian to the East. Thereafter, Constantine is chosen for the West and Galerius for the East, each one a ‘Cesar’ under an ‘Auguste’. From this consort emerged the ‘Terminalia’
which was designed to destroy Christian churches in full expansion and reduce to
servitude Christians in preeminent roles, should they not denounce their faith. This is
followed by an edict of tolerance by Galerius from his death bed (311) which lasted six
years. This in turn was followed by the abdication by Diocletian and Marcus Aurelius.
The edict accepted defeat in its strategy to make Christians denounce their faith and return
to ancestral gods and worship, thereby admitting the worship of their God. Certain
historians think this was a trap to contain Christians in recognized legal organizations,
even though perceived as hereditary and closed. The Christians refused, seeking for a
guaranteed freedom for all in the empire.

In the meantime, Constantine is becoming more powerful. In 312 the night before his
final battle at the Bridge of Milvian against Maxentius, Constantine sees a light in the
form of a cross in the sky along with the words ‘In hoc signo vinces’ (in this sign you will
conquer). This became his standard. In the East, the persecution under Galerius was harsh.
Armenia, the first kingdom to accept Christianity, took up arms to resist the imposition
of idol worship. Licinius, successor once removed of Galerius, met Constantine, and
decreed an edict of Milan, (to date unfound). The general idea seems to be of freedom of
conscience and of religion for Christians and for all (Wand 128). The restitution of
belongings and property to Christians followed31 (Bettenson 16), a reflection on the
death-bed wish of Galerius (Wand 126-127).

Constantine Himself alone ruled the empire (323). Eusebius of Caesarea was elected tutor
to his son Crispus. He was an intellectual and scholar, with many writings on
ecclesiastical history and the life of Constantine; a reflection of his affinity and
relationship with the emperor. It was Eusebius who developed a theology of a Christian
empire and a Christian emperor correlated with the Kingdom of God that influenced the
Byzantine philosophy for centuries.32 The unity of the empire (East and West) is at the
heart of Constantine’s preoccupations. He seems to favour and support Christians with
the understanding that they would in return support his project.

31 Correspondence from Constantine to Anulinus, proconsul of Africa. Bettenson. p16.
Christianity … when legally adopted and safeguarded, it affords to the Roman name the greatest prosperity of divine beneficence… when they [priests or clerics] render the greatest homage to the Divinity, then the greatest benefits befall the commonweal33 (Bettenson 17-18).

Religious liberty for all also meant equality between Christianity and Paganism. The handling of occult practices became compromised due to the permission of certain practices and not others (e.g., Black Magic prohibited, White Magic allowed) (Wand 132). Equality also in terms of office, employment, religious festivals, immunity for clerics, receiving inheritance … the first signs of a covenant between state and church. It is true that many social and economic reforms would transform the condition of people, children, and slaves.

There are certain doubts concerning the legitimacy of Constantine’s conversion to Christianity. Some historians suggest that he continued to entertain homosexual relations with young boys as was common Greek practice in that time (Henderson Church and Sexuality 10-19); questions remain around his refusal to be baptized until his death bed. It is true that his conversion gave legitimacy to Christianity and signalled the end of persecution. But was he syncretic, a universal deist or a politician?

It was Constantine who brought forward the idea that the church should function with an ‘informal’ parliamentary system. Its organization being founded upon the civil structure of the empire. Constantine participated in the Councils and the administration of theological questions but his interest seemed to be for maintaining the unity of the empire rather the promotion and flowering of the faith. His position regarding the church is resumed in the following citation,

Let my will be deemed a canon among you, as it is among the Syrian bishops [Arians] … Do not interfere in matters ecclesiastical, nor give us orders on such questions, but learn about them from us. For into your hands God has put the kingdom; the affairs of his Church he has committed to us. In your hands God has placed a kingdom; the affairs of his church he has entrusted to us … We are not

33 Correspondence from Constantine to Anulinus, proconsul of Africa. Bettenson p17-18.
permitted to exercise an earthly rule; and you, Sire, are not authorized to burn incense …34 (Bettenson 19).

Nominalisation appears, through the dilution simultaneously with the legitimacy of a Christianized political state. To be a bishop became a prestigious statute. The ease of practising the faith led many to become marginal and nominal – the moral and characteristic qualities of the Christian waned. This loss is identified with the absence of two distinct traits of apostolic Christians, regeneration and transformation of lives by the Holy Spirit. The institutionalization of the faith was manifest through legislations, socio-religious organizations, monuments, temples, and buildings of all types contributing to a ‘Christian’ architecture. The qualitative loss is beyond measure: ontology is replaced by function, ministry by governing office, being by doing, and regeneration by form.

Conclusions

The three areas under consideration highlight the extent to which there was marked discontinuity with the apostolic NT. The issues are not limited to organizational concerns but to theological ones which determine the shape of ministry and church: office replacing or absorbing ministry; authority to manage in office and no longer in the exercise of spiritual ministry; the primary function of governance rather than supernaturally originated life-giving; human hierarchal organization rather than apostolic relational simplicity; political rule rather than God sovereignty; bishop-centricity rather than Christo-centricity; institution building rather than kingdom demonstrating; the professional priesthood rather than the direct participative worshiper; and concern for organization rather than the Divine presence and operation. It is also alarming to consider that much of twenty-first century Christianity and church experience are but an extension of the causes found affecting church in this period. This consideration bears witness to the spiritual qualitative losses through the institutionalization of church. What was lost in the apostolic NT is to be recovered and restored to the ontological church.

34 Correspondence between Constantine and Hosius Proconsul of Africa, Ath. Hist. Ar. 33; a letter from Hosius, bishop of Cordova (296-357) to Constantine, Athanasius, Hist. Ar. 44.
SOCIOLOGICAL, PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Introduction

This brief synopsis provides fundamental principles from sociological considerations that have direct ramifications upon the ontology and function of church under consideration in this chapter. In describing the six criteria proposed an appraisal emerges of human sociological expectations which influence the nature and shape of church.

R.J. Gore defines sociological considerations as, “The church is a body of persons who share some measure of common life, values, meaning and loyalty. It has a historical continuity, identifiable by certain beliefs, ways of work, rites, outlooks, and feelings” (170).

i. Socialisation

It is fundamentally a natural recognizable community, fulfilling socialisation needs, and creating a sense of community. Durkheim observes of humankind,

In himself there are two beings: an individual being based upon the organism and the sphere of action within that which is extremely limited, and a social being which represents in us the highest reality of intellectual and moral order that we can know through observation, that is society… in the measure by which he participates in society, the individual naturally exceeds himself as much as in thought as in action (25).

The area of identity is established in a context where the group recognizes within itself a sense of family or community. The vital ties between those participating, serve incorporation in the group identity.

God is recognized and known to be relational, a dimension which is innate in mankind, made in the image of God. The NT witness, at a purely practical stage, testifies to the church community: meeting daily together, sharing meals, opening homes, generosity, favoured by and favouring the wider community.¹ The question to be asked is, what are the grounds for the community called church?

¹ Ac.2:44-47; 4:32.
ii. Structuralism (Politic)

This is the aspect of social order implies a need for: formal or informal patterns or structures of communication, and the exercise of authority and decision-making, to enable and maintain good functionality. These are established by: social acception, affinities, and professional aptitude, the natural or spiritual gifting. These principles applied will engender identification and integration into the community.

Religious beliefs are always collective and specific to a community that professes adhesion and practices in solidarity these rites … they are the one thing that forms unity of a group … the individuals feel connected to each other by the sharing of a common faith … they translate this shared representation [of the sacred and profane worlds] in their identical practices, it’s what we call a Church (Durkheim 48).

The previous chapter challenged the need for, and the legitimacy of types and forms of structure, administration and governance introduced by the Patristic fathers. Sociological considerations suggest implicit need for these factors to express legitimately church community. If unity, cohesion, security, and legitimacy are to come from structuralism then the witness of Godhead in the Scriptures should testify to that. The concern in challenging this construct is the difficulty of establishing a universal structure applicable to church in the universal perspective; this obstacle would lead to a profusion of theories and practise at a local level.

iii. Convention

Convention refers to elements such as common language or vocabulary providing a shared and understandable meaning; in this vision, priorities, and values are enabled because of internal convention. The statement of faith will be developed to provide a consistent doctrinal basis. A set of community orientated values will portray the way community does things. The vision statement sets out the primary aims or specific goals that the collective community of church will purpose and reach, sometimes in quantifiable or in temporal terms. The ‘common-unity’ enables individual adhesion to these clearly articulated beliefs thus creating a common accord, in the spirit of being able to build individually and collectively upon them.
iv. Communication
This concerns how the community transmits to external others its core beliefs, values, or purpose in understandable language and methods. The concern is for acceptability and coherence in the social and cultural context. While convention might create an internal language, communication is concerned with the environmental perception of beliefs, values and vision and their acceptability.

v. Comprehension
This can be referred to as the shared historical story that extends over the life of the community from past to present and to future. The sense of shared story, experiences both constructive and detrimental that create bonds, in an appreciation of shared understanding, empathic relationship, providing meaning and continuity. This can be based upon locality, historicity, denomination, doctrine or practice. It is often the shared narrative that creates innate understanding, as it was with the people of Israel during the formative desert years. The calling to remembrance of the statutes of the Lord was one way of sustaining the collective self-understanding, as a collective experience does in the history of all peoples and nations. These bonds, constructed upon experiences, correlated attitudes and reactions, mould views of church and the world. It seems evident that the human social experience will oftentimes determine community comprehension.

vi. Visibility and Dynamics (belief & action)
Any constituted group will seek to formulate a vision which enshrouds purpose or mission. Beyond formulation, there is an inherent need to demonstrate collectively in words and actions ‘who we are and what we stand for’. In the offer to society, community integration tends to take priority over individual initiative. The missional impulse will form this according to the community rules.

Durkheim suggests, “There are not two religions of different types in opposition; rather they are on either side, the same ideas and the same principles, applied to circumstances that interest whole the community …” (50). It is therefore imperative to shed light on the nature of the ontological church in substance and demonstration to substantiate the sociological criteria advocated and if so, how does the ontological definition explicate them.
Psychological needs

Abraham Maslow, (1908-1970) was a major figure as a theoretician of humanistic psychology, arguing for the blending of objective and subjective in the need for experiential as well as spectator knowledge of traditional science\(^2\) (Atkinson and Field 574), renowned for his arguing for “hierarchy of needs” in order to self-actualize, classed as “motivational theory in psychology” (McLeod 1).

Sustaining connections rather than disconnections in identity defines humanity, which in turn defines fundamental needs. Maslow’s ladder begins with basic needs, followed by psychological needs that culminate in self-realization needs. The inverse unmet needs at any of the six levels creates internal tension and frustration, intra-and extra-personal conflict through defensive coping mechanisms, resulting in dysfunctionality and dependency, whether relational, emotional, psychological, or physical. In summary, trying to meet legitimate unmet needs in illegitimate ways.

i. Physical/Somatic Needs
These needs are reflected in need for food, drink, heat, sleep, procreation/sex to maintain and care for one’s physical life.

ii. Security/Safety Needs
These needs refer to a consciousness of safety or security, materially, physically and emotionally; to this could be added socially, financially and relationally. In referring to security it is sometimes synonymous with structure which enables a person to function healthily and appropriately. That structure can be both internal and external.

iii. Belonging
This need recognizes that human beings are relational or social by nature. Secular psychology suggests that a person cannot ‘be’ until another calls them in their identity to ‘existence’. To belong in this perception, calls a person into existence in their identity through relationship to another, ‘it is because you have said ‘you’ that I can say ‘me’. A reflection of conscious presence of self, of the other, and of belonging to self. Therein, love and affection needs are met, in expression and response. Family relationships

provide a sense of structure in which each person has a specific place and therefore belongs, or affiliation to friendship, work, or interest-based groups (McLeod 3).

iv. Recognizance/Esteem
Maslow focuses upon esteem for oneself and from others towards self, generally feeding: dignity, achievement, mastery, independence the desire for reputation or respect … status, and prestige (McLeod 3). There are other considerations: respect of personal space wherein identity is expressed, preserved, and permitted; the intrinsic worth or value of one’s self as a human being and identity; love and acceptation for self, by self and by others. What one thinks of self is significant as a source of psychic and behavioural life often influenced by one’s social, educational, religious, and cultural milieu.

v. Realization
The need encapsulated in Maslow’s term ‘self-actualization’, “… refers to the person’s desire for self-fulfilment, namely the tendency for him to become actualized in what he is potentially” (quoted in McLeod 6). The concept is of attaining all that a person could potentially be or achieve in “seeking personal growth and peak experiences” (Ibid.). In doing so, meaning is attributed to one’s existence, past, present, and future. Intrinsically, a perception of control, of confidence and of assurance in self and one’s abilities, leads to the expression of heightened creativity and originality as an actor rather than a spectator of one’s life.

Maslow composed a list of characteristics of the self-realized person including: experience life as a child, with full absorption and concentration; try new things not familiar paths; listen to one’s feelings in evaluating experiences instead of tradition or majority; be honest without pretence; be prepared for unpopularity when not in the majority opinion; take responsibility and work hard; and trying to or having the courage to identify your defences and to give them up (7).

vi. Spiritual Transcendence
Maslow’s theory evolved to include the need for transcendence in the expanded version.3 Maslow refrains from limiting transcendence to a uniquely spiritual need, to include:

---

3 The five-stage model (1943, 1954) expanded to include cognitive [stage 5 knowledge, understanding exploration, etc.] and aesthetic needs [stage 6 search for beauty, balance, form, etc.] (1970a) and later transcendence needs [stage 8] (1970b) (McLeod 4-5).
mystical, aesthetic, natural phenomena, sexual, humanitarian services, scientific and religious faith needs/experiences (Ibid. 5). In the context of this thesis the spiritual dimension retains particular significance. This transcendence is characterized by a conscious awareness of: maturity, fullness, completion, or perfection in self; of freedom to believe, experience, to engage, and express this spirituality.

Maslow saw these stages as a necessary progression of development albeit not with absolutist ideas. The natural progression would occur as each level of need was sufficiently met. Critically, the requisite need to follow the order is thwarted by examples where recognizance needs are found in those lacking psychosomatic and security needs, such as in India, Africa, and Asia. The affirmation of the legitimacy of these needs is not in question, rather the principle of logical progression. “Psychologists now conceptualize motivation as a pluralistic behaviour, whereby needs can operate on many levels simultaneously. A person may be motivated by higher growth needs at the same time as lower-level deficiency needs” (9).

It is significant in a Christian context that Maslow’s recognition of human need concurs with Jesus relating to the Father,⁴ and responding to people encounters in the Gospels.⁵ The major significant modification to the ‘ladder’ is that at each level the Bible teaches that Godhead defines, legitimizes and contextualizes the meeting of fundamental human need in the framework of relationship with God (Fig.XVI).

Consideration of church as a community of people, calls for recognition of human psychological needs as influential in the understanding of church from a human perspective. Where individual need is expressed in community, that shared need will be intensified and multiplied due to the ontological nature of church. It is therefore important to synthesize the principal elements that are addressed in the believer’s union in Christ and the church’s union in Christ also.

---


⁵ Jn.8:1-11: Mk.5:21-43; Mk.10:45-52; Lk.10:29-37; Lk.15:20-24; Jn.11:1-44. In all these texts several if not all six levels of need are met.
Philosophical needs: Modern, Postmodern, Pseudo-modern Perspectives

What is Culture?

“The ideas, customs and art of a particular society at a particular period;”

“Collectively, social structures and artistic, religious and intellectual manifestations which define a group or society distinguishing it from any other;”

“Culture consists of the institutions, technology, art, customs and social patterns that a society evolves;”

“The way of thinking and behaviour shared by a substantial social grouping which gives them identity in relation to others …”

Culture is then expressed through: customs, traditions, language, community accepted norms, art, social patterns, beliefs and practices, relationships, structures … and as such is something difficult to define categorically because it constantly evolves and develops through phases of human, national, regional, communitarian or family history.

This précis considers the principal criterion shaping western culture, as it relates to the potential effect upon the nature and essence of church. It is not the challenge of church becoming postmodern by its ideas or representations, rather that she engage with creativity to reformulate her theology, practices, and message in the postmodern world. In doing so, it is possible to observe and identify the effects of culture upon church and consider the ontological defining truths that transcend any specific culture thereby affecting acculturation to the definition of church.

Modernity is typically identified with the period of industrial revolution from the eighteenth century. However, the wider revolutions in the Enlightenment and Science, and the Reformation can also be written into this movement.

… the tower or building of modernity grew through three cumulative levels, three progressive floors or stories… the first or ground floor of the building of modernity was science … in the towering dream of Western civilization … the age of

---


enlightenment … the fruits of scientific rationality … also the age of the industrial revolution … technology … constitutes the second floor … if the first floor gave us insight and understanding, this second floor gives us power … mastery …. economic growth, seen as the raison d’être of the industrial and scientific progress, became the third floor … (Middleton and Walsh 16-17).

The authors summarize the modernity worldview as,

“Autonomous subjects, scientifically grasping and technologically controlling and transforming the world, unimpeded by threats such as tradition, ignorance, and superstition, devise their own remedy. In the modern era we are our own saviours. And we effect our salvation in secular redemptive history through the ineluctable and inevitable march of progress. This is the heart of modernity’s historical self-confidence (20).

The cultural shift from modernism raises the question “… as to how much postmodernism is a demolition of modernism and how much it is merely a radical extension of it” (Hilborn 13). The term ‘deconstructionism’ is employed for the postmodern view, with such examples as the collapse of USSR, and the Berlin Wall, in contrast to the totalization of the modern construct. In assessing the founding characteristics of Postmodernity, David Hilborn helpful and succinctly identifies eight principles in a worldview of fragmentation (20-39).

i. Ambivalence

“It would take only a very little god to give neat, precise answers to life’s questions; uniform apples plucked from a low-branched doctrinal tree and ready-picked for easy consumption” (21) typifying the postmodern reaction to the modernist religious construct. The cynical deconstruction of any sense of absolute truth is regarded with suspicion and doubt, in fact rather doubt than be deceived. To absolute truth is added systematic constructs that suggest the wielding of authority over others. The shift is from objectivity to subjectivity, from prepositional to contextual and narrative stories, in which a person in context, brings meaning to the story. Ambivalence equates to the plethora of possible subjective perspectives.
The ‘ambivalents’ show a preference for their own lifestyle. No question of imposing or being subject to any others. Imperialist and absolute truth should be replaced by tolerance and solidarity without judgment.

**ii. Difference**

The celebration and promotion of differences: the heterogeneity of distinctions, diversity in culture, religion and faith are found in this value (25). Without some explication and finality to explain the world, people are constrained to accept plurality and multiplicity in every domain. The trajectory of such plurality in fusion is syncretism, “a ‘pick’n’mix’ approach to symbols, spiritualties and identities” (25). Present needs substitute context and the integrity of origins. Thomas Oden affirmed that the church was one of the rare institutions that is prepared to face the postmodern world because the church is multicultural and multigenerational (Ibid.). The postmodern deconstructionist struggle in this domain is the promotion and embrace of alterity and diversity in the face of homogeneous unifying constructs in all sectors of society.

**iii. Perspectivism**

Describes a divergence of individual perceptions and consequentially personal definitions of what reality is. The moderate version is perception of reality that is stable yet void of universal absolute reference. The radical view holds that reality is that person’s perception and likewise the principle applies to explanation, interpretation, and belief about the wider world, “I am I and my circumstances” (28). “Knowledge … although in principle concerning realities independent of the knower, is never itself independent of the knower … [it] depends on the relationship between his or her perspective …” (Middleton and Walsh 167). The effect of customizing what does exist to fit with one’s perspective feeds directly of this characteristic. Living with paradox is perceived as an integral part of perspectivism and is readily applied to the domain of faith and the Person of Jesus; to the identity of God-Man, the postmodernist will better reconcile him or herself to the paradoxes of Jesus person and life.

**iv. Reproduction (‘Secondariness’)**

“T.S. Eliot was quoted, ‘Good poets borrows, great poets steal.’” (31). The feeling exists that nothing much is wholly original. Things herein can only be reproduced, cloned, or borrowed. The concept of reproduction is that nothing creatively original exists and
therefore the postmodern culture focuses upon reproduction perceived distinctly in: technology, the music industry, film, cinema and the arts. The idea of contextual improvement albeit perceptual would better describe the trend. In religious terms, the representations of God, (icons, epiphanies, stained glass windows, etc.), the epiphany of the image is the reality. In other words, the symbol no longer points to a greater reality but if there is a greater transcendent reality it is confined to the image and the sensorial experience of the moment. The election of form and the subsequent confusion with substance is immanence without transcendence, a form of divine without the Person of God, “having a form of godliness but denying its power” (NKJV 2Ti.3:5).

v. Superficiality

Is a question of playing with: the meaning of the style rather than reflecting on the words; the mode rather than the substance, the image over the reality. Other terms such as consumerism, trend, cosmetic or surgical makeovers, imitation over authenticity, and appearance over content, sensation over challenge, transient over unchanging. Liz McComb, the jazz singer is supposed to have defined the difference between Gospel and Blues as: “… in Gospel we sing ‘Jesus’ in blues we change ‘Jesus’ for ‘baby.’” The risk for Christ and the church is that identity is in the person of Jesus Christ, not as an image borrowed or a fleeting experience but it is an incarnate all-consuming life to be lived in its fullness and for eternity in contrast to an ‘off the peg, ready-to-wear’ Gospel, victim of the mode, waiting to be replaced by the next trend.

vi. Immediacy

The compression of history in to a single present instant is called the phenomenon of “de-traditionalism.” That is to say, a culture of acceleration – everything is for the present instant, here and now. The ‘need’ is emptied of waiting and the longer-term is shaken by the short-term (35).\textsuperscript{10} The immediacy of access to information everywhere condensed into seconds or minutes engenders a loss of memory, individually and collectively. Attention spans in the western world, where there has been no oral traditions for example, find attention spans reduced to between seven and ten minutes, the length of the average music YouTube video clip, the average televised news bulletin, the publicity breaks between

\textsuperscript{10} E.g., International news every 10 minutes on major News channels is the banalisation of the meaning and significance of events in whatever sphere that be.
television emissions, etc. The acceleration culture is the cause of the loss of historical memory that engenders discontinuity. For faith, it is the conscious loss of context or metanarrative into which individual and collective destinies are written into God’s personal history with humanity. The perspective ‘from eternity to eternity’ is irrelevant if the provisions for the present moment are available. The risk is a ‘instantaneous need’ driven faith and church. Immediacy does breed superficiality. The immediate and instantaneous can be met in Christ, but the constructive and rooted meaning and significance are found in the ontological context to the incarnate Godhead and divine history-making.

vii. Globalisation

A global civilization through the means of: Internet, (information), transport (mobility), enterprise, (multi-national networking), politics and economics, (zone collaboration), and satellite, (communication). The phrase ‘global village’ defines well this thought (36). The tension between local and global, in terms of individual and collective identity is one undercurrent felt across the globe. Globalization affecting language, culture, political and economic systems, global brands and products, are some areas affected. Human life continuing to bear the hallmarks of modernism. Steve Redhead employs concepts terms such as “mobile cities, mobile modernity, and mobile mobility” as descriptive of the core principle and trend. Christians are, however, skeptic about international movements of peace, ethics, the United Nations even though one cultural characteristic of evangelicals is to demonstrate an accurate vision of the world and the Kingdom of God under construction.

In terms of faith the creative and technological possibilities in terms of access to means are to be fathomed in a missional mindset. The effects upon the conception of Church, ministry and the propagation of message of the Person of Jesus are to be held in submission to God as the God of creative origins and means. The challenge is how the means have influenced the biblical witness to church and faith. Can the characteristics of globalization positively affect the ontology of Trinity, the believer and church, ontological being essential nature?

viii. Pragmatism

The evangelical tendency is to pragmatism and activism rather than reflection, the conversionist imperative has made evangelicals typically pragmatic (7). The origin is partly American, (1839-1910), based on the principle of practicing the effects of ideas in a real context. This movement was generally characterized as antimodernist reactionary, reductionist and anti-intellectual spirit. However, the vision and involvement in missions, and para-church works, progressed considerably the worldwide work of God (Sinclair and Wright 266-267).

The arrival of postmodernism resulted in the subordination of global world visions, of existence, of God, replaced by a preoccupation with the immediate and local corresponding to the postmodern heterogeneity and ambivalence. God becomes a marketing tool to ‘do Gospel.’ If solely pragmatic, the contemplation of the personal and profound meaning of the Gospel is lost.

**Pseudo-modernism**

Dr Alan Kirby’s article entitles “The Death of Postmodernism and Beyond”\(^{12}\) advocates the demise of the postmodern era for what he designates as ‘Pseudo-modernism’. Postmodernism conceived of contemporary culture as a spectacle before which the individual sat powerless, and within which, questions of the reality were problemized. Pseudo-modern cultural products cannot and do not exist unless the individual intervenes physically in them. Internet is a playground where the pseudo-modernist can creatively make pathways, virtual journeys freely, that have not previously existed, “gives the undeniable sense (or illusion) of the individual controlling, managing, running, making up his/her involvement with the cultural product. Internet pages are not ‘authored’ in the sense that anyone knows who wrote them, or cares.”

The immediacy of postmodernism is relative to the pseudo-modern immediacy where the instantaneous has no memory recall,

> certainly not the burdensome sense of a preceding cultural inheritance which informed modernism and postmodernism. Non-reproducible and evanescent,

---

pseudo-modernism is thus also amnesiac: these are cultural actions in the present moment with no sense of either past or future ... the activity of pseudo-modernism has its own specificity: it is electronic, and textual, but ephemeral. In postmodernism, one read, watched, listened, as before. In pseudo-modernism one phones, clicks, presses, surfs, chooses, moves, downloads.

The globalisation of the world is experienced differently according to Kirby, as globalised economic markets control and regulate social activity “Pseudo-modernism is of course consumerist and conformist, a matter of moving around the world as it is given or sold.”

In reference to an informed global perspective, “… pseudo-modernism was not born on 11 September 2001, but postmodernism was interred in its rubble,” in the light of rising extremism religious, political, and social as normative. There is an underlying deep-seated anxiety about life, yet marked by an inability to engage, or by self-confessed ignorance, nevertheless engenders escapism,

    Extends far beyond geopolitics, into every aspect of contemporary life; from a general fear of social breakdown and identity loss, to a deep unease about diet and health; from anguish about the destructiveness of climate change, to the effects of a new personal ineptitude and helplessness, which yield TV programmes about how to clean your house, bring up your children or remain solvent. This technologized cluelessness is utterly contemporary: the pseudo-modernist communicates constantly with the other side of the planet, yet needs to be told to eat vegetables to be healthy, a fact self-evident in the Bronze Age. He or she can direct the course of national television programmes, but does not know how to make him or herself something to eat – a characteristic fusion of the childish and the advanced, the powerful and the helpless.

“In place of the neurosis of modernism and the narcissism of postmodernism, pseudo-modernism takes the world away, by creating a new weightless nowhere of silent autism.”

13 Kirby, Alan. “The Death of Postmodernism and Beyond”
Pseudo-modernism, still retains something of an admission of the modernist construct, the seeming fatalism leads to passivity or at best passive acceptance of the status quo. Where the postmodern deconstructionist conception seems to have died, in the light of terrorism and fanaticism contesting the phlegmatic postmodern spirit, which has engendered a crisis of security: personal, social, and national, and logically eventually globally too.

This résumé of the philosophical influences upon society is to stimulate heightened awareness as to the importance of recovering the ontological both of individual believers in societal fracture and dislocation, and of ontological church as a response.

The sociological criteria of community draw attention to the centrality of human need for relationship, belonging, structure and direction that emerge out of the community. The reminder of relationship and community origins and blueprint in the Trinity is vital in restoring the authenticity and distinctiveness of Christo-centricity in Godhead to Church. Human psychological is legitimate and innate according the creational order and in Jesus’ redemptive encounters and atonement. The legitimacy of human ontology is when these needs are originated and [re]sourced in Godhead. Human identity and significance are found in union with Godhead. Philosophical consideration has also highlighted the characteristics of modern, postmodern, and pseudo-modern cultural trends. The ontological reality of the believer and the church restoring being and existence over institutionalization and functionality, delivers church from pursuing contextual and cultural acceptability to recover her ontological raison d’être in the Trinity. For the three persons are the unique origin and culture of the church generated as an extension of Trinity, given as a demonstration to the world.
WHAT GOD SAYS OF HIS CHURCH (NINE IMAGES)

The quintessential question “What does God say of His Church?” constitutes the subject of this section in which the exegesis is developed in response to the historical, sociological, psychological and philosophical reflections of the chapter. The ontological renewal of Church necessitates a reconstruction of church according to divine intentions. The Church comes out of Godhead and therefore exists and has purpose because of that Trinity relationship. The Church exists for God and therefore also has Godhead as its essential centre of focus.

Renewing church ontologically is an invitation to reconsider the scriptural witness, putting aside assumptions, preconceptions, historical filters of interpretation and traditional grids through which church is understood in its present form. In this light, there is no systematic or rational teaching of the church in the Bible. There are illustrations and figures which describe the core foundations of the ontological nature, function and purpose of the church: a man, a temple, a bride, a vine, a household, a body, a building, an eyewitness, a field.

Renewing church ontologically

i. The New Man

For He is our peace, making the two one and the partition wall which separates he demolished the hate in his flesh, the law, the commandment in the dogma he put an end to in order that He, from two create in Himself a new quality man, making peace, and he might restore to the original intentions the two in one body to God by the cross, killing the hate in Him (TLT Ep.2:14-16).

The Jesus Axiom

The ‘ἀποκατάλλασσω’ to God’s original intentions in Christ, through his death and his resurrection, intimates a paradigmatic shift of cosmic proportions, overturning established ethnic identities of people groups. The redemptive act becomes a creative regenerative act whereby all that existed beforehand confronts the purpose of God in Christ and the cross whereby, nothing is the same anymore, for there is now a ‘New Man’.

It is essential to understand something of God’s ways; why the person of Jesus Christ and death by crucifixion should exercise preponderance whereby an original New Man is the
outcome. Scripture states that Jesus came not to destroy the Law or the Prophets but to fulfill all that is written concerning Himself.\(^1\) The ‘πληρόω’ in the infinitive describes the end purpose of completing, filling to full or bringing to realization.\(^2\) “[The] distinctive of the NT fulfilment is the eschatological content … The NT concept of fulfilment is summed up in the person of Jesus” (Kittel and Friedrich @640). The other vital NT term is ‘τελέω’ to make an end, accomplish, complete, or perfect to the end goal, the point of termination is in view (1375-1376 Zodhiates). Consequently, the meaning of the two terms is synonymous.

In the biblical covenantal concept of ‘old’ and ‘new’ Paul illustrates the thought in Romans chapter seven, using a marriage between a man and a wife as an analogy to the relationship of the believer to Law and sin (the old), Spirit and life (the new). The principle is that death is required to fulfill covenant agreement before something new can be inaugurated in its place. Jesus, in His person, his death and resurrection, becomes the ‘τελειωτής’\(^3\) and the ‘τέλος’\(^4\) of the ‘old’ in order that He have the authority to instate the ‘new’ order, having perfectly accomplished the work of the Father.\(^5\) Jesus inaugurates a new covenant,\(^6\) a new commandment,\(^7\) a new teaching,\(^8\) a new temple,\(^9\) a new priesthood,\(^10\) a new living way,\(^11\) a new creation,\(^12\) and a new people.\(^13\) In order to do this,

\(^1\) Mt.5:17; 26:56; Lk.24:44; Ac.3:18.
\(^2\) ‘πληρόω’ TGEL 2016.
\(^3\) Heb.12:2.
\(^4\) Ro.10:4; Rev.21:6.
\(^5\) Jn.4:34; 17:4.
\(^6\) Is.59:21; Jer.31:33-34; Ez.36:26-27; Mt.26:28; Heb.8:8-13.
\(^7\) Mk.12:29-31; Gal.5:14; Jn.2:8.
\(^8\) Mt.5:1-7:29, esp.7:28-29; 23:9-10; Mk.1:21-28; Jn.7:15-17; Ac.17:19; 2Jn.1:9.
\(^9\) 1Co.3:16; 6:19; Ep.2:22.
\(^10\) 1Pe.2:9; Jn.4:23-24; Ro.12:1; Ph.3:3; Heb.12:28.
\(^11\) Heb.10:20.
\(^12\) 2Co.5:17; Gal.6:15; Ep.4:24; Col.3:10.
\(^13\) Ep.2:14-16.
He has to be the ‘τέλος’ in order to introduce the believer into this new ontological existence of the New Man.

New Covenant

OT covenant, has been discussed in the previous chapter, the focus of this chapter is the relationship of covenant to Christ the ‘τέλος’. Isaiah prophecies of the Servant, “I will give you as a covenant for the people, a light for the nations”\(^\text{14}\) (ESV Is.42:6). Motyer sees the parallelism of the phrase and conceives the covenant as to Israel and all nations (322). Christ is not comparable to Moses who was the Law-Giver, He is that, but He is the covenant in Himself, rather than focusing on the reach of the covenant as Ellison does (20-21). In the celebration of the Passover with his disciples Jesus says, “Take, eat, this is my body … drink out of it all; for this is my blood of the new covenant …” (TLT Mt.26:26-28), words echoed in John chapter six, “whoever feeds on my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me and I in him” (ESV Jn.6:56). The author of Hebrews reiterates, “This makes Jesus the guarantor of a better covenant … in speaking of a new covenant he makes the first one obsolete … by means of his own blood … he is the mediator of a new covenant …” (Heb.7:22; 8:1; 9:12, 15). Christ is figured as the covenant due to his own blood and He is the mediator of the covenant, conform to the same principle of Christ, Priest, and sacrifice. The New Covenant of eternal salvation is completed by the prophetic accomplishment of the giving and indwelling of the Spirit which is given by Christ, in Trinity.\(^\text{15}\) The legal procedure of Law, in sacrifice, ceremony, regulation and ritual, is superseded by the indwelling Spirit in order that a new spirit and a new heart be the divine means of the New Covenant, of the Spirit\(^\text{16}\)

New Commandment

Christ can only introduce the believer into the ontological new reality, the antithesis of Law if he has accomplished it, through life\(^\text{17}\) and particularly through his death.\(^\text{18}\) The

\(^{14}\) See also Is.49:8.

\(^{15}\) Heb.9:12; Jer.31:33-34; Heb.10:16-17.

\(^{16}\) Is.59:21; 2Co.3:6.

\(^{17}\) Gal.4:4-5; Jn.1:17; Heb.4:15.

\(^{18}\) Ro.10:4; 7:4; 8:2-3; Gal.3:18-19; Ep.2:15; Col.2:13-14.
point is that Christ cannot give a ‘new’ commandment unless the ‘old’ has been accomplished. "Do not think that I came to destroy the Law or the Prophets. I did not come to destroy but to fulfill. For assuredly, I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle will by no means pass from the law till all is fulfilled” (NKJV Mt.5:17-18) when interpreted teleologically of Jesus, “the Word became flesh and dwelt among us … full of grace and truth … I Am the truth …” (ESV Jn.1:1, 14; 14:6) warrants the affirmation that if Jesus Christ is the incarnation of the perfect Word of God and the ‘τέλος’ of all that is written in the Law and the Prophets then as He speaks the phrase, by his incarnation and fulfillment of scripture, this word is accomplished in Him and therefore through death, freed Himself from the Law, to inaugurate a ‘new commandment’.\(^{19}\) Jesus frequently refers to ‘my word’, or ‘my commandment’ which should be read in this light.\(^{20}\) His accusation of the religious leaders is “… you do not have his word abiding in you, for you do not believe the one whom he has sent. You search the Scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that bear witness about me” (ESV Jn.5:38-39). Jesus explains the true purpose of the written word is Himself, who is eternal Life. The written word that is not Christocentric in its ‘τέλος’ fails to recognize the paradigmatic axiom that He is. The difficulty expressed in Matthew’s text over the legitimacy and place of the Law has been traditionally volatile, to which this principle of ‘τέλος’, which is textually in opposition to dissolution (‘καταλύω’), may resolve some of that tension. Edersheim denotes the Judaic sensitivity in relation to the iota, “… the guilt of changing those little hooks (‘titles’) which make the distinction between … Hebrew letters … that, if such were done, the world would be destroyed” (371). Morris attempts to explain by elaborating three principles Jesus would fulfill, “he would do the things laid down in Scripture … he would bring out the full meaning of Scripture … he would bring Scripture to its completion” (108). The first and second options offer unsatisfactory purport etymologically and contextually; that is to make Jesus an executor and an expositor. The second area of concern is in response to whether the Law is no longer binding on believers, the Law being described as a ‘παιδαγωγός’ until Christ,\(^{21}\) who

---

\(^{19}\) Jn.13:34; 1Jn.2:7, 8; 2Jn.1:5.

\(^{20}\) Jn.5:24; 8:31, 51; 14:23; 14:15, 21; 15:10, 12.

\(^{21}\) Gal.3:24-25.
supersedes the Law, what code is there to guide attitude and conduct? In the previous chapter consideration was given to this, which affirmed the significance of an ontological shift in how life in God is manifest. The Law undergirds and perpetuates the religious mode, whereas incarnation and indwelling of Godhead brings regenerative change to the believer; the means and mode of ontological life in the Age of Christ and the Spirit. It is noteworthy in the beatitudes, Jesus takes the principles of the Decalogue and elevates them out of reach of human and Pharisaic righteousness, “all have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God” (Ro.3:23) is the only reasonable deduction from Jesus usage. It is rightly so, as suggested that He is appealing to the ontological existence in Himself and Him in the believer, as the unique means of being able to live such a quality of life in which: the Law of Love and Liberty;\textsuperscript{22} the Law of source, ‘out of Godhead’;\textsuperscript{23} the Law of character;\textsuperscript{24} and an existential Law,\textsuperscript{25} give substance. To this ontological existence the usage of Law therefore has obsolete posture in mode, function, and purpose.

New Teaching

Jesus radically breaks with Judaism, with religiosity, formality, appearances, and hypocrisy, “… for the sake of your tradition you have made void the word of God You hypocrites …” (ESV Mt.15:6). What is significant is that Christ comes as the ‘τέλος’ of the Jewish Scriptures, the Messianic hopes, and the depositary of the Kingdom. This is most evident in the Sermon on the Mount, “you have heard … But I say to you …”\textsuperscript{26} In doing so Jesus meets the full weight of the Mosaic Law, summarized in the Decalogue, and expresses authority by redefining the core meaning and outworking according to Himself. In this his authority outweighs that of the Law. The relationship to Jesus is therefore established as superior to, greater than, or rather ‘τέλος’. It is on this basis that Jesus freely affirms, or establishes his new teaching or commandment. He affiliates the familiarity of the words with a new reality rooted in lives rather than observance.

\textsuperscript{22} Jm.2:8; 1:25.

\textsuperscript{23} 1Co.1:30; Jn.1:13; 6:63; Ro.8:2; 2Co.3:5.

\textsuperscript{24} Gal.5:22; 2Pe.1:3-11; 2Co.6:6-7; Ep.5:9; Col.3:10-14; 1Ti.6:11-12; 2Ti.2:22-26.

\textsuperscript{25} Jn1:12-13; Ac.17:25, 28; Col.1:16-17, 27; Ep.4:15; Gal.1:15; Jn.15:4-5; Gal.3:26-28; 6:15.

\textsuperscript{26} Mt.5:21-22, 27-28, 31-32, 33-34, 38-39, 43, 44, 6:2, 5, 16, 25, Mk.4:24; Lk.11:9.
Jesus reconnects proclamation and demonstration, as his teaching is generally accompanied by signs and miracles that attest to his identity. He is the fulfilment of the Shepherd to his own, a sign that religious Israel was not fulfilling the mandate; the sheep being identified by those who hear his voice, in view is the identity of Christ the Messianic Shepherd. In being a shepherd, expressing compassion, miracles are accomplished as the prophets declared. As He fulfills this ministry to the poor, the needy, the wounded, the possessed, and the untouchables; they became the living demonstration that the King and the Kingdom were now. In doing so he contradicts flatly the belief of cursed people through sickness, demon possession, and death. Jesus attacks the fundamental definition of sin and impurity and enforces a redemptive approach to all those who would call or come to him.

In summary the teaching of Jesus implicitly and explicitly denounces the religious spirit and practice of Judaism – imbibed with the presumption of Israel in the face of Christ who is ‘τέλος’.

**New Temple**

Jesus words intimate a significant change, “But I say to you that something greater than the temple is here” (NAS Mt.12:6). Jesus later redefines the temple, ”We heard Him say, ‘I will destroy this temple made with hands, and within three days I will build another made without hands’” (NKJV Mk.14:58), to which John records, “The Jews then said, “It has taken forty-six years to build this temple, and will you raise it up in three days? But he was speaking about the temple of his body”” (ESV Jn.2:21). These texts suggest that Jesus is presenting Himself as the legitimate temple and in doing so He is accomplishing the temple by becoming it. This is confirmed by the discussion with the Samaritan woman in John chapter four when Jesus states that neither on the mount of Samaria nor Jerusalem will worship be fulfilled but in spirit truth. The absence of temple reference indicates that the temple is obsolete, thereby reiterating the previous statement

---

27 Mt.4:23; 8:1-3, 14-17; Mk.2:5-12.
28 Ez.34:3-6, 11, 15-16; Mk.6:34, Jn.10:2-4, 11, 14-16, 26-27; Heb.13:20.
29 Mt.9:36; 14:14; 15:32; 20:34; Mk.5:19; Lk.7:13; Lk.15:20.
30 Mk.5:24-27; Lk.7:37-39; Jn.7:53-8:11.
31 Jn.4:21-24.
of Jesus who is temple. The accomplishment is necessary for Jesus to create a new temple, whereby ontologically the believer individually and corporately is “being built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the cornerstone in whom the whole building being intimately joined together grows into a holy temple in the Lord…” (TLT Ep.2:21-22). The believers become temple through union in He who is temple. The epitome of which is the heavenly reality, “And I saw no temple in the city, for its temple is the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb” (ESV Rev.21:22). While this reference is to the eschatological and eternal reality of the divine presence, it is also cohesive with the interpretation offered. It is because of Christ ‘τέλος’ that the ‘new temple’, the individual believer and the collective church are in Christ ontologically temple. A full expression of what will be eschatologically perfected in Christ.

**New Priesthood**

For the believers to be called “… a holy priesthood to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ … a royal priesthood…”32 (ESV 1Pe.2:5, 9), it is necessary for Christ to be the ‘τέλος’ of the old priesthood. The book of Hebrews develops especially in chapters’ seven to ten, Christ the high priest in an eternal priesthood;33 the death of Christ effecting a change of priestly law, to inaugurate a new lineage, that of an indestructible life and an eternal and permanent priesthood,34 securing eternal redemption, in one unique expiatory act.35 In this, Christ has called every believer to the priesthood of all believers, “… how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?” (NKJV Heb.9:14) establishes all cleansed and forgiven believers in Christ to priestly service (‘λατρεύω’). The ‘new priesthood’ therefore is constituted in Christ, because he has fulfilled the priesthood, and believers become priests, “For we are the circumcision, the Spirit God serving priestly and glorifying in Christ Jesus and absolutely not being persuaded in flesh” (TLT Ph.3:3). The offering of

32 See also Rev.1:5-6.
33 Heb.7:3.
34 Heb.7:11-12, 16, 24.
35 Heb.9:12; 10:12.
the priesthood ontologically is expressed by Paul, “therefore I exhort you brothers by the tenderness of God to stand present before God your bodies a living sacrifice set apart distinctively well pleasing and acceptable your logical priestly service” (TLT Ro.12:1). Christ the ‘τέλος’ of the priesthood introduces believers to a new ontological priesthood, whereby they are analogously priest and sacrifice in the likeness of Christ.

New Living Way

Consequently brothers possessing boldness with freedom to enter the holiest in the blood of Jesus he renewed for us a new and living way through the veil this thing which is his body and great priest over the house of God, we might draw near with an honest genuine heart in certain faith having been cleansed in heart separated out of an evil conscience and bodies having been washed in pure water (TLT Heb.10:20-22). This text pronounces the death of ‘copy’. Christ has made an offering in the heavenly reality, thereby rendering obsolete any earthly construct. The unique and eternal order of the new way is established. Earthly constructs, as with the Mosaic model, legitimate and purposeful for an era, are now considered obsolete because of Christ’s heavenly model, a ‘τέλος’. The earthly religious priesthood, fulfilled and replaced in Christ; the daily ritual offerings and sacrifices, fulfilled in Christ’s offering of Himself; the minister in the earthly, fulfilled in Christ the heavenly minister. The new heavenly way is uniquely Christ-centred; there is no continuance of earthly procedure, priestly ritual or ceremony that can imitate or replicate the heavenly reality. This must extend to attempts to reproduce in some earthly form the heavenly reality, of which ‘copies’ are no longer legitimate or viable expressions.

---

36 Function is not considered because it is not the primary purpose of this thesis.

37 See also Heb.4:16; 7:15, 19; 12:22; 1Pe.2:4.

38 Heb.8:5-7; 10:1, 9-10.

39 Heb.7:11, 17.


41 Heb.7:25-26; 8:1, 6; 10:21.
Christ is described as ‘ἀρχιερεύς’ he who enters the holy of holies not once a year but once to remain eternally; as ‘ἱερεύς’, the one offering, not repeated nor perpetuated offerings and sacrifices, but a once for eternity offering of Himself and sacrifice of his blood, in an eternal priesthood; and ‘ἱερεα μεγαν’ where the meaning is the superlative greatness, excellence, splendour, or eminence of Christ’s priesthood. The term is declarative and celebratory. Purified in the conscious centre of all one’s being, the physical and spiritual, the material and immaterial, in short, every component part of a constituted human being, is an essential ministry of Christ and the Spirit in union abiding and indwelling in Christ. Thereby witnessed to, by a real and authentic heart, (whole being), in ‘παῤῥησία’: freedom, openess, unambiguous, simple speech - without need for figures and comparisons, are the criteria for drawing near to God and to Jesus on the throne. Scripture confirms that because of Christ’s ‘τέλος’ every believer in union with Christ, is in His presence. Paul exhorts to consider the heavenly reality that the Hebrew writer expresses as, “holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling” (NKJV Heb.3:1). Calvin sees this as “a thorough surrender of themselves to Christ,” (Calvin @6852) but the context suggests a reference not to what the believer can ‘do or offer’ but rather that in Christ, he/she is constantly before the throne and with such access in Christ, can be no closer to the Father and Christ and the Spirit than that person already is. The Hebrews exhortation is in fact not to depart from that heavenly reality. Peter adds that every believer is a priest in Christ the high priest. The believer’s ontological place is in the heavenly environment to which he has, conscious and immediate, constant and unhindered, access. What the Hebrews text infers, Paul makes explicit in Romans, that the priestly offering of the believer is his whole person.

The new uncluttered way is thereby eternally established in Christ for every believer-priest, benefiting from every spiritual blessing in Christ in the heavens. The earthly

---

43 Heb.7:17, 24.
44 Col.3:1-2.
45 Ro.12:1-2.
46 Ep.1:3.
reality is to be profoundly and singularly ontological and imperatively the expression of the heavenly.

New Creation

Previous chapters have expounded this reality. In this context, “… in Christ Jesus neither circumcision [is] something potentially powerful nor uncircumcision but a new creation” (TLT Gal.6:15) concerns how Christ is ‘τέλος’ and the effect for any believer. The ‘new’ (‘καινός’) is a direct reference to the regeneration and renewal in Christ, in the Spirit.47 The ‘creation’ (‘κτίσις’) refers to an original substantive creative act, person or object. This new genre of human being is the product of the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ48 and subsequently of the believer who joined in union in Christ experiences Him exercising a ministry of death, burial and resurrection within.49 In this, Christ is called the ‘πρωτότοκος’,50 “[of] all creation, because in Him all things were created … He is the Head and Source of the body, the church, who is firstborn out of the dead”51 (TLT Col.1:15, 18). The nature of Christ has already been discussed in a previous chapter and so it remains to focus upon the teleological consequences of the text. It suffices to comment that in Jewish tradition the Hebrew phrase for, Jehovah, ‘becoro shel olam’ translates as “the first-born of all the world, or of all creation … The phraseology is Jewish; and as they apply it to the Supreme Being merely to denote his eternal pre-existence …” (Clarke @6336).

This new genre of humanity defined in the ‘new creation’ is regenerate in union in Christ, through death and burial, to resurrection to eternal life. Jesus Christ is ‘τέλος’ in that He is the firstborn of resurrection to eternal life, it is uniquely on this basis that, “… He might be the firstborn among many brethren”. (NKJV Ro.8:29). Those firstborn believers are new ontological creations because of Christ, whose atonement is the means of accomplishing the prophetic promises of a new mode of being. Christ as ‘πρωτότοκος’,

47 Tit.3:5; Gal.4:19; 2Co.3:18; Ep.4:24; Col.3:9-10; 2Co.5:17.
48 Ro.8:10-11.
49 Ro.6:3-5.
50 Ro.8:29; Heb.1:6.
51 Rev.1:5.
because of the pattern of death to resurrection has pre-eminence;\textsuperscript{52} the same principle renders collectively church as, “the assembly of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven …”\textsuperscript{53} (NKJV Heb.12:23).

**New People**

If the ‘new creation’ determines the nature of this resurrected believer, ontologically in Christ, a natural consequence is the constitution of a ‘new people’ with a new definition. Christ is the new definition and the believer’s union in Him forms the Christo-centricity of the corporate body church:

> Putting wholly off out from yourself the used old worn human being joined intimately together with his habitual old mode of acting, and having put on one’s self the brand new, being transformed into [the] new form and quality of life into knowledge by personal experience. Down from the image creating him; where absolutely has not a place or presence, Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, wildest barbarians or foreigners, bond slave, freeman; but all and in all Christ (Col.3:9-10);

> Because all of you are sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus because as many as into Christ were baptised put on yourselves Christ. There is absolutely not present among you Jew neither Greek, is absolutely not present among you bondslave neither freeborn, is absolutely not present among you male and female because all of you are one in Christ Jesus (TLT Gal.3:26-28)

In both texts the ethnic and cultural distinctions in the most extensive sense are abrogated, whereby it is not due to the very existence of such distinctions, rather they are superseded by a greater ontological and existential definition. The religious traditions and practices are deemed inoperative; social status in terms of being master of oneself; gender distinction between male and female; none of these exemplary criteria are considered extraneous to the definition of the ‘new people’. Some authors interpret these passages with a salvation only perspective,\textsuperscript{54} however, the believer viewed in Christ is primarily

\textsuperscript{52}Col.1:18.


\textsuperscript{54}Calvin, Gill @5986; Grudem 937; Strauch 64-65.
an ontological concern rather than a dogmatic one as this thesis has sought to demonstrate. That salvation in Christ transcends such distinctions, is confidently assumed, known and accepted as the biblical witness confirms. The import is the ontological definition of the ‘new people’, the passive voice determines that Christ baptizes and transforms regeneratively; while the putting on Christ is in the middle voice in both texts, indicating the need for a response to the incarnate indwelling of Christ in His Person. These principles clearly define the indiscriminate universalist approach to the text, (Henderson Church and Sexuality 54-56). This ‘new people’ is therefore defined according to Christo-centricity; that Christ externally be in the midst is inadequate, the texts suggest that Christ incarnate in the believer is the defining point whereby church is truly church. The defining reference for believers corporately is the measure of the Person of Christ in the other. All other criteria must be subservient or subjugated to the ‘τέλος’ of the believer ontologically in Christ without discrimination.

The principle of ‘τέλος’ in Christ should also address the confusion that reigns defining Israel, natural and spiritual, or empirical and spiritual, in conjunction with Church. According to doctrinal convictions: Pre-dispensationalists will insist upon a sharp distinction between the two throughout the biblical metanarrative to eschatology and teleology, Pre and Postmillennialists will in general adhere to a replacement theory of the church being the NT and eschatological reality of God’s people in view of the establishment of the Kingdom, whether now and progressive or progressive and culminating at the coming of Christ. Covenantal theologians stand distinct from Dispensationalism (McKay 320-321), “there are no exegetical grounds for denying that the relationship to Israel and the covenants are not reversed in Christ” (326).

Isaiah prophesies significantly in relationship to Christ and Israel. In chapter forty-nine verses one to four, the Lord is addressing Israel, “And He said to me, ‘You are My servant, O Israel, In whom I will be glorified” (NKJV Is.49:3). However, in verse five similar
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55 Ladd p583.
56 MacKay p320; Ryrie p140, 143.
57 Ladd p584; Mackay p325-326; Berkhof p710-715.
58 Is.49:1-4; 5-6.
themes are evoked again, this time another Lord’s servant is, “to bring back Jacob ... that Israel might be gathered to Him ... to raise up the tribes of Jacob ...” (Is.49:5, 6). In this latter section Israel is the object and not the subject as in the former. The identity of the first servant is clear in the text; the second is not explicitly identifiable, but the references to being salvation, being, covenant and being light, cannot apply to Israel’s remnant, neither Isaiah Himself that would be discordant with the wider spirit of the prophet (Motyer 384). These incarnate or inherent qualities can only be attributed to Jesus Christ.\textsuperscript{59} As to salvation, nowhere in Scripture is salvation attributed as a personal attribute to a people group, God alone is salvation.\textsuperscript{60} Isaiah makes reference to the ‘holy arm’ being revealed to the nations that they would see the salvation of God.\textsuperscript{61} In Scripture the ‘arm’ or the ‘right hand’ are often personified, referred to as distinct from God and capable of action,\textsuperscript{62} “He saw that there was no man, And wondered that there was no intercessor; Therefore His own arm brought salvation for Him; And His own righteousness, it sustained Him” (NKJV Is.59:16), the action of the ‘Right Hand’ or ‘Arm of the Lord’, suggests Jesus Christ as ‘τέλος’, “the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory” (NKJV 2Ti.2:10).\textsuperscript{63} In the same way that covenant is in a person, at no point is Israel a covenant, they are participants, beneficiaries and violators of God’s covenant. Isaiah prophesies in the light of Israel’s covenant with death that a tested foundation stone, a precious corner stone would be laid in Zion.\textsuperscript{64} The ‘new foundation cornerstone’\textsuperscript{65} is the covenant basis for salvation,\textsuperscript{66} it judges Israel unworthy of Kingdom stewardship,\textsuperscript{67} and in fulfilment, Christ is the new foundation of a new construction, the

\textsuperscript{59} Is.42:6; 9:1-2; Mt.4:14-16; Jn.8:12; Ac.13:47.
\textsuperscript{60} Ex.15:2; Job 13:16; Ps.67:2; Is.12:2.
\textsuperscript{61} Is.52:10.
\textsuperscript{62} Ps.18:35; 44:3; 45:3-4 see Rev.19:11-16; 48:10; 80:17;98:1; 118:15-16; Is.41:10; 48:13; 62:8; Mt.22:44; 26:64; 1Pe.3:21-22; Ps.89:13; Is.40:13; 53:1 see Jn.12:38; 59:16; 63:5.
\textsuperscript{63} Lk.2:30; 3:6; Ac.4:12; 13:47; 2Ti.2:10; Heb.5:9; Rev.7:9; Jn.4:42; Ac.13:23; 2Ti.1:10.
\textsuperscript{64} Is.28:14-16.
\textsuperscript{65} ‘Stone’ being symbolic of covenant and the dwelling or meeting place, house of God. “Then Jacob rose… and took the stone…, set it up as a pillar, and poured oil on top of it...And this stone which I have set as a pillar shall be God’s house...” (NKJV Ge.28:18, 22), see also Ge.49:17; Dt.4:13.
\textsuperscript{66} Ac.4:11-12; Ps.118:19-23.
\textsuperscript{67} Mt.21:33-46; Is.5:1-7.
church. Only Christ having fulfilled covenant, is the covenant. Israel was only ‘light’ because God was light amongst them. The divine intention was that Israel in Jerusalem be a light to the world, nations would gather to see the light, and conversely the light of God in Israel would reach out to all nations. Divine intention should be distinguished from Israel’s reality, “call[ing] darkness light and light darkness … groping blind in the darkness …” culminating in covenant frustration as Israel failed to live in the Lord’s light and by consequent incapable of fulfilling the covenant mandate to the nations, “The people who walked in darkness have seen a great light … on them has light shined …” (ESV Is.9:2) applied to and fulfilled in Jesus Christ. The Gospel record considers Israel out of the light, in darkness and in need of it, “that whoever believes in me should not abide in darkness… that you may become sons of the light” (NKJV Jn.12:46, 36).

Israel, Jerusalem, or Zion were to be filled with God’s righteousness and justice, it was to be an affair of the heart that would lead to eternal righteousness and salvation. Righteousness and justice were to extend out from Zion, they were the glory of God; they were to reveal Him. Jesus states, “unless your righteousness exceeds the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, you will by no means enter the kingdom of heaven” (NKJV Mt.5:30). Christ, as ‘τέλος’ was to fulfill all righteousness and justice. In this He fulfills the prophetic mandate requiring a demonstration to the world, a beacon of God’s righteousness and justice. Israel was intended to be a beacon for the nations, an open city to which they would gather to meet God, to be taught concerning Him and his ways, and conversely reaching out from Jerusalem to the nations, “… and fill the whole world

69 Mt.26:28; Ro.11:27; Gal.3:15-16.
70 Is.2:5; 10:17; 60:1-3, 11.
71 Is.5:20; 59:9.
72 Mt.4:15-16, Jn.1:5, 9; 3:19; 8:12; 9:5; 2Co.4:4, 6; 1Pe.2:9; Rev.21:2.3
73 Is.1:26; 33:5; 42:21; 51:7.
74 Is.2:3; 42:21; 51:4.
75 Is.53:11; 1Co.1:30; Ro.3:21-22, 26; Ro.9:30-31; 10:4.
76 Is.2:2; 26:1, 8; 41:1, 5; 45:20, 22; 55:1; 66:18.
with fruit” (ESV Is.27:6). Jesus clearing of the temple epitomizes the contradiction that was Israel. John’s context reinforces the point by referring to Jesus’ redefinition of his body as the temple, as opposed to the Herod’s temple. The teleological input renders limpid the end of the temple and the destined gathering place for the nations, fulfilled in the person of Jesus Himself and through his life and ministry, and the mandate addressed to the disciples for the nations, who were to be an offering to God. This lost divine vision in Israel engendered exclusivism, segregation, elitism, and arrogant presumption. The Israel of Isaiah’s prophecy is one of a mission field to be brought back, restored to God. This is reflected in Jesus own ministry, exemplified in such statements as “I have come for the lost sheep of Israel.”

The concept of light is often associated with glory and in Hebrew writings, glory with beauty. Israel was destined to shine out the glory of the Lord, a crown and a diadem for Israel, to the nations, the destiny of the redeemed. Isaiah foresees, “the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh shall see it together” (ESV Is.40:5). Luke alone contains the full quote, “… all flesh shall see the salvation of God” (TLT Lk.3:6), reflected in Paul’s words, “that they also may obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory” (NKJV 2Ti.2:10). The connection is then salvation as God’s glory. In this Christ, in whom is salvation, is also, “… the radiance of the glory of God” (ESV Heb.1:3). Isaiah prophetically foresees the incarnation of the glory of God in the person of Christ. Herein lies the ‘τέλος’ of Israel’s glory.
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Isaiah also describes the nature of Israel’s ministry to the people, in spirit and in act. Christ Himself pronounces the words of fulfilment in the Gospels, an accomplishment prophesied by Isaiah,

The Spirit of the Lord is on me therefore He anointed me to bring good news to the poor and helpless, he has sent me to make whole those having been broken in heart, to proclaim sight recovered to the blind, to send free those having been broken, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord … because this very day this scripture writing has been fulfilled in your ear (TLT Lk.4:18, 19, 21).

Textually taken from Isaiah chapter sixty-one in a parallel expression, Jesus stops short of the “year of the vengeance of our God”. Luke omits, “to comfort the mourning, to set in place the mourning in Zion, to give them a beautiful headdress for ashes, an oil of joy for mourning” (TLT Is.61:4). In this Jesus speaks of His ‘τέλος’ of Israel’s mandate to minister these aspects to their own people and to the nations, in Spirit.

The concept of ‘τέλος’ is expressed in that the call and mandate of Israel the servant is accomplished in Christ. He bears the same mandate as was intended to be fulfilled through Israel, but due to their repetitive and ultimate failure, the Servant Jesus in fulfilling the mandate, and doing so through death and resurrection thereby is free from the ‘old’ to institute the ‘new’. There is no replacement theory rather a principle of accomplishment in Christ. Whereby Christ becomes the centre point of the fulfilling of the purposes of God’s will.

This highest consummation of Christocentric accomplishment lays the foundation of a ‘new Christological people’ created, generated, and defined by Christ Himself serves to breakdown every possible criteria of distinction, of specificity, in every other expression outside of Christ; Him being the source and head of the church, which is his body, the fullness of him who fills all in all. Jesus Christ: a new humanity, a new people, a new foundation.

85 Is.10:2; 26:6; 56:6-8; 57:15; 58:6, 7; 32:5; 35:5.
86 Is.61:3.
87 Is.32:15; 30:15.
In conclusion the New Man is defined by Christ the ‘τέλος’ whereby promise or imperative are fulfilled in Him, thereby restoring Christo-centricity to the nature of Church. Christ is the discontinuity because in death ‘τέλος’ is exercised thereby inaugurating in Himself the origin, [re]source, the causality and agency of the Church.

ii. The Temple

Christ the ‘τέλος’ of the temple and the ‘new’ temple have been given consideration, the significance of temple in relation to the ontology of His person. This section consolidates that reflection, with a biblical overview of the temple culminating in the ontological expression into which Christ establishes the believer corporately as temple.

Do you not know that you are the temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwells in you? … for the temple of God is holy, and that is what you are” (NKJV 1Co.3:16; NAS 1Co.3:17), … in whom the whole building being intimately joined together grows into a holy temple in the Lord, in whom also you are being built intimately together into a permanent dwelling of God in Spirit (TLT Ep.2:21-22).

It is necessary to give a brief deliberation of antique and Hebrew conceptions of the temple. The consideration responds to the question, “What is temple?” providing fuller perception of the church as temple and identifying the common principles of deity and dwelling in addition to the Hebrew distinctions that underpin biblical revelation. Temples were primarily assigned as the residence for deities (Walton 113). Common to all near-Eastern cultures is the notion that all of human experience is centred upon the deity’s presence in a temple (129). This centrality reflected the celestial reality of a cosmic centre: economic, social, and moral centre, from where the decrees of the deity were sent out, administered, or executed (127-128). This conception, reflected in architecture, demonstrates the absence of sharp distinctions as in modern culture. Everything carried a sacred import, the natural was infused inseparably with supernatural and likewise, the physical with the spiritual. The only distinction was the identification of realms: heaven, earth, and the netherworld or under the earth world (199).

‘Sacred space’ was a common and recurrent theme in Israel and the neighbouring nations. The patriarchs would set up altars where God and an Angel of the Lord met and spoke
with them, made or renewed covenant. 89 Similarly, the destruction of altars, pillars, and wooden images as Israel conquers Canaan, is also the destruction of other gods, sacred spaces and places where ‘other’ worship would be practised.90 Yet it is what the Lord Himself declares that gives perspective to dimensions of sacred spaces and the temple dwelling of God. The uniqueness of Jehovah Yahweh is that he is One God, in contrast to the plethora of ‘major and minor gods’ arranged according to sphere of government in polytheism (Fox 298, 300). The Lord God is described as having the cosmos as his temple, “But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain You. How much less this temple which I have built!” (NKJV 1Kg.8:27). Solomon understands that God is not in created order but beyond it, over it. He recognizes that God therefore has the cosmos as His first dwelling space, “Thus says the LORD: “Heaven is My throne, And earth is My footstool. Where is the house that you will build Me? And where is the place of My rest? (NKJV Is.66:1).91 Moses captures the, space of the heavens and of earth as the sphere of God’s reign, “Therefore know this day, and consider it in your heart, that the Lord Himself is God in heaven above and on the earth beneath; there is no other … Indeed heaven and the highest heavens belong to the Lord your God, also the earth with all that is in it” (NKJV Dt.4:39; 10:14). The sacred space or temple is also the expanse of the heavens and on earth which belong to Him, as a creational right of ownership and in that the right to reside.92 God, being the creator of the heavens and the earth, has therefore the authority to choose his dwelling place. Implicitly, he has all authority in the heavenly realm, King of Heaven93 and so stands in opposition and in superiority to Hebrew worship of the hosts of heaven.94

89 Ge.12:7; 22:9; 32:24-31; 35:1, 7; Ex.17:15; 1Sa.7:12-13, 15-16.
90 Dt.12:1-4.
91 See also 1Ch.29:11Ne.9:6; Is.42:5; Zc.12:1.
92 See also 1Kg.22:19; 1Ch.29:11; Ps.103:19; 113:4.
93 Ge.14:22; Ezr.5:11; 7:23; Jer.23:24; Dn.2:37; 4:37.
94 Dt.4:19; 2Kg.17:16; 23:5.
The earth belongs to the Lord as creator,⁹⁵ “For the pillars of the earth are the Lord’s, And He has set the world upon them” (NKJV 1Sa.2:8); it is his sanctuary because it is filled with His glory, His name, that is to say his person, his presence and his attributes are manifest in it, exercising kingship over it, as he pleases.⁹⁶ So the Lord ministers: knowledge, justice, righteousness, goodness and mercy, judgment and vindication as He pleases,⁹⁷ over the inhabitants and the kingdoms within His sacred space.⁹⁸

Created and rested the seventh day

“For in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day. Therefore, the LORD blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it” (NKJV Ex 20:11). The other gods of near eastern antiquity are seen to create order out of conflict and chaos with a concern for temple as the control centre holding it all together. In the near eastern perspective, rituals to the deity assigned a role, humans could play in maintaining order in the cosmos (Walton 130). The Lord creates originally, not out of conflict but out of will, pleasure and purpose, that of being relationship with people. This created sacred space then is not essential to God rather it is to us (215). The created order is viewed as temple; God taking rest, having finished the creative work, is symbolic of establishing a balanced order and harmonious stability.

This rest of the Creator was indeed ‘the consequence of His self-satisfaction in the now united and harmonious, though manifold whole;’ but this self-satisfaction of God in His creation, which we call His pleasure in His work, was also a spiritual power, which streamed forth as a blessing upon the creation itself, bringing it into the blessedness of the rest of God and filling it with His peace (Keil and Delitzsch @7989).
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⁹⁵ Ex.9:29; Ps.50:1; 104:24; Is.40:28; 45:18.
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The seventh day rest is symbolic of that order, and it signals the enthronement of the sovereign ruler. In biblical thought, the concept of rest was of God moving from creation to maintaining and sustaining all that had been made. Edersheim, in a context of Sabbath conflict states, “he had broken the Sabbath-rest, as God breaks it, when He sends, or sustains, or restores life, or does good; all unseen and unheard without touch or outward application by the Word of His Power, by the Presence of His Life” (516).

God’s sacred space was also a garden. Near eastern art work from the thirteenth century “features a god in the middle from whom four streams of water flow. He is flanked by two sacred trees…” (Walton 122). The river source from the Garden of Eden, prefigures the life-giving water that flows from Ezekiel’s temple vision and John’s eschatological vision of the heavenly sanction of the throne, bringing life to creation and healing to the nations. “The garden is viewed as an archetypal sanctuary that is a place where God dwells and where man should worship him” (124). The first revelation of God’s intentional desire for relationship with Adam and Eve, the first to experience, without constraint: face to face communion in every sensorial way, the regular habit of walking in the garden in the cool of the evening with Adam epitomizes that meeting and intimacy. This relational reality of encounter suggests that worshipful response was consequential of this. What man lost in the Fall was proximity and eternity of relationship and life (125).

The holy hill, or mountain, firstly manifest in Sinai and then the hill called Zion is reflective of the Canaanite ‘high places’ where so often Israel would prostitute themselves in ritual and sexual acts of Baal worship. The Lord has established His holy hill as his dwelling place is an expression not of worshippers offering to God but of God descending to establish residency among men. The ancient ziggurat construction reflected this intention. The ziggurat was not considered a temple space for worship of mankind

99 Heb.1:3.
100 Ez.47:1-12; Rev.22:1-2.
101 Ez.47:9, 12; Jer.17:7-8; Ps.1:1-6; Rev.22:1-2.
102 Ex.19:18-20; Ne.9:13; Ps.68:8, 17.
103 Num.25:1-3; 1Kg.14:23; 2Kg.23:13; 2Ch.34:3-7.
Godward, rather it was a sort of portal for the god to descend (Walton 121-122). The Tower of Babel then had for its primary purpose to enable God to descend, or mens’ desire for God to descend. The near eastern Mesopotamian archaeological records witness, as does the Bible record, using other imagery such as Jacob’s ladder. The significance of the text is less explanatory of the angel traffic between heaven and earth, rather it foremostly gives a vision of the Lord standing and renewing covenant continuity from Abraham to Isaac and now reaffirmed to Jacob on the same terms. What is parallel besides the ladder, and the ziggurat, is a place of worship was built105 (120).

A mountain of God is the mountain of Bashan; A mountain of many peaks is the mountain of Bashan. Why do you fume with envy, you mountains of many peaks? This is the mountain which God desires to dwell in; Yes, the LORD will dwell in it forever. … The Lord is among them as in Sinai, in the Holy Place (NKJV Ps.68:15-17).

The mountain of Sinai or the hill of Zion, are inhabited by God and they are demarcated as holy places, where the tangible presence of God is visible and established, “Let us go to his dwelling place; let us worship at his footstool!” (ESV Ps.132:7). The localised presence is held in tension with the God who dwells in the cosmos and above it; the microcosm of the macrocosm. The desire of God to dwell in Zion is the prominent focus.106 God consistently seeks increasing relationship, proximity, and intimacy as the revelation of his sacred place becomes more focused. From this hill He will disseminate: righteousness and justice, salvation, wisdom, and knowledge; blessing, law, and word.107 The holy hill is dwelling in which transcendence and immanence meet in the person of God, his glory and his reign are manifest;108 it is a centre from which is disseminated the revelation of God; it is refuge.109 This centrisation concentrates the presence, the nature, and

104 Ge.28:11-17.
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the work of God in one place, reaching out to the ends of the earth. God thereby intensifies his revelation, covenant relationship and purpose. It serves as a magnetic pole for the Israelites in celebration, in tribulation, in disobedience and in restoration.¹¹⁰

God dwells in the tabernacle or the temple, reflected the archetypal cosmic sanctuary. The temple is considered the centre of the cosmos, a microcosmos (Walton 123). “O LORD of hosts, God of Israel, the One who dwells between the cherubim, You are God, You alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth. You have made heaven and earth (NKJV Is. 37:16). When God made evident his covenant intentions towards Israel coming out of Egypt, “So God heard their groaning; and God remembered His covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob” (NAS Ex.2:24) … “And I will take you for Myself, for a people; and I will be for you God” (TLT Ex.6:7), the tabernacle or sanctuary was written into the wider embrace of God’s renewing covenant commitment. The dwelling of God is therefore not based upon human, desire, need or religiosity, rather it is God’s desire giving impetus to the realization of covenant. The belonging relationship becomes unequivocal as the concept of sacred space becomes more specific. The pattern developed, can demonstrate a sense of belonging through ownership, through original creative acts where divine relational purpose is the hallmark. God is not detached but very much attached, implicated, and actively involved in his creation, particularly mankind, and especially His people. God is committed to revealing Himself, letting Himself be perceived, his voice be heard, and the logical consequence for a covenant self-revealing God is that He dwell in the midst of His people, that He be their God.¹¹¹

It merits repetition that the tabernacle and sanctuary were primarily residences for God to dwelling among His people. The cloud that had led out of Egypt, which was visible on Mount Sinai, that same cloud covers the tabernacle and God’s glory fills it. The witness is a tangible sign of presence and of personhood, glory being the reflection of the Person and Nature of God in his perfection and infinity.¹¹² “And there I will meet with you, and

¹¹⁰ Is.35:10; Jer.3:14; 31:12; 50:5.
¹¹¹ Ex.19:5-6, 9; 20:22; 24:16-17; 25:8.
¹¹² Ex.40:34-35, 38; 1Kg.8:6, 10-11; Zc.2:4-5; Ez.43:1-7.
I will speak with you from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubim which are on the ark of the Testimony, about everything which I will give you in commandment to the children of Israel” (NKJV Ex.25:22), gives definition to the dwelling presence and the revealing voice from within the Holy of Holies.\textsuperscript{113} The individualization of Divine Presence in the covenant commitment inaugurates a proximity unknown since Adam, in sacred space; while covenant is conditional, God intimates the permanency of His commitment; in doing so, there occurs a transition from mystery and unfathomable to revelation and comprehension of divine intentions. Unlike the near eastern temples, … rituals were performed to transfer the deity from the spiritual world to the physical world … actualizing the presence of the god in the temple … We conclude that the material image was animated by the divine essence. … it did not simply represent the deity but it manifested its presence … the deity was the reality that was embodied in the image not the deity itself (Walton 115-116).

It is clear from the symbolism of the sanctuary indwelling texts, that no image or process of divination holds any legitimacy in view of the Lord of cosmos, heaven, earth, or Holy Mountain and hill, flooding the sanctuary with His very presence and Person; glory being the splendour of both. The prophets taunted Israel effectively about this process in contrast to the Lord’s dwelling among the people,\textsuperscript{114} even so they would be the downfall of Israel and Judah. The presumption of Israel is nowhere more evident than in the vision of Ezekiel,\textsuperscript{115}

Speak to the house of Israel, "Thus says the Lord GOD, ‘Behold, I am about to profane My sanctuary, the pride of your power, the desire of your eyes and the delight of your soul; and your sons and your daughters whom you have left behind will fall by the sword (NAS Ez.24:21),

\textsuperscript{113} Num.7:89; 1Sa.4:4; 2Sa.6:2; 1Kg.8:6; 2Kg.19:15; 1Ch.13:6; 2Ch.5:7; Ps.80:1; 99:1; Is.37:16.

\textsuperscript{114} Is.41:21-2; 44:9-28; 46:1-12; Jer.8:1-3; Ez.6:13-14; 8:9-17; Ho.4:12-14.

\textsuperscript{115} Ez.8:4, 6; 9:3; 10:1, 3-5, 18-19; 11:22-23.
which takes no account of the conditionality of the covenant whereby faithfulness to covenant affords the continued blessing. The presumption then is founded upon the thought that God has unconditionally attached Himself to the temple, to Zion his holy hill and that is inviolable. The texts referenced tell the story of the departure of the dwelling glory of God in three stages, until He passes the threshold and returns to the heavens. The imperative lesson is that of conditionality, God’s glory belongs to Himself, glory is God and therefore, “I am the LORD, that is My name; And My glory I will not give to another, nor My praise to carved images” (NKJV Is.42:8); the second remark is that those present did not even notice the departure of the divine glory; the historical raison d’être of Israel has gone. The fatal blow is the recognition that religious ritual and practice continues yet there is the unremarked absence of the Divine presence and Person.

The words of the NT, “you are the temple of God …” (NKJV 1Co.3:16), take on their full significance in the light of this analysis. The temple, if accomplishment in Christ is significant when the prophet Isaiah says, “… therefore thus says the Lord GOD, “Behold, I am the one who has laid as a foundation in Zion, a stone, a tested stone, a precious cornerstone, of a sure foundation: ‘Whoever believes will not be in haste’” (28:16), he is prophesying of the ‘τέλος’ of the old sacred space that becomes, the foundation for a new sacred space. Paul develops this thought speaking to the Ephesian church, upon the cornerstone or the substructure that is Christ, upon the foundation of the apostles and the prophets, which is Christ, grows a people who become temple of God in Christ and in Spirit.116 As Jesus breathes his last breath in accomplishment of atonement, the temple curtain tears from top to bottom and as such extirpates any distinctive sacred zones: as experienced on the mountain and hill, in the tabernacle court, holy place and most holy place of which the Hebrew writer comprehending this, inviting believers to come close to the throne of God. The ‘zoning’, the geographical, ethnic, and cultural criteria have been brought to an end; the new nature of the temple is therefore built upon Christ, and restores fully the Adamic proximity to God. Christ restores in His person the intimacy, not only of being in the midst, but of indwelling, which in redemption and regeneration is supreme of over Adamic restoration, whereby the corporate temple is an intensifying experience of divine presence: God in the midst of his church - individual believers who

are temple through the indwelling Christ in Godhead coming together, each with a measure of indwelling divine presence; joining that presence to other believers in the ‘κοινωνία’ of Christ thereby participating in that experience of temple. These three dimensions reunited establish the body of believers as a living organic temple.

The first hallmark of church as temple is therefore an indisputable demonstration of Divine Presence and the Person of Godhead. Moses prophetically foresees something of this reality, “Lord, You have been our dwelling place in all generations” (NKJV Ps 90:1). The second hallmark is that if encounter or meeting. There is a recovery of the ‘cloud’ and the ‘glory’ in Christ, “the radiance of the Father’s glory … we have seen His glory … and a bright cloud overshadowed them and a voice from the cloud said “This is My Beloved Son …”117 God present inevitably should lead to God speaking. The proximity must lead to encounter, as the biblical texts demonstrate throughout. The third hallmark is the recovery of connectedness, the Tri-unity indwelling the body of believers, transcends local temple, mountain and hill, earth, and heaven, to cosmos. The ontological experience of temple transcends believers to adjoin the heavenly temple in divine presence, encounter, and priestly worship. If believers are temple locally, they are an integral part of heavenly temple worship. Dynamically, it is from the heavens down that God has consistently ministered; in that what is the highest perfect heavenly experience of temple, God intends that to descend to be the origin and consistency of the local. In Christ, believers are seated in the heavenly places and in that believers are full participants of the heavenly temple encounter. In this the temple is primarily to be restored to this ontological relationship.

The last distinguishing hallmark is that the priestly worship of which every believer is participant, is not based on what can be offered to God, according to the natural order, “for we are the circumcision, the Spirit God serving priestly and glorifying in Christ Jesus and absolutely not being persuaded in flesh” (ESV Ph.3:3). The exercise of this priestly worship is firstly responsive to His presence, His encounter, His glory, and His voice. It is the effect of being caught up in a cycle of worship and glory. The scenes of heavenly worship in Revelation indicate that when some movement or action comes from the

117 Heb.1:2-3; Jn.1:14; Mt.17:5.
throne, the multitudes respond in worship. Worship begins in what God issues from Himself on the throne, upon the encounter, the Spirit enables church as temple to respond in acts, words, and attitudes of responsive worship and so the temple fulfils its purpose and the temple of believers is caught up in the cycle of worship, both in the heavenly places and the demonstration of that in the earthly and holy temple that believers are ontologically. These hallmarks are vital to restoring the ontological temple. As Walton observes,

Performance of cult was central and foundational to their religion … their principal responsibility and superseded the element of belief (mental affirmation of doctrinal convictions) in today’s view of religion, that belief is more foundational. This should not be imposed upon the ancient world (Waldon 132).

The doctrinal belief and affirmation of church as temple has frustrated and caused estrangement from the ontological and experiential presence and encounter with the Divine Father, Jesus and Spirit.

iii. The Bride

Accordingly, so the Christ, Source and Head of the church, and He is Saviour. But even as the church is submitted to Christ… just as Christ loved the church, and Himself surrendered for the sake of it in order that she might consecrate, purifying [by] the washing [of] the water in the specific oral word in order that might present standing in it [to] Himself gorgeously the church, not possessing stain or defect nor wrinkle nor any such things, but that would be consecrated and without fault … no one at any time ever hated his own flesh, contrariwise he nurtures and warmly cares [for] it, just as also the Lord the church; because members we are of his body, out of the flesh of him and out of the bone of him. Because of this a human being will leave his father and mother and will attach to his wife, and the two will be into one flesh. This same mystery is huge but I speak as to Christ and as to the church (TLT Ep.5:23-27; 29-32).
The focus of this section centres upon the ontological principles of what God says about His church as a bride. The text responds to three fundamental questions: i. What kind of relationship? ii. What kind of love? iii. What kind of commitment?118

The bride of Christ describes a quality of relationship rather than a doctrinal position or a simple metaphor or analogy. This Husband-Wife relationship, as a means to describe the nature of relationship God has with his people, is particularly significant in the Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea and Malachi. This divine marriage, as in the human sphere, rests upon an understanding of covenant, “… I swore to you and entered into a covenant with you so that you became Mine (NAS Ez.16:8) “… she is your companion and your wife by covenant” (NAS Mal.2:14). The nature of covenant then is a reflection upon the most intimate kind of relationship that is known and can be experienced. The prophets are the voice of God expressing the tension in covenant between the glorious intentions of God for His bride,119 “Your Maker is your Husband…” (NKJV Is.54:5), “… you will call me ‘My Husband’ …” (ESV Ho.2:16); and the infidelity of the bride towards her husband,120

For your loyalty is like a morning cloud, and like the dew which goes away early. For I delight in loyalty rather than sacrifice, and in the intimate knowledge of God rather than burnt offerings (NAS Ho.6:4-6);

But you trusted in your beauty and played the whore because of your renown and lavished your whorings on any passerby; your beauty became his (ESV Ez.16:15) …You adulteress wife, who takes strangers instead of her husband! (NAS Ez.16:32) …you gave your gifts to all your lovers, bribing them to come to you from every side …No one solicited you to play the whore (ESV Ez.16:34);

And the heart wrenching call to return and be restored,121

118 i. Vs.22-24; ii. Vs.25-27; iii. Vs.28-33.
119 Is.61:10; Jer.2:2; Ez.16:8, 13, 14.
120 Jer.2:31; 3:1-2, 20; 13:25-27; Lam.1:1-2; Ez.16:15, 32-34; Ho.5:7; 6:4, 6; Mal.2:14-16.
121 Is.62:3-5; 54:4-6; Jer.33:6-7, 11; Ez.16:42; Ho.2:14-16, 19; 14:4; Mal.2:15-16.
… I will allure her, and bring her into the wilderness, and speak tenderly to her. And there I will give her her vineyards and make the Valley of Achor a door of hope. And there she shall answer as in the days of her youth, as at the time when she came out of the land of Egypt. “And in that day, declares the LORD, you will call me ‘My Husband,’ and no longer will you call me ‘My Baal.’” (ESV Ho.2:14-16) "I will betroth you to Me forever ... in righteousness and in justice, In lovingkindness and in compassion, (NAS Ho.2:19).

The heart of God the Husband’s concern is for the covenant relationship. The divine marriage relationship requires exclusivity, which is the legitimate response to warranted jealousy. Covenant expresses ‘IQesed’122 in the context of this marriage relationship, can be described in terms such as: loyalty, fidelity, allegiance, belonging, truth, honesty, honour, grace, joy, beauty, innocence, devotion, purity, attachment, forgiveness, peace, compassion, justice and righteousness, constancy, intimacy, friendship, and love.123 These terms are the opposite of what Israel, the prostitute wife, offers in response to the Divine Husband’s covenant relationship. These qualities are the product of covenant belonging. The spouses’ refusal to remain in a relationship of belonging, defies the basic innate personal and collective need of which God is conscious. Belonging, in psychological terms implies: relational security, inclusion and acceptance, an affiliation or connectedness, and companionship. In the same way that belonging to any social group, whatever its purpose: social, political, cultural, ethnic, religious, or interest based, can feed the sense of self, identity, value, and significance. God the Husband is telling His people, the church, who she is, as wife.124 The symptoms of the wife’s breaking out of covenant belonging, as in Israel’s case, only exacerbates the problems of alienation and separation rather than attachment. Ezekiel makes it clear, there were no other lovers seducing her, she had to seduce them. God did not reject in the first place, rather she

122 Ho.6:4, 6.
123 See the principal texts referencing the divine Husband-Wife relationship.
detached, an act of rejection which would lead to rejection by other lovers. In losing belonging to her Husband, she lost the innate qualities of the covenant relationship that were inverted. The rejecting become rejected, the divorcing one becomes abandoned, the unfaithful is subjected to infidelity, the one despising becomes despised, the criticizing one becomes judged and condemned. ‘The Fall’ stands as the turning point where attachment and belonging are thereafter deformed, whereby man attempts to dominate in order control and the woman seeks to conquer by seduction to control. Both are relating out of fear not trust; relating becomes hierarchal and is lost in the mistrust, detachment, independency, and separation as self-protection, instead of self-giving. This breakdown through alienation, not only from God but between man and woman signals the end of the intended covenant relationship of mutual belonging on which so much depends for the innate need to belong (Collins 95-97, 98, 140-141). It is suggested that because God relates through covenant reciprocally, He too wants the ‘belonging’ otherwise His jealousy would not be manifest, “I will be your God, and you will be my people.”

In Christ, the Bridegroom, the church is restored to the belonging relationship, into an exclusive attachment and belonging, whereby the Fall is overturned because Christ bore it in atonement, thus restoring and accomplishing the fullness of Christ- the Husband and Church the Bride. If ontologically church is to be restored, then it will firstly be through the conspicuousness of relational belonging and attachment to Christ the Husband. This belonging is neither doctrinal nor positional it is profoundly theological and therein, relational, ontological, and experiential. The depth of belonging is critical to the legitimacy, the stability, the identity, and the sense of unequivocal allegiance to God before the world; it portrays the radicality and impassioned exclusive attachment to God. “Christian communities act and speak too much in the style of Christian republics. They assume the attitude of self-directing and self-responsible bodies. The church is no democracy, any more that it is an aristocracy or a sacerdotal absolutism: it is a Christocracy” (Findlay 375).

Christ is described as ‘κεφαλὴ’ of the bride. The same term is used for the ‘body’ analogy of the church but with distinct implications from the considerations of the ‘bride’.

---

125 Ez.16:33-34; Is.54:6; Ho.2:5-7.
‘κεφαλή’ is employed by Jesus in the Gospels, “Jesus said to them, “Have you never read in the Scriptures: “‘The stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone; this was the Lord’s doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes’?”’ (ESV Mt.21:42), His association with the cornerstone (‘κεφαλὴν γωνιας’), clearly indicates that Christ understands the word and concept as foundation or origin which Paul confirms, as he does the supremacy of Christ in the church, uniquely applicable to Him.\textsuperscript{126} The Roman usage refers to cornerstone, as the point from where the whole building is referenced and built, or capstone, the centre-stone that holds all the others in place, whereby the two ideas converge together in Christ. The focus of this headship is to identify Christ in relationship to His bride as foundation and source, originator. The relationship of Christ to the bride, as the text reflects implicitly, relates to Jesus as Saviour and Christ, not as Lord. The inference is that the emphasis is not on hierarchy but on the nature of the relationship. In other words, the church is not bride because she says or believes so, but because the church emerges, generated in and out of Christ. In doing so, He elevates her to the honour, beauty and glory of spouse.\textsuperscript{127} The relationship of belonging is the recognition of foundation and source expressed absolutely in Christ.

‘ὑποτάσσω’ is translated by the term submission, in order to define the Bride’s relationship to the Christ the Husband. The term is subject to cultural, religious and traditional deformation, and greatly abused. The composite term has two meanings because it is applied in two principal contexts. It is employed as a Greek military term, referring to troops arranged in military fashion under the command of a leader. The second non-military meaning is a voluntary attitude of cooperation or collaboration; carrying a share of responsibility or of burden alongside.\textsuperscript{128} The former is clearly hierarchal, the latter is reciprocal, mutual and relationally egalitarian in character, that is not to deny distinctive properties. An analysis of the biblical data demonstrates that there is only one figure of authority to whom the first meaning is applied and that is Christ,\textsuperscript{129}

\textsuperscript{126} 1Co.3:10-11; Ep.1:23; 4:15; Col.1:18; 2:10, 19.

\textsuperscript{127} Is.61:10; Jer.2:2; Ez.16:13-14.

\textsuperscript{128} ‘ὑποτάσσω’ \textit{TGEL} 2016.

\textsuperscript{129} 1Co.15:27-28; Heb.2:8; Ep.1:22; Ph.3:21; 1Pe.3:22.
to whom all things, heaven, earth, under the earth, angels, authorities and powers submit subordinately. In this light, all other human relationships are on the basis of cooperation and collaboration.\textsuperscript{130} This is homogeneous with the Genesis creational texts relating Adam to Eve, as prototypes of man and woman and of husband and wife, and therefore of every human relationship. Paul’s reference to submit to governing authorities needs held in tension with Peter and John’s words before authorities “We must obey God rather than men.”\textsuperscript{131} This interpretation of ‘ὑποτάσσω’ enables the believer to reconcile the possibility of cooperation with authorities where tenets of faith are respected, just as the apostles demonstrate.\textsuperscript{132} The former interpretation inevitably leads to degrees of unimaginable compromise; bearing in mind that the Christian church began with the label ‘Sect’. Being a Christian was to be subject to persecution, expulsion and death; outlawed under Claudius (41-54 AD), Nero (54-68 AD), Vespasian (66-79 AD), and Domitian (81-96 AD) to name the NT period Caesars. “The church’s protection from human tyranny from schemes of ambition, from the intrusion of political methods and designs, lies in her sense of the splendour and reality of Christ’s dominion, and of her own eternal life in Him” (Findlay 376). The justification of this interpretation reinforces the church’s recognition of Jesus Christ as ‘κεφαλή’ and the only one to whom all those in Christ collectively bow down ‘ὑποτάσσω’ ‘under’ Him. In, “The Bond of Love,” Mackay comments,

The headship Christ exercises is of course characterized by infinite self-giving love, but the term ‘head’ (kephalē in Greek) cannot be emptied of any implications of authority … in days when Christians are careless regarding His will for the church and governments seek to bring ever-increasing areas of life under their jurisdiction (213-214).

In this text, it is the only passage in the N.T. where both interpretations suggest conjoint meaning. In reference to husband and wife the reference should not be applied in a hierarchal sense rather as a reflection of the relational part of responsibility that a husband

\textsuperscript{130} Ep.5:31; Ro.8:7; 1Co.14:32; 1Co.16:16; 1Pe.3:1; 2:18; 1Pe.5:5.
\textsuperscript{131} Act.5:27-33; 4:18-21; 7:54-60. See also Paul’s reception and rejection during his missionary travels.
\textsuperscript{132} Ro.13:1; Tit.3:1; 1Pe.2:13; Jm.4:7.
uniquely carries towards his wife. The scope of this present argument does not permit a parenthesis of substance to further develop the wider implications outside of the relationship directly of Christ to his bride. As much as Christ is clearly source of the church as bride, his relationship is one of Saviour and Christ, neither of which necessitate a hierarchal understanding, they refer primarily to origin, whereas the use of Lord would explicitly require subjection. However, the terms define the nature of His relationship to his elevated bride. Christ-Saviour is communicating: salvation, redemption, protection, deliverance, in accomplishment. When Christ and the bride are ontologically envisioned distinctively in their personal properties and unique relationship, the Bride enters her high calling.

The nature of the Divine Husband’s love for His Bride\textsuperscript{133} requires further development. Christ’s love and surrender finds causal relationship to church. While it is important to emphasize the individual encounter of the love and benefit of Christ’s surrender, it is essential to comprehend that in the eternal love the collective body of believers, formed in the church, was conceived, “The church does not exist simply for the benefit of individual souls; it is an eternal institution, with an affiance (‘betrothed’) to Christ, a calling and destiny of its own; within that universal sphere our personal destiny holds its particular place” (Findlay 367). The extent of this belonging covenant is manifest in the extremism of divine love; while the causal motivation of the church is Christ who gave Himself in atonement freely, for divine purpose, “He who did not spare His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not also freely give us all things?” (NKJV Ro.8:32).\textsuperscript{134} Christ’s giving is the antithesis to selfishness, self-absorption, self-satisfaction, through the giving of Himself in eternal love and devotion to the Bride. It is vital to understand the purport of the magnitude of this primary love. In propitiation, Christ died firstly for God, or the propitiation for sins was made to God.\textsuperscript{135} Humankind are beneficiaries of this, direct objects benefiting from Christ’s redemption,\textsuperscript{136} that we

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{133} Ep.5:25-27.
\item \textsuperscript{134} Ep.5:2; Gal.2:20.
\item \textsuperscript{135} Ro.3:25; Heb.2:17; 1Jn.2:2; 4:10.
\item \textsuperscript{136} Ro.3:24.
\end{itemize}
might live through Him.\textsuperscript{137} In the peace-making of Christ, that is peace with God, having been satisfied, the guilty condemnation of just judgment has been met and appeased. Therefore, in Christ “Mercy and truth have met together; Righteousness and peace have kissed” (NKJV Ps.85:10). “But God demonstrates His own love toward us, in that while we were still sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, having now been justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him” (NKJV Ro.5:8-9), patently puts an end to the ambiguous and ambivalent tension of love and righteous anger, as perceived in the prophet’s writings previously referenced. A new order, the primacy of divine love,\textsuperscript{138} is the nature of the relationship, defined by the primacy of the love of God in Christ. In this martial love, all the five dimensions of love are perfectly untied and fulfilled in Christ and therefore the Bride is made the object of this unrestrained lavished perfect love of self-giving and self-surrender.\textsuperscript{139}

The importance is that the sanctifying by washing of the word, exercised by Christ, occurs within the security of the Bridegroom love. Where punishment confined to guilt and judgment were under just anger, the Bride in Christ experiences Christ’s pedagogy, even corrective as proving and legitimizing the relationship and love.\textsuperscript{140} As previously discussed sanctification, irrespective of any particular place in the ‘ordo salutis’ that one might be tempted to limit this ministry to, is the constant process whereby Christ renders his bride distinctive in nature and relationship. The sanctifying of Christ for his own, “And for their sakes I sanctify Myself, that they also may be sanctified by the truth” (Jn.17:19),\textsuperscript{141} relates well to the Bridegroom and bride relational analogy. While Paul refers to Christ as the Sanctifier, this is a Trinitarian attribute.\textsuperscript{142} In the same manner, Paul refers to sanctifying through purifying, a reference particularly to internal life: hearts are

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{137} Jn.4:9.
\item \textsuperscript{138} Jn.3:36.
\item \textsuperscript{139} ἀγαπάω sacrificial, and disinterested, ‘φιλέω’ reciprocal friendship, ‘φιλόστοργος’ family belonging, ‘ḥesed’ covenant love and ‘ἔρως’ redeemed sexual intimate love. See previous chapter “Human Identity.” - Emotions.
\item \textsuperscript{140} Heb.12:8.
\item \textsuperscript{141} See also Heb.2:11.
\item \textsuperscript{142} Ro.15:16; 1Co.6:11; 1Co.1:2; Heb.10:10, 14; Jn.10:37; Jn.17:17; Jude 1:1.
\end{itemize}
cleansed by faith,\textsuperscript{143} by Jesus giving Himself,\textsuperscript{144} the blood of Jesus,\textsuperscript{145} and confession of sins.\textsuperscript{146} It is important to emphasize that this purifying to forgiveness is a purging or expulsion of the unclean in reality not just in a principle of belief. In the washing of the word, it is noteworthy that the Word or truth,\textsuperscript{147} faith in Jesus Christ,\textsuperscript{148} by the Holy Spirit,\textsuperscript{149} by prayer,\textsuperscript{150} and through the body and blood of Jesus,\textsuperscript{151} are means of sanctifying. Paul refers specifically to sanctifying by washing; likewise, washing can be through the Word\textsuperscript{152} or the Holy Spirit\textsuperscript{153} or the blood of Christ.\textsuperscript{154} In drawing attention to the diverse means of consecrating, purifying, and washing, Paul’s intentions are honed; in contrast to the prostitution of Israel, the bride-church is founded upon this relationship of love, devoted to a process that has the determined end of, “… not possessing stain or defect nor wrinkle nor any of such things” (TLT Ep.5:27).\textsuperscript{155} The washing refers to one effective purpose of the word, which in this context is ‘ῥῆμα’ from the root word meaning ‘to break the silence’, a particular reference to an oral word by nature: prophetic to hear and act upon,\textsuperscript{156} specific of reminder and practice,\textsuperscript{157} and an existential word, source of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{143} Ac.15:9.
\item \textsuperscript{144} Tit.2:14.
\item \textsuperscript{145} Heb.9:14, 22.
\item \textsuperscript{146} 1Jn.1:9.
\item \textsuperscript{147} Jn.17:17.
\item \textsuperscript{148} Ac.26:18.
\item \textsuperscript{149} 1Co.6:11.
\item \textsuperscript{150} 1Ti.4:5.
\item \textsuperscript{151} Heb.10:10; 13:12.
\item \textsuperscript{152} Ep.5:26.
\item \textsuperscript{153} Tit.3:5.
\item \textsuperscript{154} Rev.1:5; Heb.10:22.
\item \textsuperscript{155} Ep.1:4; Col.1:22; Jude 1:24; Rev.14:5; of Jesus-Christ: Heb.9:14; 1Pe.1:19.
\item \textsuperscript{156} Lk.3:2; Mt.26:75; Lk.1:38; 5:5; 2Pe.3:2.
\item \textsuperscript{157} Lk.24:8; Ac.5:20; 10:37; 28:25; Ep.6:17.
\end{itemize}
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life or to live by. The washing infers that the whole person is reached, it is the subsequent effect of the nature of the word. “Washing is figurative of the bride-bath on the morning of her wedding day, token of the purity in which she untied herself to her betrothed, so the baptismal laver summons the church to present herself” (Findlay 371). Just as Christ was spotless and perfect in every aspect of being and work, this marriage operates so that the Bride shares the same characteristics as the Divine Husband. This determined end is the fruit of the divine love, reflective of the beauty that is inferred, ‘ἔνδοξος’ translated as high repute; in this context is better reflected as ‘gloriously gorgeous in grace.’

Paul draws to attention and concludes upon the traumatic crisis in not belonging, in exclusion from the relational primacy of eternal divine love to define the nature of the commitment. The reference for loving the other is a principle of self-love on the assumption that no one hates Himself. In modern day culture it is easy to identify ‘self-haters’ who have adopted self-destructive patterns in one or several components of their identity. Inevitably, the disease spreads to reach the whole person. The core issues that would be considered are in the areas of: reconciliation in identity; perception of self in worth; defence mechanisms regarding others that compound the internal problems by over-accommodation, transfer of blame or responsibility to others, and avoidance, or denial.

The humanistic approach begins and ends with self, whereas the biblical methodology begins and finishes with Christ, where individual and collective identity and relational needs are met, healed, and restored. The belonging and love relationship in Christ is the foundation stone for personal ‘self-love’ such as Paul refers to. In Christ this ‘self-love’ is legitimate because according to Paul, Christ loved Himself, because in an eternal love relationship with the Father, that is to say, there has eternally been a subject and object between the persons of the Trinity, not that there is need of love, they are equally and

---

158 Lk.4:4; Jn.3:34; 5:47; 6:63; 12:47; 14:10; 15:7; 17:8; Ac.11:14; Heb.1:3; 11:3; 1Pe.1:25.
159 Is.61:10; Jer.33:11; Ez.16:8, 13-14; Rev.19:7-8.
perfectly love. The relational imperative of Trinity transcends to include the Bride and therefore every believer in union in Christ. However, Jesus also witnesses to the hate tension in the Gospels.\(^{161}\) He cancels out any compromising duality by establishing loyalty to one Master in a love-hate decision. The Gospel writers employ the comparison to lose and save,\(^{162}\) find\(^{163}\) or guard.\(^{164}\) To lose (‘ὑπόλαλλω’) bears the strong sense: to put a way entirely, abolish, render useless, kill or put to death, or destroy.\(^{165}\) Luke and John employ the term to intensify further, ‘μισέω’ to hate, pursue with hatred or detest, by extension, ‘love less’.\(^{166}\) ‘Life’ in these discipleship passages is often synonymous with ‘self’ (Morris 269). The existential choice is whether to live life with earthly priorities and material, financial and pleasure concerns, “… this selfish narrowing of his horizon makes his soul narrower and narrower. He loses it …” (Hendriksen Mark 331) makes clear that self or soul were destined to live with a perspective of eternal life here and now. The choice in Christ increasingly enlarges life with an eternal perspective lived out in the present. John’s reading roots this dynamic in Jesus’ own experience of death and rising to resurrected eternal life. In the literal and physical death of Christ is the spiritual principle of death to a form of life, in order to live life according to another order, resurrection order; that is why he can say, “For this reason the Father loves me, because I lay me life that I may take it up again” (ESV Jn.10:17). The ‘life-love’ of Paul that he perceives in Christ, is the perfect life that knows no other source, intention, or purpose than the Divine Life and Love. Similarly, the believer in Christ, because of Christ is a ‘life-lover’, originated in Him, defined by Him, alive through Him. The archetypal commandment deeply integrates this principle: after being the object of the Father’s love in Christ, the believer responds in holistic love in all his person towards the Father; this love teaches him or her genuine and legitimate self-love in Christ and consequently the love for the other will fulfill the command in the fullest and intended denotation.

\(^{161}\) Mt.5:43-44; Mt.6:24; Mt.10:22; 24:9; Lk.14:26; Jn.12:25; 15:18, 19.

\(^{162}\) Mk.8:35; Lk.9:24.

\(^{163}\) Mt.10:39.

\(^{164}\) Jn.12:25.

\(^{165}\) ‘.appcompatάω’ TGEL 2016.

\(^{166}\) ‘μισέω’ TGEL 2016; SECB 2015.
In the present context it is because of the Father’s love manifest in Christ and for Christ and reciprocally, that Christ manifests ‘self-love’ demonstrated in the giving of his life for the Bride. The perfection of Christ’s ‘self-love’ is the perfection of His love manifest for the believer and collectively as His Bride. This love commitment manifests itself in perfect paternal and maternal care expressed in ‘ἐκτρέφω’, a pedagogical term that embraces more than education rather a holistic nourishing, feeding, training up to maturity seated in warm affection care; and ‘θάλπω’ that Paul employs to describe nursing mothers\(^{167}\) to express the tenderness, attentiveness, the maternal instinct to cherish in affection the little child. Christ is manifesting the perfection of His love, divine love perfected by encompassing both the paternal and the maternal.\(^{168}\) Paul in the same way expresses the paternal and maternal in his attachment to the Thessalonians.

This final section is the foundation on which the whole ontological relationship of belonging, of love, of commitment rests: “Because members we are of his body, out of the flesh of him and out of the bone of him. Because of this a human being will leave his father and mother and will attach to his wife, and the two will be into one flesh. This same mystery is huge but I speak as to Christ and as to the church” (TLT Ep.5:30-32). There is no marriage without physical union and likewise with Christ in relationship to his bride. Paul quotes Adam’s words, “This time, this one is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; this one will be called woman, because she was taken from man” (TLT Ge.2:23). If Christ is ‘κεφαλή’ source then the analogy is obvious, we are bride because we have been taken from out of Christ, Paul confirms, “ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν οστῶν αὐτοῦ.” (TR Ep.5:30). The reference to ‘bone’ applies to substance and the reference to ‘flesh’ suggests a shared or same parentage. In Christ, the bride, composed of believers in union in Him, are of out of the same stock that is the resurrection of Christ to the new existence; and his origin and parentage, whereby filial relationship to the Father is in view.

Thus the first father of our race prophesied, and sang his wedding song. In some mystical, but real sense, marriage is a reunion, the reincorporation of what had been sundered. Seeking his other self, the complement of his nature … It helps him see

\(^{167}\) 1Th.2:7.

\(^{168}\) E.g., Is.61:10; Ps.91:4; Lk.19:41-44; Jn.3:16; See also the development in the prior chapter on Trinity.
how believers in Christ, forming collectively His body, are not only grafted into Him… but were derived from Him and formed in the very mould of His nature (Findlay 378).

Paul continues the application of the marriage covenant to Christ and the Bride, “For this reason a man shall leave his father and his mother, and be joined to his wife; and they shall become one flesh” (NKJV Ge.2:24). The three stages in the formation of the marriage covenant specify that it all starts with a divorce between the parents and the young man and woman. The age of autonomy requires a rupture in the old relationship in order to form a new one. This liberation from an old relational covenant rendered obsolete, leaves the place for the new covenant. The second principle is one of being glued to the other, referring to two individuals who move to covenantal and reciprocal attachment, belonging, as has been developed in the preceding text. These qualities create the space in which covenant is experienced. The third stage is that of union. The term employed is not uniquely sexual or physical it is a holistic term encompassing every constituent part of human identity and being, the dynamics of which are the enjoyment of homogeneity and alterity in a profound ontological union. “It helps him see how believers in Christ, forming collectively His body, are not only grafted into Him… but were derived from Him and formed in the very mould of His nature” (Ibid.). Paul is referring to Christ and the Bride as he refers to breaking the old covenant and making the new one with the Bridegroom; the exclusive radical attachment; and the intimate union of oneness.

The ontological bride therefore draws existence and origin from Christ; she draws her nature and identity from union in Him; she is, because of who he is, in a covenant bond of belonging and love and holistic consecration. The challenge to church is that there is often dislocation from the origins and the intentions and the exclusivity that Christ seeks with his bride. It is what leaders can make of church, as an offering to God, with all the best intentions and yet miss the imperative of divine origin and relational intention. Restoration to this ontological relationship is even more critical as society and culture at a globalized level are often more influential and authoritative than the true head Christ. The ontological renewal of the ‘The Bride’ restores the radicalism and exclusive

169 “azab” leave, leave behind or alone, abandon, be set free from, rupture, divorce. BDBHEL 2017.
attachment to Christ the ‘κεφαλὴ’. This radicality does not come from protagonism or contention, neither from assertion of beliefs or values, it comes one the unique source of the Bride relationship with Christ. The extremism of perfect love; the distinct sharing in the nature of the Bridegroom; the divine origins and parentage must be renewed to church for this is her divine identity before Christ in the face of current trends of conformism, compliance, secularisation, and assimilation.

iv. The Tree/Vine

I Am the Vine revealed as true and my Father is the husbandman. Each and every branch or shoot in Me not bearing fruit He lifts it up, and every branch bearing fruit He prunes in order that it might carry more fruit. Already now you are pruned through the Word I have spoken to you. Abide in me, I in you. Even as the branch can absolutely not bear fruit out of itself, except it might abide in the vine, likewise, not even yourselves, except you might abide in Me. I Am the Vine you the branches. He (or she) abiding in me I in him/her, he/she bears much fruit, because by yourself without Me you can absolutely have no purpose. Except anyone might abide in Me, he/she is sent away as the branch, and is withered, and gather them and throw them into a fire, and they be burned (TLT Jn.15:1-6).

By way of introduction, the Vine is Jesus Christ as continued understanding of Him as ‘τέλος’, as this text advocates, “Christ … is ‘the Vine, the true One’ – the reality of all types, the fulfilment of all promises” (Edersheim 833). The image of the tree, the olive tree, or particularly of the vine, have OT precedence, referring to: wives and sons, the righteous man deeply rooted by water, flourishing supernaturally in and out of season, and God portrayed as the husbandman, implicit in the analogy of Israel as a tree planted, “You have brought a vine out of Egypt; You have cast out the nations, and planted it” (NKJV Ps.80:8). The Abrahamic covenant promise of a multitude of descendants and a land, implicitly stands behind the expressions of the people of Israel planted in the Promised Land. Historically, the promise is perceived as accomplished under Joshua,

---

170 Ps.128:3; 144:12; Ez.19:10.
171 Ps.1:1-3; Jer.17:5-10; see also Is.52:6-8, Ps.92:13.
172 2Sa.7:10; Ps.44:2; Is.51:16; 60:21; Ez.16:6; 17:22-24; Mt.13:31-32.
settling the twelve tribes in the land.\(^{173}\) In Joshua’s final declarations, the conditionality of being planted in the land is evident based upon Israel’s continued covenant allegiance and compliance. Textually, Joshua’s discourse is prophetic in nature, as he declares that Israel’s compromise will cause the nations to be a thorn in their flesh and eventually leading to loss of the land and destruction of the people. In the context of defeat, fall, and exile, the prophets declare hope of restoration with conditionality,

> If that nation against which I have spoken turns from its evil, I will relent concerning the calamity I planned to bring on it. Or at another moment I might speak concerning a nation or concerning a kingdom to build up or to plant it; if it does evil in My sight by not obeying My voice, then I will think better of the good with which I had promised to bless it (NAS Jer.18:8-10).\(^{174}\)

The resulting tension created by this conditionality in promise of a return to God through a profoundly changed heart, stands between loss and gain. Isaiah’s prophecy of the vine and vineyard, repeated and confirmed by Jesus,\(^{175}\) reflects this tension where the assumption of Israel denies conditionality;\(^{176}\) contextually, the tenants presume ownership; they take the Husbandman’s place, having refused to provide the fruits of harvest to the one to whom they rightfully belong. Israel’s self-proclaimed idolatry surely reaches the farthest extent of divine patience. Motyer expresses well the dilemma, “what can now be done for the people of God when a total work of grace has been lavished on them and yet they remain as if grace had never touched them?” (68). Jesus compounds the message by adding the prophetic announcement of another ‘κεφαλή’ that the builders, Israel, have rejected. While the figure changes from vines to stones, the meaning is evident to the Jewish hearers. Their idolatrous self-belief and possessiveness become their self-exclusion (Edersheim 766). Christ stands therefore as ‘τέλος’ as the prophets also declared in the imagery of the branch, the shoot, “There shall come forth a shoot from the stump of Jesse, and a branch from his roots shall bear fruit … who shall stand as a signal

---

\(^{173}\) Joshua chapter 23 especially vs.14-16.

\(^{174}\) See also Jer.2:21; 12:2; 8:2-3, 4-5, 8, 13, 18-19; Ho.14:1-7; Mal.4:1.

\(^{175}\) Is.5:1-6; Mt.21:33-45; Mk.12:1-12; Lk.20:9-19; see also Ps.80:8-16.

\(^{176}\) Jer.8:7b-10; Ho.9:16-17; 10:1-2.
for the peoples—of him shall the nations inquire, and his resting place shall be glorious” (ESV Is.11:1,10). “The branch of the Lord, is always elsewhere a title pointing to the Messiah and his kingly and priestly offices … all that he is he holds in trust for them” (Motyer 65). Jesus Christ in declaring ‘I Am the Vine’ accomplishing the promise of Israel in view of their failure to be the vine, the tree or the stewards of the vine. The analogies fuse at some points where Israel is the vine, yet Israel is the carer of the vine, that is suggestive of stewardship entrusted to them of the earthly expression of God’s Kingdom, and the demonstration of it to the nations. The kingdom message of Jesus, preceded and prepared by John Baptist, accompanied by the teaching and tangible signs of the Kingdom, suggest explicitly that Christ has taken up the mandate to fulfill it. “When therefore the owner of the vineyard comes …” (ESV Mt.21:40), in the light of the ‘τέλος’ in Christ, does indicate that His coming, declaring and demonstrating Kingdom; pronouncing Himself as ‘Vine’ and as a new ‘κεφαλή’ does strongly suggest that the judgment day had already come for Israel. Likewise, when Jesus says, ‘my Father is the Husbandman,’ He is stating the restoration of God’s role and relationship to the Vine and the branches, according to the original Garden of Eden intention.178

Textual considerations

The text in the light of ‘τέλος’ carries a collective meaning, as well as the obvious personal one. Personal experience provides precedence and cause for the collective, “… The new relation is set forth which was to subsist between Him and His Church” (Edersheim 833). Therefore, the collective cannot create the personal. Jesus’ statement of Himself as ‘Vine’ begins rather with ‘εγω ειμι’, clearly establishes divinity as God, though he be figured as Vine that in no way suggests subjugation in ontological terms in relation to the Father. Jesus attests this in His opening phrase. If Jesus is in the Father and the Father in Him, then the equality in divinity is not challenged by the attribution of function. The Father’s grace as Husbandman seeks health, nourishment, maintenance that engenders growth in view of a quality of fruit at harvest time. The figure of Jesus as the Vine forms the branches, the believers individually and collectively as church, in

177 Is.11:1, 10; Ac.13:22; Ro.15:12; Rev.5:5; 22:16; Is.53:2; Jer.23:5; 33:15; Zc.3:8; 6:12.

178 Ge.2:8.

relationship of union. The meaning of ‘μένω’ as previously developed applies in this section, referring to an organic relationship of union characterized by unchanging permanency and continuity, whereby Christ exercises mediation and constructs upon Himself within the believer and likewise within church. The sense of ‘μένω’ is intensified in the phrase “even as the branch can absolutely not bear fruit out of itself, except it might abide in the vine, likewise not even yourselves, except you might abide in Me” (TLT Jn.15:4) and reinforced in verse five, “because by yourself without Me you can absolutely have no purpose” (TLT Jn.15:5). The relationship of union is one of utter dependency upon the Vine, concordant with the principles of the collaborative Trinitarian relationship. Christ, is origin and source of being, wherein what a branch is, (person or church), is only the product, of the Vine, not of itself.

The figure provides three scenarios: The first concerns the branch that is ‘in’ the Vine but is not bearing fruit. In bible translations, the term employed is “take away,” however the primary meaning of the word ‘αἴρω’ is to raise or lift up; to take upon, carry or bear oneself; to lift from the ground or to lift in order to carry. Jesus applies the term: to the paralytic healed and called to rise up and take his bed; of Jesus’ invitation to carry his yoke and learn from him; to Simon of Cyrene who was compelled to carry Jesus’ cross and of the discipleship call to do likewise. These examples, which demonstrate the meaning of the term, strongly suggests that it cannot be ‘to take away’. The fact that the branch is still ‘in’ the Vine, communicates that it is still in union, and is still connected to the source of life. The image advocates a strong pastoral image of the Husbandman recovering a branch that has fallen to the ground, but because of its union, the branch is raised up again, tied to the wires that support the vine branches with the promised perspective of bearing fruit in view.

The second image relates to the branch that is bearing fruit. In coherence with the analogy, ‘καθαίρω’ should correctly be translated to prune, rather than to purify or cleanse from impurity. The pruning exercise, if perceived as correction, discipline, or punishment, is misconstrued. The motivation and intention of God the Husbandman is understood

180 For example: NKJV, ESV, NAS, DBY, Authorised Version, Young, and Tyndale.
181 ‘αἴρω’ TGENL 2016; SGB 2015; Kittel and Friedrich @35.
182 Mt.9:6; 11:29; 27:32; Mk.10:21.
through the purpose of pruning. If a branch has produced fruit in its season, then these shoots if left will not enable fruit in the next season. The branch and shoots become wild and fruitless or poor in quality and in quantity. The pruning is an exercise to cut off the shoots and parts of the branch that have borne fruit, in view of the expectant quality and quantity of new fruit in the next season. The believer and the church are therefore drawn into a relationship through union that is in constant development of quality that in turn produces quantity. The pruning, is cutting away what has already served its purpose, what remains after harvest is therefore out of date, God’s act of love is to remove that which has served its purpose and become unnecessary for the next season. In view is that the fruit of the branches belongs not to the branch but to the Husbandman.

The third image is that of the branch that does not abide in the Vine, Christ. Verse six is not in a context of judgment, the verbs in the passive voice indicate that it is a state that has cause in the branch. The branch that is not in the vine, seems to think that planted in the ground by itself, it can produce fruit. If a branch is separated from the vine, there is no source of life or nourishment therefore, it cannot produce out of itself, it is not its own source. Without the vine, the natural process is: it withers, it is gathered, and burns. The principle is one of self-judgment, in the likeness of Israel the vine, the cause of disunion is the branch’s desire to live self-sufficiently and bear fruit separately from the Vine. Jesus therefore says, “… by yourself without Me you can absolutely have no purpose,” and so the point of being a branch no longer exists. The image emphasizes the nature of relationship to the Vine. The branch only lives and produces because of the Vine, and the sap that runs from the root to the tips of the branches and shoots. It is the sap that determines the nature of the fruit, the quality, the quantity, and the time for ripening.

The ontological repercussion for church the branch of the Vine reveals the imperative of a living organic permanent, continuous, and unchanging relationship of union. Any religious notion of objectively offering to God what one believes He requires, deserves or demands is obsolete and utterly inadequate before the greater reality of union in the Vine Christ. The relationship of utter dependency puts church before the evidence that it is not what you can do for God, in His name, as if He needs you to do anything, rather it is what union in Christ desires to produce in and through church that is of utmost significance. An examination of what is done for, offered to God in Christ, will reveal whether union is tangible reality or not. Observation of church trends suggests that much
is done in the name of God, for God, but not everything has its source or origin in the Vine, it is an assumption that goes too far to suggest that what is produced is logically of the sap. The pertinence is whether what the Vine, communicating the sap to the branches, desires to produce, there is no such thing in the vine as profiling or self definition. Utter dependency of this union indicates the branch has no choice in the matter. The identity, the causal origin and the agency of the branch are exclusively in the Godhead. Church therefore, is not defined by denomination, confession, strategy, federation, affiliation, values, or potentiality. She should imperatively restore her ontological origins wherein it is evident that union, utter dependency, divine definition, and expression find their legitimate source. Church only expresses the measure of her union in Godhead as the fruits that flow out of that will attest. Where Jesus with the Father in Trinity demonstrates this relationship of source through: collaboration, entire dependency, revelation, mutual honour, delegation, and autonomy, as developed in the previous chapter, so the Vine proves that the church is only the extension and a procession of Trinitarian origin, life, and operation. The Vine calls for restoration and renewal of this state of being.

The Vine teaches a relationship of constant renewal if the Husbandman is permitted to prune. The challenge concerns the vain mindless repetition of the same old systems, programmes, activities, ways of functioning, leadership and ministry models that fail to allow the pruning that engenders new life and vigour from the same origin and source that is the Vine Christ. Recollecting the OT images of a tree planted near sources of living water, that produce fruit in every season, irrespective heat or cold, attest to the life principle of continuous and immediate cycles of fruit-bearing that defy the natural order, because the sap, the very life of Christ, of the Holy Spirit, of the Father, are the supernatural source that commands and moves the believer and church into continual cycles of spiritual and qualitative growth and fruitfulness. Godhead are the generating, regenerating of: life, nature, growth, fruits, quality and quantity. Church, if defined by this union, will be in a constant cycle of qualitative growth wherein the organic processes reproduce according to union in Christ. This is to recover experience of divine movement as normative to Church in the Vine.

---

183 Ps.1; Jer.17.
The concluding remark that concerns fruit bearing suggests that fruit bearing is firstly concerned with the product of union in Christ and the spiritual life originated and sourced in Him, manifest in the believer or in the church. This is the demonstration of fruit bearing. The analogy does not concern multiplying or adding branches, or increasing more grapes, it is uniquely the tangible demonstration of whatever the Vine Christ desires to generate as life and fruit in a person or a church – that quality of life that innately multiplies and produces fruit quantitatively is the legitimate witness of the church to Christ the Vine. Fruitfulness in this context, is not about evangelism or reaching and discipling others for Christ; this activism, where function replaces ontology, is incompatible with the present vision of the Vine.

v. The Household/Family

Therefore remember that formerly you, the Gentiles in the flesh, who are called "Uncircumcision" by the so-called "Circumcision," which is performed in the flesh by human hands - remember that you were at that time separate from Christ, excluded from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world. But now in Christ Jesus you who formerly were far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ … So then you are no longer strangers and aliens, but you are fellow citizens with the saints, and are of God’s household (NAS Ep.2:11, 12, 13, 19).

Church, composed of those in union in Christ, is the ‘οἰκείος of God brought into existence through the axiom of Jesus Christ; the formation of filial household is defined through the Person and work of Christ. First considered by Paul is the definition of the prior relationship to Christ and the ‘οἰκείος of God, of uncircumcised non-Jewish ethnicity. Paul employs the following key terms:

‘ἀπαλλοτρίω’\textsuperscript{184} in the passive voice refers to being alienated, non-member or non-participant in Christ and the life of God. The term speaks of rupture of ties due to hostile and empty minds, and hardened hearts.\textsuperscript{185} Paul infers physical-natural reasons of non-circumcision, identifying culturally and religiously the Jewish nation,\textsuperscript{186} in antithesis to

\textsuperscript{184} Employed three times in the NT in the Perfect/Passive/Participle form: Ep.2:12; 4:18; Col.1:21.

\textsuperscript{185} Ep.4:18; Col.1:21.

\textsuperscript{186} Ep.2:12.
reconciliation. Hodge comments that what was out of reach “… was to be without redemption and without access to God” (@6097). The awareness of disqualification enjoins exclusion. The verb form employed also communicates something that is past, and therefore is critically altered from its previous state.

‘ξένος’ is translated as foreign or foreigner. The distinction is of one who may be friend but is not family member, without access to internal family relationships; it contrasts knowing about, as a spectator, with knowing from within. Exclusion from degrees of intimacy, trust, openness, understanding, acceptance, affinity, belonging, security, and love with less conditionality, describes the place of the ‘ξένος’.187

‘πάροικος’ specifies a temporary residence or home near to others, literally a ‘by-dweller’.188 One could be residing in a land or country sharing cultural and, religious identity, yet not be an integral part of that ‘household’. Peter describes this as the relationship of church the Household to the world.

‘παρεπίδημος’ although not mentioned in the text concurs with the theme.189 The relationship to the world in contrast to the Household, Peter describes as ‘παρεπίδημος’, an alien making him or herself temporarily at home in proximity of or in the vicinity of a foreign people; describes putting roots down in a parallel existence although segregated not integrated and without rights or citizenship bonds.

The resulting portrait of not being members, finds response in what Paul develops as the vision of God’s household in which believers are ‘πολιτεία’. The term suggests citizenship in community,190 freedoms and rights of a citizen.191 The term belongs to the

187 NT teaching does describe believers as ‘φιλόξενος’: 1Ti.3:2; Tit.1:8; 1Pe.4:9; Ro.12:13; Heb.13:2; Mt.25:35, 38, 43-44; see also Ro.16:23; 3Jn.1:5.

188 Ac.7:6, 29; 1Pe.2:11.

189 1Pe.2:11; Heb.11:13; 1Pe.1:1.


realm of secular or civil society. Kittel and Friedrich suggest that ‘polis’ the attribution of ‘city or state’ creates culture in antiquity not just through adhesion but ownership of common shared laws and rights. “‘Πολέετεια’ means citizenship … the order or constitution of the state … the community or state itself” (@ 6097 Hodge). Later Judaism attributes a religious and moral behavioural rather than political meaning (@649). The religious and moral implications are reflected by NT usage,\(^{192}\) citizenship being of heaven and of the Kingdom. The question does not directly concern birth right\(^{193}\) nor paternal lineage,\(^{194}\) both of which for believers are established in Godhead, but of citizenship. The citizenship is into ‘οἰκετίς’ the household family of God which is His ‘πόλις’\(^{195}\) (@6104 Clarke, Gill). While the foremost reasoning places the believers collectively as citizens of God’s heaven, and therefore inheriting the natural freedoms, rights, and responsibilities, of that “… city which has foundations, whose builder and maker is God … for He has prepared a city for them” (NKJV Heb.11:10, 16). The ontological meaning causes one to consider citizenship, ‘being a member (‘μέτοχος’) of’ as citizenship, individually and corporately, in the Persons of Godhead.\(^{196}\) Expressing citizenship then, is church the ‘οἰκετίς’ in Godhead, benefiting from all that they have been given access to, of their Persons, “… I am your portion and your inheritance among the children of Israel” (NKJV Num.18:20). The ontological perspective is that uniquely in Christ, through his atoning sacrifice for reconciliation is household membership made possible. ‘συμπολίτης’ denotes the intimate joining together of fellow citizens; the citizenship is not of Israel but of Christ, into God’s household, indicative of a new ‘οἰκετικός’ originated exclusively in Him. The text states that the community is composed of the saints and already members of the household, and so in Christ all the freedoms, privileges, and responsibilities of being God’s household, rather than alienation, recognition, rather than

---

\(^{192}\) ‘Πολίτευμα’ and ‘πολετεύωμαι’ to be, behave or conduct one’s life as a citizen: Ph.3:20; Ac.23:1; Ph.1:27. The non-religious and non-political use of ‘πολίτης’ simply refers being identified as a citizen of a town: Lk.15:15; 19:14; Ac.21:39.

\(^{193}\) ‘γένος’ of origins or descent: in Trinity Jn.3:5; Gal.4:19; 1Jn.5:1.

\(^{194}\) ‘πατριά’ of paternal or family lineage – common origin: in Trinity Jn.1:12; Ep.3:15; Gal.4:5-6.

\(^{195}\) Rev.3:12; 21:2.

\(^{196}\) Heb.3:1, 14; 6:4; 12:7-9.
exclusion, inclusion, rather than segregation, integration, rather than separate, unified equally, rather than temporary, are permanently rooted.

Church the ‘οἰκεῖος’ then is to manifest its relationship with the master technician and craftsman\(^{197}\) of His household which will be most starkly demonstrated in its citizen relationship to the world. The paradigm of Scripture is that God calls a people from among a people, he calls a nation from among a nation in like manner renewal and restoration calls a church from the midst of church.\(^{198}\)

Coming into the NT period with the incarnation of Jesus and the message He brought, there is a shift in meta-narrative emphasis from the “geopolitical” existence of a nation among nations shaped by God’s covenants, to an “existential” intention, cutting through distinctions in the cultural, ethnic, political, geographical, and religious beliefs of communities, people groups and nations. This people claimed a sense of identity and distinction, history, and destiny from their own philosophy of existence and life. The NT reality is still a people group among and throughout peoples, a Kingdom among or throughout nations. The distinctive nature however, is no longer pursued by conformity to a divine code of rules, but to the regenerating, supernatural transforming of human beings from the inside out, as distinct from social transformation that is more often referred to in our generation and society (Henderson Church and Sexuality 27-28).

It is citizenship in the ‘οἰκεῖος’ that determines relationship to the world. The politicization of Church is contrary to the true sense of citizenship in the Household. The levels of secular state conformity sometimes for financial gain, social status or influence whereby the distinction between state and church is compromised or forfeited, radically jeopardizes the core principles of the Household in identity, belonging, security and values. The modern-day difficulty with branding as ‘sect’ was not unfamiliar to apostolic NT church.\(^{199}\) The apostolic witness is to radical Christianity perpetrators unprecedented

\(^{197}\) Ge.2:7; Ps.33:7; Is.43:21.

\(^{198}\) Ex.18:10; 33:16; 1Kg.8:53; Ps.114:1; Is.10:22; 11:11; 49:6; Ez.11:17; Mal.1:11; Jn.12:32; Ac.2:41, 47; 13:48; 18:9-10; Rev.11:9.

\(^{199}\) Ac.9:2; 19:9, 23; 22:4; 24:5, 14; 28:22.
growth, as a pilgrim people in society and nation, in order that the fundamental characteristics of the Household be found uniquely in Godhead.

If ‘πόλις’ is the ‘οἰκείος’ then there is significance in the meaning of family that determines Church the Household. Citizenship is then firstly concerned with the ontological needs of identity, belonging, security and culture or values. Psychology and sociology among the sciences will identify these core needs at a human level whereby any form of community, be it: family, friendship group, interest, social, leisure or religious groups, will be sources that can contribute to the meeting of such core needs. Church collectively witnesses to God, as Paternal and parental Head of His family, as source in Trinity of these essential needs. These attributes define Church the Household, intensified, strengthened, and rendered irresistible in internal life and external demonstration to peoples and nations of another eternal entity characterized by the nature of Godhead. If ‘I Am’ tells someone you are … personal identity has found its original source in God, and therefore in Household contributes to collective identity. If God says My people, My Household, then belonging is not to the Household itself but to Godhead, nourished and demonstrated in Household. Belonging to each other is only subsequent to the belonging that God puts upon His child and Household, intensified in a demonstration of ownership to the world. Security is vital to creating a safe, stable, and sure basis in a person and in circumstance, expressed ontologically in the seven constituent parts of a person’s identity; in material, financial, and social spheres of life. In Household security is uprooted from the ephemeral and transient fluctuations of society and human community and rooted in Godhead where eternal security and assurance are found. The principle of intensification through collective witness to personal experience releases church from dependency upon secular securities. Cultural identification of values, reflects the purpose of God from the desert years for Israel, which was the inculcation of divine presence, truths and values that shape the Household, because the divine nature in Godhead indwells the individual believer, the collectivity.

---

200 Ex.19:5; Dt.7:6-7; 32:9; Is.43:1-7; Mal.3:17; Jn.6:35-40; 7:28; 8:14; 14:18-23; 1Co.3:23; 6:19-20; Gal.3:29; Ep.1:3-14, 18; 2:19.
The nature of Household family relationships in like manner, just as citizenship, are redefined in Christ. This household reflects the divine origin in the Creator and the Redeemer of every believer. If the believer is born of God and His good pleasure, then God is established in perfect paternity and parenthood, “Have we not all one father?” (NKJV Mal.2:10) and in Jesus words, “Do not call anyone on earth your father; for One is your Father, He who is in heaven” (NAS Mt.23:9), reflecting the intention of Jesus to reveal the paternal relationship of God desired with his children. Jesus discloses the nature of his relationship to the heavenly Father: as a youngster, come of age that is twelve or thirteen, “Why did you seek Me? Did you not know that I must be about My Father’s business?” (NKJV Lk.2:49) indicating that Jesus is conscious of the heavenly Father relationship and mandate that, however painful for Mary and Joseph, reflects the primacy of God’s fatherhood. Jesus responds in similar vein to the gathered crowd, “And He stretched out His hand toward His disciples and said, Here are My mother and My brothers! For whoever does the will of My Father in heaven is My brother and sister and mother” (NKJV Mt.12:49-50), demonstrates a radical new interpretation of relationships whereby the spiritual becomes the foundational for all other natural relationships. The human relationships as demonstrated in Jesus’ life, did not discern, His identity, His belonging to God and not to them, His security in the Father and the values of the Father and Kingdom, as the various Gospel texts indicate. The grounds for relationship are now concerned with those believing in and being in Christ, which is the Father’s will. The generous inclusivity of Jesus in “whoever” is in tension with exclusivity determined by the responders “does the will of my Father” (Hendriksen 142). The challenging discipleship passages where losing or hating one’s soul to gain one’s life, or the worthiness of a disciple to follow Jesus, in relationship to his family, likewise set out a principle of “mediation” by Jesus in all relationships.

202 See also Mt.5:45, 48; 6:6, 8; 7:11; Mk.11:25-26; Lk.6:36; 13:32; Jn.8:42; 20:17.
203 Lk.2:49; Jn.2:3-5; 7:3-9; Mk.6:3-4.
204 Jn.6:39-40.
205 Mt.19:22; Jn.6:60-61.
He is the mediator, not only between God and man, but between man and man, between man and reality. Since the whole world was created through him and unto him... he is the sole Mediator in the world. Since his coming man has no immediate relationship of his own anymore to anything, neither to God nor the world; Christ wants to be the mediator... Since the coming of Christ, his followers have no more immediate realities of their own, not in their family relationships nor in the ties with their nation nor in the relationships formed in the process of living (Bonhoeffer 95-96).

While the tendency in these difficult passages, emphasizes sacrifice of self and of family that is to fail to grasp the significance of the mediation of Christ. If Christ stands then as Mediator in every relationship, then being in Christ removes immediate, direct relationships and places them within the context of His mediation. This is what these ‘difficult texts’ are teaching and demonstrating. While Morris comments, “Jesus is not saying that earthly familial ties are unimportant, only that they are not all-important,” (332), seems to weaken the text and does not expound fully the intention. Every relationship is to be defined through Christ and in Him, conform to the ‘new’ according to the ‘τέλος’ in Christ, wherein respect, honour and concern reflected biblical principles in relationships are not contradictory as long as Christ remains the Mediator and union in Christ is the basis for any form of relationship or communion. In this light relationship are to be re-evalutaed and re-ordered according to Christ who is the source of a new family, Church the ‘οἰκείος’ of God, in which He is the essential reason, substance and nature of the mediate relationship. In this sense, as reflected with the five foundational ministries of the Body, believers are given to each other, and Christ in them is what is given to relate and edify Christ in the other. It is in such a way that Church becomes the Household of God. Paul’s own testimony concords,

---

207 Mt.19:19; Ep.5:2; Jn.19:26-27.

208 Gal.6:15.
For we are the circumcision, the Spirit God serving priestly and glorifying in Christ Jesus and absolutely not being persuaded in flesh; nevertheless I possess having had reliance even in human nature [alone]; If any other thinks others rely on human nature [alone], I much more; circumcised the eighth day, out of the generation of Israel, the clan of Benjamin, Hebrew of Hebrews, according to the law a Pharisee, according to zeal persecuting the church, according to righteousness in the law being irreproachable. Nevertheless, whatever things were to me gain, these things have esteemed through the Christ detrimental and so then truly I esteem everything to be detrimental through holding superior the personal experiential knowing Christ Jesus my Lord through whom everything I lose … (TLT Ph.3:3-7).

Paul’s advice to Timothy reflects the outworking of Jesus’ teaching, “Do not inflict heavy handed correctives on elder men, but build up as fathers, young men as brothers, elder women as mothers, younger women as sisters, by whatever means with innocent and pure intentions” (TLT 1Ti.5:1-2), indicating the wider understanding of Paul’s relationships with the brothers and sisters,209 loved children,210 sons211, in the churches and in service of Christ with Paul.212 His singular and vital principle is the defining demonstration of being in Christ.213 Similarly, the apostle John emphasizes the relational bond in Christ, formulating church and eldership, in terms of family in Christ.214 Church the Household is thereby ontologically defined in Christ and His mediacy as the unique criteria that demonstrates God’s family, as He constitutes its members. The Household takes absolutely no consideration of, neither in reference to family nor to ministry of the natural order. The Household will fail to be what she is intended to be if that is the case, confounding the divine Christological.

209 Ph.1:1-2.
210 1Co.4:14-16.
211 1Co.4:17; 1Ti.1:2, 18; 2Ti.1:2; Phi.1:8-10, 16.
212 1Th.3:2.
213 Ro.16:1-13; 1Co.1:10; 4:14-17.
In Romans chapter nine Paul sets out seven spheres where citizenship in Church the Household of God is legitimized,

I am telling the truth in Christ, I am not lying, my conscience testifies with me in the Holy Spirit, that I have great sorrow and unceasing grief in my heart. For I could wish that I myself were accursed, *separated* from Christ for the sake of my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh, who are Israelites, to whom belongs the adoption as sons, and the glory and the covenants and the giving of the Law and the *temple* service and the promises, whose are the fathers, and from whom is the Christ according to the flesh, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen (NAS Ro.9:1-5).

Understanding Paul’s true intentions in this passage with regards the ‘οικεῖος’ of God, requires one to observe Paul’s heart break over the Jewish nation’s rejection of Christ; he is tried in his thinking over this failure to embrace the awaited Christ Messiah; he seeks to understand the historical and prophetic accomplishment in Christ, and in the apostolic period. In Christ, God recovers the existential nature of salvation and life purposed in Him; the multi-cultural, ethnic, generational facets of church God’s Household in Christ shift from these characteristics to the existential need for restored relationship to the Father through Jesus Christ. Paul’s criteria are founded upon the accomplished Word and how it was fulfilled; on the grounds of distinction between the natural order and the order according to promise and the seed,215 whereby Christ in believers, they become the seed of the promise.216 As Christ is the ‘τέλος’ of Israel, previously developed in the treatment of “Church The New Man,” it requires only to restate the centrality of Christ in the fulfilment and introduction of all ethnicities into Himself, into one Household. It is with this understanding that Paul sets out the inheritance of the Household of God in: adoption, glory, covenants, law-giving, priestly service, promises and the fathers. While the purpose of this development is principally ontological, these principal truths of inheritance legitimizing citizenship in Godhead are worthy of brief comment.

---

215 ‘σπέρμα’ is perceived as Christ Ac.3:25-26; 13:23; Ro.1:3; Gal.3:16, 19; 2Ti.2:16; 1Jn.3:9.

216 Gal.3:29.
i. Adoption

The adoption of Israel is found in God calling them as a people entity, national adoption of the whole body of the people as a nation (Gill @5015), described figuratively as a son, a firstborn.\(^\text{217}\) The appellation ‘children of Israel’ indicates paternal and parental relationship to the community manifest through covenant with them.\(^\text{218}\) This is the historical covenantal promise to Israel, conditioned by covenant obedience. The significance of the ‘τέλος’ of these qualities is in Jesus Christ revealed as the ‘Firstborn’ and ‘Son’. Adoption therefore in Christ is ministered by the Trinity into every believer in Christ and in union with him. The collective experience of the individual reality, “the firstborn among many brethren” creates “the church of the firstborn.”\(^\text{219}\) Christ, ‘πρωτότοκος’ over all creation, ‘πρωτότοκος’ from the dead, in all supremacy, can reasonably be perceived as fulfilling the failed Israel relationship, “… it is not as though the word of God has failed” (ESV Ro.9:6); Hodge observes, “As the whole OT economy was a type and shadow of the blessings of the New, so the sonship of the Israelites was an adumbration of the sonship of believers” (@5015). Jesus makes clear the paternity of God in relationship to Israel contrasted to Himself, revealing the contradictions of being descendants literally from Abraham but not having the same disposition to God as he: of loving God and attesting to his paternity yet rejecting and hating Jesus; of characteristics than are akin to Satan, identifying in this way, paternity, his divinity and divine Sonship, stand contrary to the earthly and natural in the divine purpose in Christ; that natural Israel be restored divine sonship and paternity can only occur in Christ.\(^\text{220}\)

\(^{217}\) Ex.4:22; Jer.31:9; Ho.11:1.

\(^{218}\) Dt.7:6-8; Ex.6:6; 11:7; 16:12; Jer.16:15; 32:30; Ho.3:1; Jl.3:16.

\(^{219}\) Ro.8:29; Heb.12:23.

\(^{220}\) Jn.8:39-59.
ii. Glory

Generally the glory of God in His Person is revealed through creation,221 residency,222 presence,223 salvation,224 Jesus Christ,225 Kingdom,226 and in believers individually227 and collectively.228 Specifically, the glory of Israel refers to the manifestation of the divine presence: the pillar of fire and of cloud, Mount Sinai and the giving of the law, the Ark of the Covenant, the Holy of holies and tent of meeting, and the Jerusalem temples where the cloud of the glory of the presence of God dwelt.229 In Israel, God was to be glorified,230 in Jeremiah’s words, “Has a nation changed its gods, Which are not gods? But My people have changed their Glory For what does not profit”231 (NKJV Jer.2:11), perceiving the loss of glory because of a turning away from God who was their glory. Romans nine also contrasts the glory of Israel with the rejected stone of stumbling and of scandal that inaugurates a new glory.232 Christ is prophesied as the glory of God.233 Paul contrasts the glory of the Old covenant, with the greater, exceeding, and permanent glory, that is the ministry of the Spirit to those in Christ, as fulfilling through Christ the greater ‘τέλος’ glory. While Israel’s glory may remain, in Christ the fulfilment has brought a greater new covenant therefore superseding the former in quality, nature, and power of life. The permanency of the indwelling and the vivifying regenerating ministry are the glorious
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221 Ps.19:1.
222 Ex.25:22.
223 Ex.33:9-11.
224 Ps.79:9.
225 Is.40:5; Jn.1:14.
226 Mt.19:28.
227 Ro.8:30.
228 Ep.5:27.
229 Ex.13:21-22; 24:16-17; 2Co.3:7; 1Sa.4:21-22; 29:43; 40:34-35; 2Ch.7:1-3; Ps.63:2; 102:16; Hg.2:7, 9.
230 Is.46:13; 49:3.
231 See also Ho.9:11; 10:5.
232 Ro.9:30-33.
‘τέλος’ of the divine intention. Christ’s final prayer relates the communication of His glory, “And the glory which You gave Me I have given them, that they may be one just as We are one…” (NKJV Jn.17:22), reflecting intimately the indwelling of Godhead in union, something that Israel knows nothing of; therefore, the greater glory is in Christ and by consequence found in union in every believer. The corporate glory therefore is the intensification of the assembled individual indwelling glory of Christ crowned by the Godhead in the midst. Glory for the ontological church is therefore defined, engraved consciously in the being of individuals and church. Something that should be tangibly evident in church.

iii. Covenants

The plural of covenants refers to the number of covenants\(^{234}\) including the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants, remembering that they are conditional, relational, moral, judicial, ritual, and promissory in content. The prophetic announcements of new covenant, of a new heart of flesh and of God’s spirit indwelling only find fulfilment in Christ because the latter covenant is founded upon a regenerative work of God in the believer in contrast to the nature and practice of law conformism. They are incompatible both in nature and agency which defines the essence of the life produced.

Paul perceives the covenant of Law as: holy, just and good, spiritual,\(^{235}\) it is imperfect and precursor,\(^{236}\) requiring repeated blood, sacrifices and offerings for application and effect.\(^{237}\) Its purpose is to: render guilt,\(^{238}\) condemning rather than justifying,\(^{239}\) that

\(^{234}\) Adamic: Ge.1:28-30; 3:14-24; Noah: Ge.8:21-9:7; Abrahamic and Patriarchs: Ge.12:1-3; 15:1-21; 17:1-14; Isaac: Ge.26:1-5; Jacob: Ge.28:12-17; Mosaic: 2:24-25; 3:15-17; 19:5-6; 34:10-28; Jos.8:30-35; Davidic: 2Sa.7:11-17; New Covenant: Es.59:21; Jer.31:33; Ez.36:26-28; Mt.26:28; Heb.8:8-13; 9:15.

\(^{235}\) Ro.7:12, 14, 16; 1Ti.1:8.

\(^{236}\) Heb.7:19; 10:1.

\(^{237}\) Heb.8:4; 9:22.

\(^{238}\) Ro.3:19.

\(^{239}\) Ro.3:20; 4:15; Jm.2:9.
sinfulness and passions abound,\textsuperscript{240} it administers death,\textsuperscript{241} it brings under curse,\textsuperscript{242} and applies to the unrighteous person.\textsuperscript{243} The author to the Hebrews speaks of ‘better covenant’ that Christ inaugurates being ‘τέλος’ of the old in order to inaugurate the new: by the perfect revelation of the Son,\textsuperscript{244} by a better hope upon better promises,\textsuperscript{245} founded upon a perfect sacrifice and a perfect priest,\textsuperscript{246} for a better, eternal covenant,\textsuperscript{247} a better resurrection to eternal life,\textsuperscript{248} to a heavenly home and a better inheritance.\textsuperscript{249} In Christ the judicial, ritual, moral and relational conditions are perfectly fulfilled whereby through his death a new covenant in Him is inaugurated; that of the Redemption and that of the Person of the indwelling Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{250} The ontology of the believer and church is founded upon Christ who is the covenant, the Spirit who is the covenant. The covenant is no longer perceived through practices or sacramental rituals but through the ontological demonstration of the Persons of Christ and the Spirit who are the benefits of the new covenant.

iv. Law-giving

‘Νομοθεσία’ “… denotes the result rather than the act of legislation, i.e., the law, constitution, etc. The one NT instance is in Romans chapter nine verse four, where one of Israel’s privileges is the possession (not the giving) of the law.” Other Lexicons retain the law giving perspective (Zodhiates 1015).\textsuperscript{251} ‘Νομοθετέω’ rather bears the meaning of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{240} Ro.5:20; 7:5, 8.
\item \textsuperscript{241} Ro.7:5; 1Co.15:56.
\item \textsuperscript{242} Gal.3:13.
\item \textsuperscript{243} 1Ti.1:9.
\item \textsuperscript{244} Heb.1:1-4.
\item \textsuperscript{245} Heb.7:19; 8:6.
\item \textsuperscript{246} Heb.9:23; 7:20-28.
\item \textsuperscript{247} Heb.8:6.
\item \textsuperscript{248} Heb.11:35.
\item \textsuperscript{249} Heb.11:16; 10:34.
\item \textsuperscript{250} Heb.19:15; Mt.26:28; Heb.8:10; 2Co.3:6.
\item \textsuperscript{251} ‘νομοθεσία’ \textit{TGEL} 2016; \textit{SECB} 2015. Ro.9:4 only.
\end{itemize}
giving the law (Kettel and Friedrich @526), whereas the other lexicons observe the enactment of prescribed laws, to receive the law, passively to be legislated (Zodhiates 1015). \(^{252}\) This word is employed in reference to the imperfect Levitical priesthood, in comparison to the more excellent ministry of Jesus Christ, Mediator of a better legislation of promise.

Jesus condemnation of the Pharisees identifies the character of law-giving of that time. \(^{253}\) prohibiting access to the Kingdom; usury to inflate pretention of self-importance; reproducing worse than themselves in disciples; disingenuous vow-making; rigid in the letter, lacking in the spirit of the law; hypocrisy of self-righteous appearances and evil self-indulgent hearts; supercilious self-declared innocence when condemnable under the same culpability as the fathers for the same spirit and actions. Jesus in the strongest terms condemns this kind of law-giving. Rabbinic understanding of law can be illustrated:

> The Law was … the foundation of both religious and social life. It came from God, it afforded a divine revelation of all needful truth, and provided a practical way of salvation … The … Law is a gracious gift from God to Israel, a signal mark if his favour; and that the possession of it carries with it God’s presence in a unique manner and degree (Barrett 192-193).

Clarke comments, “The revelation of God by God Himself, containing a system of moral and political precepts. This was also peculiar to the Jews; for to no other nation had he ever given a revelation of his will” (@5015). In the light of this theme, the law-giving within Israel remains an old covenant practice, Jesus reveals the fundamental problem of seeking eternal life in the Scriptures, when their purpose is to point to Christ Himself. \(^{254}\) As long as Law-giving is perceived as a source of salvation, righteousness and exclusive relationship with God, natural Israel will remain in a practice that is non-salvific and in its imperfection does not resemble in any way the ‘τέλος’ that is in the Christ, of all the Law and the Prophets; He who is Life, Salvation, and Justice. The Household inherits

---


\(^{253}\) Mt.23:13-36.

\(^{254}\) Jn.5:39-40; see also Mk.14:49; Lk.4:21; 24:27.
Christ, legislated by grace, by love, by the character and governance of the Spirit, by existence and origin in union in Christ and consequentially Godhead. Church the Household legislates and demonstrates Jesus Christ.

v. Priestly service

“‘And you shall be to Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation’ …” (NKJV Ex.19:6), recounts the divine purpose for the people of Israel as a whole. The redemption of the firstborn that belonged particularly to God, created the Levites, a tribe consecrated uniquely to God’s priestly service. The insufficiency of the sacrificial offerings and priesthood may have appeased God, but never resolved the sin question in human nature neither for priest nor people. Christ becomes the perfect sacrifice through atonement and perfect high priest through mediation. In accomplishing perfectly the Levitical law of priestly service, Christ redeems the ‘λειτουργός’ and restores it ontologically to every believer in Him, having resolved permanently: the cleansing and forgiving requirements of his sacerdotal ministry: worshipping God in spirit and in truth beyond geography, culture, tradition and mediacy in an unmediated direct relationship to, and in Him; the whole being of the believer is the accepted offering of holistic consecration of life. Paul perceives his ministry as priestly service, his life as a sacrificial offering along with the fruits of his service bringing others to Christ. The only ‘λειτουργός’ is therefore profoundly ontological defined in the person of Christ who has accomplished the old

255 Jn.1:14, 16-17; Ep.2:5-7.
256 Mk.12:30-32; Ro.13:10; Gal.5:14; Jm.2:8.
257 Gal.5:22; 2Pe.1:3-11; Ro.8:5-11.
258 Col.3:1-4.
259 Num.8:17-18.
260 Heb.10:11-12; 7:16, 24-25; Ep.5:2.
261 Heb.10:11; 2Ti.1:3; Heb.9:14; 10:2.
262 Jn.4:23-24 Ph.3:3.
263 Ro.12:1; Mk.12:30, 32; see also ‘προσκυνέω’ referring to a posture of kneeling, bowing, prostration reflective of an ontological state of being outside of all priestly form of function. Lk.24:52; 1Co.14:25; Heb.10:19-22; Rev.4:10; 5:14; 7:11.
264 Ro.15:16; Ph.2:17; 2Ti.4:6.
order, where distanciation, representation and authentication reigned as hallmarks of religiosity, the universalised ‘λειτουργός’ of his ministry in every believer and subsequently the church re-establishing immediacy; in the offering of self individually and collectively as ‘λειτουργός’ in Christ and to the Godhead.

vi. Promises

Promises, (‘ἐπαγγελία’ an announcement with pledge, commitment to fulfill), are distinct but not separate from reciprocal covenant as Calvin observes,

But promises are what we meet with everywhere in Scripture; for when God had once made a covenant with his ancient people, he continued to offer, often by new promises, his favour to them. It hence follows, that promises are to be traced up to the covenant as to their true source … (@5015).

Beyond the Abrahamic covenant promises of a land and innumerable descendants, which can be perceived as accomplished to some degree,265 the principal promises of the Jewish hope concern the Messiah and the Kingdom reign of God in Zion, reaching out to the nations. Scripture reveals the accomplishment of these promises in Jesus Christ: the Davidic king and an eternal throne;266 the Seed of the Abrahamic covenant for righteousness by faith in the promise;267 suffering and resurrection of Christ, Light and Glory;268 the non-Jewish peoples would know Christ;269 the outpouring of the Holy Spirit of the new covenant;270 the promise of eternal life;271 of a strong and enduring faith response to God;272 the ‘παρουσία’ of Jesus in His Kingdom and glory.273 These are the

265 Jos.22:14-16; Ex.1:6; 1Kg.8:56.
266 Ac.13:22-23.
267 Ro.4:16; Gal.3:14, 18, 29.
268 Ps.16:9-11; Ps.22; Is.52:13-53:12; Ro.4:21-23; 1:1-4.
269 Ro.15:8-12; Ep.3:6.
270 Lk.24:49; Ac.1:4; 2:33; 2Pe.1:4.
271 Ac.2:37-39; Ep.1:13; 1Ti.4:8; Tit.1:2; Heb.9:15; 1Jn.2:25; Jm.1:12.
272 2Co.7:1; Heb.6:12; 10:23, 36; 11:13, 17.
273 2Pe.3:4, 12-13; 1Th.2:19; 4:13-15; Jm.2:5.
promises fulfilled and secured in Christ. The new covenant when accomplished in Christ and the Spirit in the new, transitions from a culture of promise to one of realization on the principle that Christ is the τέλος. Whatever is promised in Christ in the new covenant is to be experienced and realized. The substance of ontological church pursues the task of every believer/member in Christ brought into the progressive realization of all that is promised ontologically in Christ, as many of the new covenant promises relate the ontology and substance of the believer.

vii. Fathers

The ‘fathers’ symbolize the paternal filial relationship as originator or founder, with undertones of: care, compassion, respect, honour, mercy, protection, representing the historicity and continuity of the Household inheritance, just as the Abrahamic covenant was re-given by God directly to Isaac and Jacob, and throughout biblical history the continuity remains. The paternal transmission assured the continuity and renewal from generation to generation. The repeating and remembering of the covenant privileges and responsibilities were also its renewal. The result of this continual process also concerns returning to God; one historical function of the prophetic voice.

This religious construct is fulfilled by ontological union in Christ whereby each believer in the household has direct relationship, direct and personal experience of the heavenly Father, in whom are found: origins, parenthood, identity, acceptance, purpose, heritage and destiny. The household of believers sharing the same life, experience their lives lived from the same heavenly reality of being found in Christ, where He is; and being raised to participants in his inheritance, both relationally and substantially with the Father and the Spirit.
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274 Ge.17:19; 26:2-5.
276 Ex.2:24; Lev.26:42; 2Kg.13:23; Ac.7:8.
277 Ps.45:17; 77:11.
278 Dt.7:18; 8:2; 9:7; 29; Jos.5, 24; Ps.78:35; Ro.15:4; 1Co.10:1-6.
279 Is.46:8-9; 57:11; Jer.14:10; Ez.16:63.
Church God’s ‘οἰκεῖος’ is Christocentric for He is the ‘τέλος’ and originated in Him, in Trinity, the ‘οἰκεῖος’ finds legitimacy in God’s parentalism; new relating through the mediation of Christ in every relationship constitutes tangibly the Household. Jesus is in His person: adoption, glory, covenant, law, priesthood promise and father, whereby he is ‘τέλος’ of all that preceded the new covenant and he is ‘πρωτότοκος’ establishing the believer and the Household through union in Him in the realization – that is the ontological progressive perfecting of Christ in the ‘οἰκεῖος’. Church the Household is portrayed as being entirely independent from secular society for origins and resources. There is no convergence in the identity of the household members. They do not require anything from secular society to be citizens of Household.

vi. The Body

And He subjected all things under his feet and gave Him a Head and Source over all things [to] this church who is his body filled [with] Him filling all in all (TLT Ep.1:21-22). Moreover you are the body of Christ and limbs out from the part assigned … (TLT 1Co.12:27) … holding onto prevailingly to the Head and Source out of absolutely all the body, through the connecting joints and binding ligaments being abundantly fitted out, being joined, knitted together, grows [with] the growth of God (TLT Col.2:19).

Church the body is uniquely originated and defined in Christ. God sets Christ’s pre-eminence as Head and Source over the created universe, through Him, for Him and in Him, all things exist; the resurrection and exaltation of Christ being the foundation for this relationship.\(^\text{281}\) Paul enhances the significance of the church as it relates to Christ of the universe, and relating ontologically to the universe, “in order that might be made known now at this present time [to] the first ones and the authorities in the heavens through the church this greatly varied wisdom of God” (TLT Ep.3:10). The church witnesses to and demonstrates the new man, the regenerate resurrected people of all ethnicities, in union in Christ, originating out of Him, existing through and in Him. The church’s divine purpose to the universe, if properly understood and integrated, establishes

\(^{281}\) Ep.1:19-20; Col.1:18.
Christ, ‘κεφαλή’ Head, Source and Foundation, not only of church but of the universe. Because church experiences and demonstrates this unique relationship, she is the firstfruit of the new order in Christ that defines the ontological relationship of all heavenly and earthly beings and worlds. In the light of such a purpose, the ontological church the body therefore requires defining.

If Christ’s relationship to the church is perceived as a supreme authority then the ‘κεφαλή’ is a superior authority figure that may be detached from the body under his jurisdiction. But Paul’s metaphor takes a much deeper meaning analogous to a literal head and body in humankind. Paul conveys church as finding origin in Christ the ‘κεφαλή’; church also conversely grows up into the Head and Source; these two imperatives define the nature of the relationship of exclusive and utter dependency to the Head, the Source, the Foundation. To live in this cyclical relationship is to be church the body where church flows out of divine origin and returns into the ‘κεφαλή’ where growth occurs; indicating that church recognizes the nature of its inseparable vital union in Christ and seeks the kind of growth that requires church to choose the source - Christ. Paul clearly warns the Colossian church of ‘religious traditions and practices’ that would dangerously threaten as substitute source. The ontological church is radically distinct from the religious church where Christ may be revered, ritually or ceremonially worshiped but He is not ‘κεφαλή’ as presently defined. Church of human intent or construction with religious sentiment offered to God for acceptability; church where every human and religious resource is thrown into making church something; church where religious observance, allegiance, obedience, practice and good work are reverently observed, does not demonstrate God’s church – Christ’s body on the principle that nothing of the mentioned aspects can make church the body of Christ for the origin is in human construct or intent and not the Person of Christ.

283 ‘ἐκ’ Col.2:19; Ep.4:16.
284 ‘εἰς’ Ep.4:16.
Two principal characteristics of the nature of church the body are: a relational demonstration of fullness and organic cohesive and relational unity. The ‘πλήρωμα’ of Christ refers to the perfection of His person, His divinity and humanity, expressed in abundance and completeness, pervading in particular the collective body of believers as church, filling continuously (‘πληρόω’) and collaboratively the body. Just as the individual believer in union in Christ is fully complete, church the body is but an extension of the Trinitarian experience. The collaborative suggests that this filling up to fullness or completing, by a saturating satisfying measure, reflects the sufficiency in the Person of Christ and the imperative union to the ‘κεφαλή’ permeating the body to experience and demonstrate His perfect fullness. For church to fail to be body in this way is depravation of the full measure of His Person manifest in the body. 

The organic unity of, “... all the body, through the connecting joints and binding ligaments being abundantly fitted out, being joined, knitted together, grows [with] the growth of God” (TLT Col.2:19), puts Christo-centricity in its rightful place. Only if there is Christ in a union relationship, is their unity of believers in union to Him and therefore in communion (‘κοινωνία’) with Christ in the other, uniting the individual and collective expression in an ontological Christocentric body. Any unity based upon vision, strategy, any particular minister or ministry, any statement of faith, denominational or other affiliation, is to fail to experience the import of Christ’s Person and body; it is decapitation to death in whatever form that may take, or in other terms idolatry. Inability to “hold onto prevalingly to the ‘κεφαλή’,” will have this affect. It is questionable whether the body exists as intended, when union in the Head and Source does not produce union with fellow members or limbs. The former naturally produces the
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286 Ep.4:12, 15-16; Col.2:19; Ro.12:5; 1Co.12:12, 27.
287 Ep.1:22 ‘πληρόω’ is in the middle voice and participle mood.
288 Col.2:9-10.
290 See also Ep.4:16.
291 1Co.12:12, 20, 27; Ro.12:5; Ep.4:25.
latter if Christ has his place. This is the founding principle of the ‘κοινωνία’ which is a hallmark of the apostolic church: the experiential and demonstrable primal union of Head, Source, and body.

The concept of becoming a member of a body is a uniquely divine act of baptism, “… because in one Spirit we all into one body were baptized …” (TLT 1Co.12:13). There is a definite ministry of the Spirit, who Himself baptizes believers into the body of Christ. This can be a polemical text in application. Some theologians and commentators such as Boice seem to fusion baptism into Christ in water, with baptism into the Spirit, with union in Christ, presenting them a synonymous amalgamated initial experience of every believer (396-398). “Many suppose that there is reference here to the ordinance of baptism by water. But the connexion seems rather to require us to understand it of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and if so, it means, that by the agency of the Holy Spirit they had all been fitted, each to his appropriate place, to constitute the body of Christ — the church.” (Barnes @5503). However, it is a rather forced reading and does not account for all the biblical data; it also reflects a rationalized approach to a spiritual experience. Luke clearly elaborates in his Gospel and Acts distinctly identified baptisms: into repentance – a cultural DNA of confession, repentance, and forgiveness, attested and confirmed by Jesus; a baptism into the Person of Christ; a baptism by Jesus into the Person of the Holy Spirit; and a baptism by the Spirit into the body. It is impossible from the principal texts in Acts, to establish order or to impose one, is suppositional. With the deepest respect for the biblical texts, it seems preferable to insist upon the necessity to experience the specific facets that each distinct baptism refers to without too much hypothetical consideration as to order and place. From an ontological perspective demonstrably he/she: who lives in a culture of confession to forgiveness; who

292 As with Bloomfield, Cavin, Doddridge according to Hodge.
293 By John Baptist: Mt.3:2, 11; Mk.1:4-5; by Jesus: Mt.4:17; Mk.1:14b-15.
294 Ac.2:38; 10:47; 19:5; Ro.6:3; Gal.3:27.
295 Mt.3:11; Mk.1:8; Lk.3:16.
296 In Ac.19:1-6 three of the four acts are clearly represented; Heb.6:2 talks of “the doctrine of baptisms.”
the indwelling Christ; who evidences the indwelling Spirit; and who displays the power of a permanent state of transformation whereby they are placed in the body of Christ by the regenerating and sanctifying Spirit, is the normative ‘πνευματικός’ believer. In some sense, God saves us from ourselves, to Himself and saves us into the body. Hodge states, “It is not therefore by baptism as an external rite, but by the communication of the Holy Spirit that we are made members of the body of Christ … by this baptism of the Spirit, all who experience it are merged into one body; they are all intimately and organically united as partaking of the same life … (Hodge @5503). This understanding concurs with the texts about the organic workings of the body.298 The binding factor is not around individuality but around unity in Christ, in Spirit, in the church and the church in the Head and Source. It seems that the defining criteria of universal or catholic and local has no bearing nor authoritative weight in this light. Any expression of church, local, regional, national, international, or universal will demonstrate therefore the same principal truth that defines it as an expression of church the body of Christ. This membership question becomes radicalised through such understanding when present day trends: in forms of worship, teaching and ministry; what is trending on social media; and where big vision and big personalities drive the body, influence choice of a place of worship, the fleeting, moving, shifting Christian population critically need to recover the baptism of the Spirit who baptizes a person into the body as He freely desires, would put an end to the consumerist window shopping syndrome.

Proper perception of the ontological church the body is built upon three principal texts.299 The first principle is that for church to be the body of Christ, she demonstrates Trinitarian ministry. Paul to the Romans refers to God in relation to gifts and ministry that animate life in the body;300 to the Corinthians he talks of the gifts of the Spirit, the ministries of Christ, the operations of God;301 and to the Ephesians he describes the gifts and ministries in Christ.302 The significance of Trinity ministering in the body, is not so much based on

298 Ro.12; 1Co.12, 14; Ep.4.
299 Ro.12; 1Co.12, 14; Ep.4.
300 Ro.12:3b.
301 1Co.12:4-6, 7, 11.
302 Ep.4:7, 11.
who does what between the Father, Jesus Christ and the Spirit simply because they are all described as equally able to perform the same functions on the principle that they are individually, substantially, equally and perfectly God. These distinctions if overemphasized weaken the Trinitarian collaborative oneness and unity in operation. Therefore, we find Trinity in ‘χάρισμα’,303 in ‘διακονία’,304 and in ‘ἐνέργημα’.305 The significance therefore is found in the Trinitarian commitment towards believers in order that they be and operate as body uniquely according to the distinct means that Trinity manifest.

How these varied and supernaturally originated ‘χάρισμα’, ‘διακονία’, and ‘ἐνέργημα’ operate in the believers as body, constitutes a seminal principle. Common perception is that a member of the Trinity gives to the believer one or several grace gifts that the believer then exercises for edification or service to God. However, further ontologically and theologically consideration suggests otherwise. The most explicit reference is in Ephesians, “but to each one of us the ‘χάρις’ has been given according to the measure of the ‘δωρεά’ of Christ…” (TLT Ep.4:7). This text refers to the ‘δωρεά’ of Christ. This gift is the gift of the Person of Christ, not a ‘χάρις’ gift. The believer is to receive the gift of the person of Christ, according to Paul. This distinction is confirmed in scripture, in the salvific context, in which the grace of God is the ‘δωρεά’ of Christ.306 This proposition is further corroborated in reference to the ‘δωρεά’ of the Person of the Spirit;307 the vocabulary of Ephesians chapter three verse seven, is intimately united to that of chapter four verse seven, “κατα την δωρεαν της χαριτος του θεου την δοθεισαν μοι κατα την ενεργειαν της δυναμεως αυτου” (TR 1550), and of chapter two verse eight, ‘τη γαρ χαριτι εστε σεσωσμενοι δια της πιστεως και τουτο ουκ εξ υμων θεου το δωρον’ (Ibid.). Etymologically, they formulate the principle in the same manner as is applied to Christ.

303 Ro.11:29; 2Ti.1:6; 1Pe.4:10; Ep.4:7; 1Co.1:4; Jn.1:16; 1Co.12:4.
304 Ep.4:11; Ro.12:3; 2Co.3:7-8; 1Co.12:5.
305 Ep.4:11; 1Co.12:6, 11; Ep.3:20; 2Co.6:1; 1Co.12:11; Gal.3:5.
306 Ro.5:15 TR 1550 “…η χαρις του θεου και η δωρεα εν χαριτι τη του ενος άνθρωπου ησου χριστου εις τους πολλους επερισσεσεσσεν”; see also 2Co.9:14-15; Gal.1:15.
The most compelling verse is found in Ephesians chapter three verse twenty, “τω δε δυναμενω υπερ παντα ποιησαι υπερ εκπερισσου ον αιτουμεθα η νοουμεν κατα την δυναμιν την ενεργουμενην εν ημιν” (Ibid.). It is reasonable therefore to suggest that the ‘δωρεά’ is also of the person of God who ministers his grace, his operations in the believer.308 The pertinence to comprehending the nature of the body of Christ is a fundamental change of paradigm. In simple terms the believer receives from the outset the ‘δωρεά’ of the Persons of Jesus Christ, the Spirit, and the Father. Therefore, for church to be body of Christ, and to ontologically operate, the significance of indwelling and operating Trinity stands in strict opposition to human means, operation, and construct. The body is an entirely spiritual and divine entity, ontologically and functionally. The believer’s ‘δωρεά’ is the Trinity who operate the manifestation in and through the believer as they intend, there is then no substance to the language of ‘my gift, my ministry, or my mission’ for this reason.

The ‘χάρις’ is originated by the indwelling Trinity and therefore is not for that believer, but for the person or persons who are the object of God’s intention for building Christ into that person and in the collective body. The lists of gifts and ministries operate within this framework as divine ‘χάρις’ operates for building the body into Christ.

Paul refers to the ‘μέτρον’ accorded to each one; the term contains the thought of expanding space or sphere of influence, and necessarily of limit. Going beyond the latter indicates that the believer or the church body in question is no longer operating within the divinely designated ‘μέτρον’. This is called transgression. It means that either party concerned has mutilated itself from the divinely constituted body of Christ, to function in its own source and means.309 The Trinity is in the believer, equipping with the perfect measure at all times, and source of every necessary ‘χάρις’, ‘διακονία’ and ‘ἐνέργημα’. That is not to say that all of Godhead indwells the believer, but in the previous notion of

308 Ep.3:7; 1Co.12:6; ‘ουκ εγω δε αλλ η χαρις του θεου η συν εμοι’ (TR 1550) implicitly 1Co.15:10; from function; ‘συνεργουντες δε και παρακαλουμεν μη εις κενον την χαριν του θεου δεξασθαι υμας’ (TR 1550) 2Co.6:1. This point can also be argued from the Trinitarian unity and oneness, that where the Spirit or Christ are so is the Father in presence and operation. The minimallist reading would hold that it is a grace of God’s person that is given.

309 Ro.12:3; 2Co.10:12-15; Ep.4:7, 13, 16.
fullness, the free operation of the Persons of the Trinity assures the perfect and necessary measure to the believer operated for benefit of the body. It is the Father, Christ or the Spirit who operate in the believer what is appropriate and adequate for the body at any given time. Paul reflects this explicitly in his formulation of how he perceives the ministry he exercises, “… I have become a servant according to the gift the grace of God being given according to the operating power of his inherent power” (TLT Ep.3:7). The passive voice and participle mood exemplify this comprehension. Paul is passive because God is continuously active in him within the bounds of His ‘ἐνέργεια’ demonstrated in His ‘ὀνείμας’ in Paul; establishing the scope of ministry not upon Paul but upon the measure of God at work in him. Paul employs the middle voice to establish his relationship to the divine ministry of God in him. That is to say he is invited to collaborate with the working of God for ministry, the scope of which is expressed in verse eight, to ethnic peoples.310 The language of Paul again confirms, “… And He, gave some of them as apostles, some of them as prophets, some as evangelists, some as shepherds and teachers, destined for the perfecting of the believers …” (TLT Ep.4:11). Christ has given some believers to the body for perfecting. If Christ has given someone to the body, then it is Christ in Trinity who seeks to communicate something of themselves to the body through a particular believer.311 If every believer in union in Christ and baptized by the Spirit into union in the body, is indwelt with a perfect measure of Father, Jesus Christ and Spirit, then this is the only equipping necessary for the body to function organically according to the intention revealed in Scripture, each one according to the measure given. The first point is that every believer is an integral part of the body, every believer is organically a participant; every believer is given to the body as a means of expressing Trinitarian ministry in all its diversity for the growth of the body, with a growth that is from God.312 Figure XVII in the appendix illustrates how according to the ‘μέτρον’ every believer has a corresponding sphere that could develop from a one to one to an international global

310 This one example is homogenous throughout Paul’s writings and therefore sets a pattern that is cohesive with the ontology of the Trinity ministering in the body of Christ. See also Ep.3:20; 6:10; Ph.2:12-13; 3:10; Col.1:29; 2Co.3:4; 12:9; Gal.2:20; Col.1:11, 25; Col.2:19; Ep.2:10; 4:7.

311 See also 1Co.12:28 which in this light is not communicating hierarchy or structure nor order of some kind. The text concords with Ephesians 4:11 to reinforce the nature of Trinitarian ministry in the body for the body. If so, then one could talk of an order of ‘μέτρον’ to edify and perfect the body of Christ.

312 Col.2:19; Ep.2:21; 4:15-16; 1Co.3:6.
expression of Trinitarian ministry. Secondly, the biblical texts explicitly demonstrate that if it is the Trinity who exercise ministry collaboratively in and through each believer in the body, then each person could express any ‘χάρισμα’, ‘διακονία’ and ‘ἐνέργημα’ according to the God given measure. Paul makes it abundantly clear that any ‘μέτρον’ manifested is for the perfecting of the body in order that the body edify itself. A measure is given whereby the five apostolic ministries: apostle, prophet, evangelist, shepherd, and teacher, will exercise a measure necessary to perfection the body of believers. This redirects ministry with clarity as to its purpose: ‘καταρτισμός’ the restoration, preparation, equipping, making ready thoroughly and completely. The operation of Trinity through the five ministries to the body is to equip the body to edify itself in Christ. Ministry undergoes a radical reorientation of ethos and purpose. The test of a church that is ontologically body is measured by the ability of the body to edify itself without the ‘professionals’. The former will be evidence that the latter are operating according to the body principles. The mature church being perfected in this way, demonstrates the fullness and stature of Christ.

To the Ephesians and the Colossians, Paul describes this body organically working as joints and ligaments. The reference assists in contextualizing the body working as limbs or members and joints, binding, and holding the whole together. In such a vision of church the body, where participation is central, not because of people rather, because of Trinity, there is a constant movement: from object to subject, from giver to receptor, from limb to articulation as ‘χάρισμα’, ‘διακονία’ and ‘ἐνέργημα’ are operated in God for others in the body that Christ may be perfected, producing a spiritual cohesive unity. What emerges is a cyclical understanding that everything originates out of Godhead, everything is expressed, enabled through Godhead ministering collaboratively in every believer, and that the perfection in Christ in Trinity, is the end objective whereby spiritual qualitative growth flourishes. David MacKay comments,

“… every aspect of the Church’s life and work must be conformed to His revealed will, rather than being determined by the preferences of any particular culture. Thus,

313 ‘Καταρτισμός’ and ‘καταρτίζω’ TGEL 2016.
314 Ep.4:16; Col.2:19.
the beliefs and practices of any part of the church must be shaped by Scripture, as must the form of government and pattern of worship” (214-215).

God in Trinity determining Church the ontological Body of Christ to exist, presents overwhelming challenges to the historical construction since the Post-apostolic period, as has been developed in the previous section of this chapter. Millennia later church still battles regrettably with its forms and expressions. However, the battle ground concerns her origins and sources and centricity, which is significantly more alarming in that the essential question seems to have been missed. There remains an imperative call to restore and to renew God’s defining intention for Church, body of Christ and the believer’s part therein.

vii. The Building
As we are God’s collaborators, God’s farm, God’s building you are. According to the grace of God being given to me as a wise architect or master craftsman I have laid the foundation, furthermore another builds on it. Moreover, each and every one look well how he builds on it. For this foundation no other can be laid near this one that is being laid, Jesus Christ. Moreover, if someone builds on this foundation with objects of gold, silver, stones of great value, wood, hay, [or] straw, the operation of each and every one will be shown; this because the Day will give understanding that the fire is revealed which will also test the quality of operation of each one (TLT 1Co.3:9-15).

Therefore by consequence you are no longer strangers and temporary neighbours without citizenship, but citizens together with the saints and belonging to the household of God, being built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the cornerstone in whom the whole building being intimately joined together grows into a holy temple in the Lord, in whom also you are being built intimately together into a permanent dwelling of God in Spirit (TLT Ep.2:21-22).

Textual considerations
Both texts introduce several figures and concepts that describe church, the present focus is specifically upon church ontologically as ‘οἰκοδομή’. Both citations have differing contexts yet consider the church as such and will complete the textual construction by
defining church as temple dwelling, discussed earlier in this chapter. Both texts, Corinthians being corrective in purpose, and Ephesians expository, have theological and practical contributions to the centrality of Christ and the cross and serve to define in part the nature of the ontological church as God intends it to be. In both citations the ontological context is one of Trinity, whereby God exercises ownership or belonging over the building; the centrism of Jesus Christ as foundation in whom the building emerges; the Spirit building together the edifice and indwelling. Findlay refers to the Spirit as not as a “mode of habitation … but the agency in building this new house of God” (Findlay 153-154), when apostles and prophets exercise ministry in relation to the foundation; when the believer takes his or her place this is true unity (154). ‘οἰκοδομέω’ is a Trinitarian ministry forming believers as church the building.315

Christo-centricity is restored fully through the representation of Him as the new cornerstone laid outside of any other construct. The foundation stone is Christ. Paul’s corrective comments to the Corinthians make clear that any deviation from the Person of Christ is to build a pseudo-foundation. The texts together provide a compounded vision, Christ the foundation cornerstone for the Corinthians, Christ the ‘sub-structure’ to the Ephesians. In bringing the two texts together, the apostolic and prophetic foundation laid is the person of Christ.316 Fee and Findlay exemplify the traditional understanding that the foundation stone that is laid upon which believers will build is the “Gospel itself” (Fee 139), leaning upon the wider context of Paul’s message of the cross. “Prophets and apostles … lay down the foundation of revealed truth. That foundation has been, in the Scriptures of the NT, on which the faith of Christians has rested ever since” (Findlay 151). However, Paul clearly states that is the Person of Christ who is the foundation, because “… in Him all this, the ‘οἰκοδομή’ being held intimately together …” (TLT Ep.2:21). The confusion seems to be between means and object. The Gospel, the Scriptures, are a means of revealing Christ, but the foundation can only be Christ Himself as accomplishing the specific witness of Scripture, “This Jesus, is the stone that was rejected …” (ESV Ac.4:11).317 Lightfoot extends this argument to the building itself,

315 God Father Ac.20:32; Jesus-Christ Col.2:7; Ep.2:21; 1Pe.2:5; Holy Spirit Ac.9:31; Ep.2:22

316 1Co.3:10-11; Ep.2:20.

317 Ps.118:22-23; Is.28:15-16; Mt.21:42-44; Ac.4:11-12; 1Pe.2:4, 6.
The question is raised here whether ‘the building’ represents ‘the body of believers,’ or ‘the body of doctrine taught.’ In favour of the first view is the direct statement θεον οικοδομη εστε: {1Co 3:9} in favour of the second, the whole context, which certainly has some reference to the character of the teaching. Perhaps we should say that neither is excluded, that both are combined. The building is the Church as the witness of the truth. Thus, it is the doctrine exhibited in a concrete form (@5278).

This migrates focus from Scriptural doctrine and dogmatic which, in and of themselves, are not the foundation, but might lead to an understanding and experience of Christ as sub-structure and foundation stone, which remains hypothetical. The specific hallmark of the apostolic and prophetic ministers is that they are graced and enabled to lay the foundation of Jesus Christ upon which church the building is constructed. They are building Christ into believers, the living stones edified into a spiritual household, (TLT 1Pe.2:4-5). Conclusively, the enduring, growing, unshakeable reality of church depends uniquely upon the breadth and depth comprehended and experienced of the Person and work of Christ laid down foundationally. Apostolic and prophetic ministers do not necessarily build others on the foundation, that is the role of every believer as a living stone in an organic and dynamic building. If they plant churches then they reflect the dual emphasis: on Christ the foundation and Christ built into believers as church.

Paul describes Himself as ‘συνεργός’, collaborators with a definite sense of union, the most intimate bond.318 He combines this with a conception of the grace given; the verb is in the passive voice and participle mood thereby indicating that he is ministering out of or simply ministering the measure of grace received, and this on a continuous basis conform to the operations of the church the body.319 This term does not immediately relate to spiritual gifts, it is the generic sense of favour with and from God. The collaborative principle Paul reflects, is found in Jesus’ relating to the Father during His earthly ministry,

318 1Co.3:9; Ro.15:18; Heb.13:21.
319 See also Ro.15:15.
as developed in chapter two. Paul’s relationship to the apostolic work of building is founded upon God inviting Paul to come into His works in a collaborative, participatory way. The work is not Paul’s, it is determined and purposed by God. Likewise, Paul makes it clear that the only equipping is that of the divine grace received continually in Christ. Therefore, because Paul has been edified in Christ, and therefore in Him, he is able to edify Christ in others. This is perceived in him as an absolute priority in all of ministry. The purpose of ministry remains building Christ as foundation and into lives. In the Ephesians passage the passive voice and participle mood is employed for ‘ἐποικοδομέω’, “… being built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets …”, ‘συναρμολογέω’, “… in whom the whole building being intimately joined together …” and ‘συνοικοδομέω’, “… in whom you are being built intimately joined together …” (TLT Ep.2:30, 21, 22), express the same truth that this ministry of being constructed as a building is uniquely in Christ and upon His Person. If the believer is passive then, from the context, the ministry of Christ and the Spirit is the unique source of the believers, as bricks in the wall being built together. The union with Christ producing an effect of communion in the joining and building up together. This is seen in the micro perspective of a believer in Christ individually, and specifically in this context of the collective standpoint. That is however not enough, the context requires a macro vision of many buildings in Christ being fitted together in a continual manner into the universal yet visible and tangible expression of God’s building.

As each several piece of the structure, each cell or chapel in the temple, spreads out to join its companion buildings and adjusts itself to the parts around it, the edifice grows into a richer completeness and becomes more fit for its sacred purpose. The separate buildings … as they spread over the unoccupied ground between them and as the connecting links are multiplied. At last a point is reached at which they will become continuous. Growing into each other step by step and forming … a web of mutual attachment constantly thickening, they will insensibly, by a natural and vital growth, become one in visible communion as they are one in their underlying faith. When each organ of the body in its own degree is perfect and holds its place in

320 Jn.9:4; 10:37-38; 14:10-12.
321 2Co.10:8; 13:10; 12:19; Ep.4:12.
keeping with the rest, we think no longer of their individual perfection, of the charm of this or of that; they are forgotten in the beauty of the perfect frame (Findlay 149-150).

Findlay clearly captures the scope of the ‘macro’ vision. The imperative, this ontological vision of church as God’s building, establishes that there is no theoretical or organizational construct of human doing, this is a Christological reality. That which is experienced in micro context, as Christ is exalted in this manner, organically grows expansively to manifest tangibly and demonstrably the continuously growing unity of buildings being joined to each other on the unique premise that is the Person of Christ. The alterity of Christ expressed in each entity adding a fullness to another, tending to the perfection of the indwelling and inhabiting Trinitarian temple of God.

If the ontological church – the building is to be restored in the present day, every structure, method, strategy, organization, function should be examined in the light of such Christo-centricity. Observation indicates in the apt words of Fee,

Paul’s intent here is of course to correct a misguided perception of ministry on the part if a church that was making too much of its ministers … All too often those “in charge” be they clergy, boards, vestry sessions … tend to think of the church as “theirs.” They pay lip-service to its being Christ’s church, after all – then proceed to operate on the basis of very pagan; secular structures, and regularly speak of “my” or “our” church. Nor does the church belong to the people. The church belongs to Christ, and all other things – structures, attitudes, decisions, nature of ministry, everything – should flow out of that singular realization (134-135) … It is unfortunately possible for people to attempt to build the church out of every imaginable human system predicated on merely worldly wisdom, be it philosophy, “pop” psychology, managerial techniques, relational “good feelings” … where systems have become more important than the Gospel itself will be shown for what it is … and in the hour of stress that which has been built of modern forms of sophia usually comes tumbling down (145).
‘οἰκοδομέω’ ministry is a foundational ontological truth of church the building. It is the spirit that should pervade unequivocally and unambiguously the being of church the building. Paul indicates, in the Corinthian text, that the foundation laid and the ongoing apostolic and prophetic ministry of laying Christ the foundation and building Christ foundationally into believers, constitutes a basis for those who have been edified or constructed to, in turn, exercise the ‘οἰκοδομέω’ of Christ because they are in Christ and in Spirit, the source, foundation and final purpose.

Jesus talks of the man who is ‘φρόνιμος’ referring to a new disposition for thought, emotion, will, his humanity,322 who is to build his house upon the rock; reflecting strong analogies with the previous discussion. Paul clearly puts each believer as part of the building as a receptor and source of edifying believers.323 He perceives this ‘οἰκοδομέω’ ministry as a way of living experience that reaches one’s neighbour rather than a functional comprehension. It is unambiguously an ontological or existential reality of Christ and the Spirit in the believer present and demonstrable in every sphere.324 The cultural benchmark for believers as church the building, is a pronounced every member active involvement in ‘οἰκοδομέω’. The apostle Paul sets the five ministries in this edifying imperative and describes the vision of mature church as one where every member is actively edifying the other as part of the whole. Peter’s vision of living stones reiterates this principle. The five foundational building ministries, should build on this pedagogy, to edify every brick in the wall equipped in turn to edify the whole building, Jesus Christ being the means.325

One final consideration concerns Paul’s caution to the Corinthians, having been built in Christ, as to how they are to build. He makes use of six images: gold, silver, high value stones, wood, hay and straw.326 Contextually, he has addressed laying another pseudo-

322 Mt.7:24, 26.
323 Ro.14:19; 1Co.14:3, 12, 26; 2Co.12:19; 1Th.5:11; Ep.4:29; Jude 1:20.
324 Ro.15:1.
325 Ep.4:12, 16; 1Pe.2:4-5; 1Co.14:12, 26.
326 1Co.3:12.
foundation and now the substance with which the believer is building on the foundation. Conjecture or curiosity has plagued the possible analogies of the six materials however, Paul does not go beyond listing out in what appears as a descending order of material consistency and cost, without explanation. He does explain further the ‘Day’ suggestive of the final judgment when the building workmanship of each one will be scrutinized and put to the test in view of authentication. Paul employs three interrelated words to describe revelation in reverse order; the manifestation (‘φανερός γίνομαι’), understood (‘δηλόω’) and disclosed in fire, (‘ἀποκαλύπτω’). The logic then is that which is tangible seen, then will be fully comprehended for what it truly is, because it is disclosed in fire; the latter referring primarily to internal disclosure, that is, the motives and intentions of the person. It is noteworthy that while the collective church the building is the predominant theme, each one is responsible for his or her part in the whole. In general terms several commentators identify the images as doctrines, putting the first three figures, as representative of true and pure doctrines, in opposition to the latter three, false and erroneous doctrines. As John Gill correctly observes, this cannot concern heretical doctrines which stand in contradiction to the nature of the foundation (@5278), especially given the judgment does not infer condemnation or exclusion. It is more plausibly,

... empty, trifling, useless things are meant; such as fables, endless genealogies, human traditions, Jewish rites and ceremonies; which through the prejudice of education, and through ignorance and inadvertency, without any bad design, might by some be introduced into their ministry, who had been brought up in the Jewish religion; as also the wisdom of the world, the philosophy of the Gentiles, oppositions of science falsely so called, curious speculations, vain and idle notions, which such who had their education among the Greeks might still retain…” (Ibid.).

327 ‘ἀποκαλύπτω’ is the only verb in the triad in the Present tense. If the triad acts as a single unit then the present refers to the consequence of the two preceding acts on the Day and perhaps can be perceived as referring to the imminence or actuality of the Day rather than a literal present day. In this case only 1Pe.1:7 respects the present tense; the testing of faith. Jesus reference to “Everyone will be seasoned or salted with fire” is in the future tense (TLT Mk.9:48).

328 Albert Barnes, Adam Clarke, and Charles Hodge (Online Bible Program 1Corinthians 3:12 @5278).

329 See also Jamieson, Fausset, Brown Commentary (@5278).
Some will distinguish building materials suitable for sacred temples in contrast to the ordinary materials for domestic or primitive homes. The contrast is only supported because of the reference to fire and the common logic that the latter three burn quicker than the former. However, all will burn or melt at some point. Perhaps Peter’s understanding of faith “more precious than gold that perishes” (ESV 1Pe.1:7) moves beyond polemic and contrast to something greater. The foundation is Christ, the body of believers in union in Christ is the building therefore in view are the means of ‘οἰκοδομέω’ that are eternal in nature, nourishing Christ in each believer as part of constructing the building. In response to the question, “what builds up in this way?” Scripture provides several principles:

i. Being intimately joined together in and by Christ

ii. áγάπη love

iii. Word of His grace

iv. Faith in Christ building up in the Spirit

v. Praying through and collaboratively with the Spirit

vi. Apostolic authority

vii. Grace gifts, services and works operated by the Trinity in the believer

In exercising these principles within the building and in favour of the building, the edifice that emerges will be consistent with the foundation that is Christ. The paradox of having a foundation for a palace and building a shack on it will be avoided. Christ will be foundation but will be built into every part of the building as it materializes. To the

330 See Fee 140-141; Barnes @5278.
331 Ep.2:21; Col.2:7.
332 1Co.8:1.
333 Ac.20:32; Ep.4:29.
334 Jude 1:20; 1Pe.1:5.
335 Jude 1:20; Ro.8:26; Ep.6:18.
336 2Co.10:8; 13:10.
337 1Co.12:4-6, 11, 28; 14:12, 26; Ep.4:12.
Ephesians, Paul makes it apparent that being ‘οἰκοδομέ’ precedes and prepares church to be temple of Godhead. It is therefore essential for church to recover this ontological understanding of herself as building and return to Christo-centricity.

In conclusion, in all eras mankind has expressed the innate sense of accomplishment from building: whether it be towers from Babel to the Eiffel, or the Empire State building to The Shard; or expressed in empire building through colonialism: Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Roman, British, French, Dutch or European, all have risen and all fall. The difficult historical lesson to learn is that empires never endure, a lesson of human limitation and of God revealing the nature of His intentions, at least what He does not advocate. The church has been subjected to the same influences from the time of Cyprian the great architect of the Catholic centralized, hierarchized, and oecumenical structure; and Constantine and from Leo I onwards. Modernist revolutions of the nineteenth century into present day globalization reflect this principle. Behind these constructs are trends of: consumerism, materialism, secularism, triumphing individualism, laxism, and extravagance abound, and church has not been preserved. The present-day quest in: theory, method, strategy, technology, philosophy, psychology, and religion, where church is directly affected by disconnected egoism, sentimentalism, and syncretism; the biblical revelation of ontological church, overwhelmingly issues a call for a return to church the ‘οἰκοδομέ’ of God’s making and doing, in and on the Person of Christ. This is the uniqueness of the ontological Church the Building.

viii. The Witness
"You are My witnesses," declares the LORD, "And My servant whom I have chosen, so that you may know and believe Me And understand that I am He. Before Me there was no God formed, and there will be none after Me (NAS Is.43:10),

“in order that might be made known now at this present time [to] the first ones and the authorities in the heavens through the church this greatly varied wisdom of God” (TLT Ep.3:10).

The ontology of church as the Witness is rooted in the OT understanding of the congregation. The term ‘qāhāl’ is the term most often translated by assembly or
congregation, synonymous with ‘ἐκκλησία’ church or assembly in the NT. The synonymous Hebrew term ‘‘ĕdāh’ meaning congregation – an assembly or witness, bearing an implicit and inclusive notion of totality, from the root noun ‘‘ĕd’ means witness or testimony (Baker and Carpenter 805-807). Church the Witness stands in relationship to God, to itself, and to the world as a testifier, an eyewitness or spectator. However, the relational aspect of covenant renders the term less objective and detached through a language of commitment, making the term more implicated and personal in nature. In NT language ‘μαρτυρέω’ also encompasses similar meaning: to affirm that one has seen or heard or experienced something, or something that is taught by divine revelation or inspiration. Additionally, the noun form embraces the concept of a martyr. In the OT most references are to the community, in the NT the majority are explicitly individual, however, church the Witness bears the same collective mandate as a testifier to the spiritual and tangible realities of Christ and His Kingdom.

The spirit of the Witness originates in the Trinitarian relationships, as the Father witnesses concerning the Son and the Spirit,338 the Son witnesses regarding the Father and the Spirit,339 the Spirit witnesses to Jesus and the Father.340 The principle of two or three witnesses is expressed and fulfilled in Trinity.341 This reciprocal witness to veracity is foundational to understanding Church as the Witness, an extension of the ontological Trinity. The believer and the community are brought into the spirit and atmosphere of the Witness.

Scripture reveals several people or objects that serve the purpose as a witness for or against:

i. Covenant342

ii. Scripture, Law and Prophets343

338 Jn.3:34; 5:37; 8:18; Mt.3:17; 17:5; Lk.9:35; Ac.15:8; 1Jn.5:9-10; 1Ti.2:6.
339 Is.48:16; 61:1; Jn.3:22; 1Jn.5:10; Rev.3:14.
340 Jn.15:26; 1Jn.5:6; Ac.5:32; Ro.8:16; Heb.10:15.
341 2Co.13:1; Jn.8:17; Dt.19:15; Heb.10:28;1Sa.12:5; Mt.18:16; 1Ti.5:19.
342 Ge.31:44.
343 Dt.4:45; 31:26; 32:46; Ps.132 :12; 2Kg.17:15; Ne.9:34; Jn.5:39, Mt.24:14.
iii. Altars\textsuperscript{344}
iv. Tabernacle, Tent of Meeting\textsuperscript{345}
v. Heaven and earth\textsuperscript{346}
vi. Trumpets\textsuperscript{347}
vii. Sacrifices and Offerings\textsuperscript{348}
viii. Supernatural works and miracles\textsuperscript{349}
ix. Moses\textsuperscript{350}
x. Aaron’s and Priesthood\textsuperscript{351}
xi. John Baptist\textsuperscript{352}
 xii. Prophets\textsuperscript{353}
 xiii. Apostles/Disciples\textsuperscript{354}
 xiv. Angels and heavenly Saints\textsuperscript{355}

As an extension of Trinity, Church the Witness is therefore defined by the same five
dimensions of relationship whereby Scripture reveals the significance of the Witness:\textsuperscript{356}

\textsuperscript{344} Ge.31:48 52; Jos.4:5-7; 22:34; 24:27; Is.19:19-22.
\textsuperscript{345} Num.1:53; 14:10; 16:42; Ac.7:44; Rev.15:5.
\textsuperscript{346} Dt.4:26; 30:19.
\textsuperscript{347} Num.10:2-3.
\textsuperscript{348} Jos.22:27; Lev.16:5; Num.15:24-25; Heb.11:4-5.
\textsuperscript{349} Jos.4:5-7; Jn.5:36; 10:25; Ac.14:3.
\textsuperscript{350} Ex.32:9-14; Num.14:17-19.
\textsuperscript{351} Num.16:9.
\textsuperscript{352} Jn.1:7-8; 5:31-32.
\textsuperscript{353} 1Sa.12:5; 2Kg.17:13; 2Ch.24:19; Ne.9:30; Ez.12:11; 24:24; Lk.4:22; Ac.10:43.
\textsuperscript{354} Mt.10:18; Jn.15:27; 19:35; 21:24; Ac.22:15; 23:11; 26:16, 22; 1Jn.1:1-2; 4:14; 5:9; Rev.1:2, 9.
\textsuperscript{355} Rev.22:16; Heb.12:1.
\textsuperscript{356} Five examples have been quoted from: The Exodus (Ex.12), The Failed Promised land entry (Num.13-14), Solomon’s Temple (1Kg.8), Trinity in NT, and Church.
i. God towards the Witness

God reveals his intentions, his purposes, his pleasure, and his promises present and future. He reveals His Person, His nature that His people would know Him, and that the nations and world know Him. Knowing Him is to come into relationship with God individually and collectively. Directly or through the diverse means listed above, God is Witness to Himself, to His people, to the world. Due to the responsive nature of the Witness, God is ‘for’ and ‘against’ Israel as the people Witness back to God.

Jesus says of Himself, “He who comes from above is above all; he who is of the earth is earthly and speaks of the earth. He who comes from heaven is above all. And what He has seen and heard, that He testifies; and no one receives His testimony” (NKJV Jn.3:31-32). Jesus is the incarnate Witness, the Word incarnate, whereby it is not only by spoken or written word but by the physical demonstration of the human and divine Christ that stands as the perfect Witness, being in the Father and the Father in Him, perfectly one in unity. Christ’s ministry is hallmarked by this unity, the unity being the source of what Christ says and does. The challenge of the church is to express ontologically this Trinitarian characteristic, whereby the witness originates in Godhead. There is no credence to human originality because of divine origin. The church is witness to heavenly and Trinitarian realities on earth.

ii. Witness towards God

The congregation of Israel or the church is Witness to God. Biblical history records the nature of this Godward witness as something that is free because Israel’s witness was often ‘negative’ or ‘against’ as much as it could be ‘positive’ and ‘for’. The intention was always that the people as Witness reflect back to God an earthly expression of the heavenly impulsion. Often the reflection back to God was the earthly and founded upon human nature in all its ugliness. Moses the Mediator serves as an example of how he stands between the people and God, witnessing back to God who He is and the uniqueness

---

357 Ex.12:2-14; Num.13:1, 14:11; 1Kg.8:15-21; Jn.3:31-33.
358 Jn.8:14, 18; Rev.1:5, 9; 3:14.
359 Jn.10:30; 14:10-11.
360 Ex.12:21-28; Num.13:27, 30-31; 14:13, 22; 1Kg.8:22-30.
of His revelation, to one people and before the nations.\textsuperscript{361} The example from the night of the Exodus Passover illustrates this positively: inclusive of every household, sacrificing a lamb, painting blood on doorposts, sharing the same meal, clothed similarly for the same departure, etc.\textsuperscript{362} The witness is firstly back to God in response to His instructions, while the refusal to go up to the Promised Land provides one of many negative examples. The desert wanderings are particularly marked by only few positive responsive witnesses, and many negative witnesses, showing the difficulty of incorporation of the heavenly and divine witness into earthly reality. It is not surprising that all the people could witness back to God was the cruel disappointment of their dreams, romanticised and sentimentalized. This is how unreality forms, to cause a people to become, in their own perception, a victim of God.\textsuperscript{363}

Christ’s witness to the Father takes the form of the declarations He makes concerning his relationship with the Father, as mentioned above. Moreover, this constitutes the basis for being and ministry in which the inseparability creates a profound unity and coherence. It reflects the perfect response long awaited from Israel, which never materialized in a permanent and definitive way. Jesus’ witness that he does nothing of Himself, but what he sees the Father doing, and he will extend this to say it is the Father who accomplishing the works in him;\textsuperscript{364} His constant appeal to the apostolic sending of the Father is His witness back to the Father.\textsuperscript{365} What Christ does establish in Trinitarian relationship and operation is that His demonstration was the perfect production of what the Father in Trinity intended. The Church as Witness through the indwelling Christ receives the same mandate by extension whereby God is enabling a perfected witness back to Himself of the incarnate demonstration of indwelling Trinity outworking in demonstration the culture of Trinity and of the heavenly purposes.

iii. Witness to each other/internally\textsuperscript{366}

\textsuperscript{361} Ex.32:9-14; Num.14:17-19.

\textsuperscript{362} Ex.12:1-14.

\textsuperscript{363} Ex.16:3; 17:3; Num.11:4-6; 14:2-4; Dt.31:19, 21; Jos.24:22.

\textsuperscript{364} Jn.5:19, 36; 8:28; 14:10.

\textsuperscript{365} Jn.6:38-40; 7:16; 8:29; 12:44-45, 49.

\textsuperscript{366} Ex.12:4, 24; Num.14:1-4, 7-8, 39-40, 1Kg.8:56-59.
The people have an internal witness that in collective terms is the affirmatory expression among them to remember and maintain the Witness. Again, this can be for good or for evil, for or against God the Witness, or themselves.\(^{367}\) The Passover sequence and Redemptive act described above become written into the collective memory, an anchor point: repeated, remembered, and transmitted from generation to generation.\(^{368}\) The collective memory of Egypt reflects the nostalgic but whimsical vision of the country where they were slaves for hard labour. Joshua and Caleb’s witness to going up into the good land and their impending death by stoning demonstrates negatively the power of internal collective witness.\(^{369}\) Positively, the building of the tabernacle, of Solomon’s temple, the post exodus rebuilding of the temple and Jerusalem city walls exemplify positively the internal witness.\(^{370}\)

In terms of Christ, the internal witness concords with the unity between the Father and the Son and the Spirit. The internal witness reflects the integrity absent in Israel, whereby, what is witnessed from the Father correlates with the responsive witness back to Him. This is exemplified by the internal witness in the sphere of God’s purpose in Christ: atonement, incarnation in believers – the new humanity, and of kingdom reality demonstrated, are all in perfect accord in Christ. This conveys the integrity of Godhead in nature and operation. The utter alignment of Christ in these three foundational truths of His coming that endure in eternal quality and effect, stand in contrast and fulfilment to all of Israel’s stubbornness and abandonment, leaving a generation without a witness of God.\(^{371}\) In the case of Jesus Christ, the preceding list of signs and symbols are witnesses to Him. These are the internal witnesses within the bounds of Redemption and Kingdom.

Church as Witness, bearing the inherent nature of the Trinity, should be true to the Witness in accurately remembering the Source and purpose of her Witness; nurturing the


\(^{368}\) Ex.12:23-28.

\(^{369}\) Num.14:6-10.

\(^{370}\) Ex.25:1-5; 35:29; 36:2-7; 1Kg.8:1-2,12-14, 62; Hg.1:12-14; Ez.1:5; 3:1, 10-13; Ne.3:1-32.

\(^{371}\) Dt.9:27; Is.6:8-13; 46:12; Ez.2:4; Jud.2:10, 21:25.
reality of experienced eternal truths in Christ internally. The unity in dependency and collaboration, incites reciprocity as witnessed within the Trinity.

iv. Witness to the world\textsuperscript{372}

The natural outworking of the Witness is that the world observes and be confronted with the values of God and the reign in the heavenly realm, in all the glory that belongs on earth, to the extremities of the earth. In each case, when the three dimensions to the Witness are expressed positively, the result in view is always the repercussions upon the nations.\textsuperscript{373}

The confession of the Samaritans establishes the witness of Christ to the world, “… we ourselves have heard Him and we know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world” (NKJV Jn.4:42). He is: the Bread of Life, the Light, Salvation, witnessing love for the Father, Overcomer to the world that the world believe through union in Him.\textsuperscript{374} In Christ’s fulfilling the witness to the world, he has mandated anew all believers individually and collectively with a worldview witness mandate. The believer’s union in Christ, in the Father and in the Spirit, simply makes him an extension of the divine Trinitarian mandate in Christ. If God was in Christ, witness to the world, then the believer and the church in Christ, is by simple spiritual subsequence a witness to the world.\textsuperscript{375}

The substance of the NT apostolic eyewitness mandate was to give witness to the Kingdom; the sufferings culminating in the crucifixion, the resurrection of Jesus; redemption to repentance and the forgiveness of sins and that this word of Kingdom reach the world.\textsuperscript{376}

It is important to place Church the Witness as the extension and fulfilment in Christ of the intra Trinitarian witness. Church is the object of the witness of God in Christ. She has been brought into Christ, in a depth of inseparable union as source and origin. She is bonded in radical love and allegiance, utterly dysfunctional outside of the ontological

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{372} Ex.12:40-42; Num.14:21, 45; 1Kg.8:60-61; Jn.7:7, 18:37; Ac.1:8.
\item \textsuperscript{373} Num.14:21-22; Dt.4:6-7; Jos.4:23-24; 1Kg.4:34; 8:43, 60; 1Ch.16:24; Ez.1:1-2; Ne.5:17; 6:15-16; Zc.2:10-11; 8:13, 22-23.
\item \textsuperscript{374} Jn.6:33; 12:46-47; 14:31; 16:33; 17:21.
\item \textsuperscript{375} Jn.17:18, 23; Mk.16:15; Ac.1:8.
\item \textsuperscript{376} Mt.24:14; Lk.24:47-48; Ac.1:22; 2:32; 3:15; 4:33; 5:30-32; 10:41; 13:31; 1Co.1:6; 1Pe.5:1.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Christo-centricity that has been developed. Her first witness is that of a response to God whereby His purpose is all-pervading. The first demonstration is back to God that is, church the Witness tangibly demonstrates the truths, promises, and experiences that God has invested in His witness. The third demonstration is the internal quality of Trinitarian life animating the church whereby there is an internal witness to the experienced values and principles of Christ. The fourth demonstration is this quality of life to the world.

G.E. Ladd helpfully describes five directives for church as Witness in relationship to the Kingdom of God, (109-117)

i. Church is not Kingdom

“… The church is the form of the Kingdom of God which it bears between the departure and the return of Jesus.” The kingdom is the message and the sphere of God’s reign and working … church is the people of the Kingdom, never the kingdom itself.

ii. Kingdom creates Church

The missional task given by Jesus was founded upon the reality and demonstration of the Kingdom, therefore, to participate in the Kingdom is also to be part of Church.

iii. Church witnesses to Kingdom

Church does not make nor build nor become the Kingdom, she is a witness to the Kingdom. This she does by experiencing and demonstrating the essence of Kingdom life and values.

iv. Church is the instrument of the Kingdom

Just as Christ came and ministered in the framework of the prophetic mandate announced by Isaiah, witnessed throughout the Gospels and NT period, and fulfilled the mandate, He has mandated individually and collectively witnesses to be instruments in the experience and demonstration of that life.

v. Church is the custodian of the Kingdom

Those who experience Kingdom, thereby become stewards of the part received and so Kingdom is entrusted to the church, the living and ongoing witness to Kingdom ensures that it will extend until the fulfilling at the inaugural ‘παρουσία’ of Christ.
The witness in the words of John is to what is: heard, seen, (a Hebraism for experience), contemplated (idea of learning by proximity to someone or something), touched (sensorial handling), and made visible, apparent, or knowable.377 Church as a witness cannot therefore be proclaiming uniquely objective truths, rather binding declarations with experiential demonstration of a qualitative life lived. In Postmodern thought, it is the difference between convincing one of what you believe rather than demonstrating what you believe. The ontological bond between Church the Witness and Kingdom – the nature of Trinitarian life in Christ, the origin of Church, is expressed by Jesus and Paul in three ontological images:

i. Yeast378

The context is one of Kingdom growth. As with many parables Jesus’ explains the Kingdom experience and growth in natural, organic, farming terms. Some commentators have argued that the yeast was fermented dough from a previous batch or “last week’s dough” (Morris 353). However, the use of the yeast figure in this context holds no negative connotation.379 The point is that Kingdom possesses innately the expansive, permeating, impregnating quality of yeast. The measure of flour has caused much conjecture,380 whether an accurate measure is required or not. Implicitly, Jesus is communicating that a little of Kingdom will expand and transform an extravagant disproportionate measure of flour – the world. The critical point being that the chosen means for Kingdom communication is through the incarnational and transformative. This applies not only to the communication to the world as Witness but firstly to how Kingdom life and values in Christ are incarnate in Church the Witness. This is a response to the dislocation between the declarative and the demonstrative as a key to Kingdom life and the propagation thereof. Jesus models this: in His own Person, in his disciple band, and his encounters with people; demonstrated by the apostles; proclamation is accompanied by, bound to demonstration. Where the second witness is church to God and then to

377 1Jn.1:1-3.
379 Used as offerings to God: Lev.7:13; 23:17-18; Used by Jesus as a figure of the hypocrisy of the Pharisees: Lk.12:1; Paul compares the effect of untreated sin to yeast: 1Co.5:6-7; Gal.5:7-9.
herself, the demonstration should not be limited to the supernatural signs and works of the power of God, though confirmatory of the proclaimed word.\textsuperscript{381} These are situated in the category of witness to the world. The preceding witness is of Kingdom life and values incarnate, experienced and demonstrated within church the Witness. The pursuit of the witness to the world is preceded necessarily by the integration of demonstrative and integrative Kingdom values. The witness to the world is a witness of the quality of life in Kingdom experienced in church.

ii. Theatre\textsuperscript{382}

Paul employs the phrase, “θεατρον εγενηθημεν τω κοσμω και αγγελοις και ανθρωποις” (TR 1550 1Co.4:9), the phrase “spectacle to the world” translates as ‘theatre’. Contextually, Paul is employing sarcasm to contrast the Corinthian church’s attitude to the apostle undergoing multiple trials and tribulations, while they are reigning already in Christ. The concept however transcends the context to provide an ontological image of church the Witness. The image is of believers, particularly apostles for Paul, on the theatre stage being observed by the crowds of spectators in the world.\textsuperscript{383} Church the Witness then is the community on the stage, living out before the world, life in Christ, Trinitarian existence, source of the new humanity, the life and nature of Christ experienced, demonstrated tangibly to the watching world. This vision of the Witness removes the over-emphasis upon a mission dynamic that is quantitative, activist and propagatory. This Witness asserts a vision to the world that is incarnational, ontologically supernatural, and qualitative in that ‘being’ refers to a quality of life, and demonstrative as a means of communicating to the world. The integrity of the ontological church is found in the power of demonstration not in proclamation.

iii. Perfume\textsuperscript{384}

But to God thanks, who at all times leading us in celebratory triumph in Christ and manifesting tangibly through us the odour of his knowledge in each and every place

\textsuperscript{381} Ac.4:29-30; 14:3.

\textsuperscript{382} 1Co.4:9.

\textsuperscript{383} Mt.11:7 Jesus reference to John Baptist in the desert; Jn.1:14 the Word becoming flesh and dwelling among us, 11:45 observers of Lazarus’ resurrection; Ac.1:11 Jesus ascension; 1Jn.4:14 eyewitness to Father sending the Son as Saviour.

\textsuperscript{384} 2Co.2:4.
because Christ the sweet fragrance is God in those being saved and in the midst of those who are being lost; who truly [are] an odour out of death to death and who [are] an odour out of life to life and to these who [is] sufficient. (TLT 2Co.2:14-16).

Paul in this text raises the concept of the odour or fragrance of Christ outside of any specific context or form, conveying it as ontological and existential quality. The fragrance of Christ can only come from being in Christ, Himself. Outside of Christ’s atonement proven in resurrection, there is no victory,

makes you alive joined together, joined to Him gracing all the mistakes committed, wiping away according to us the debt due, the dogma that was set over against us and He has taken it on Himself away out from the middle [of us], nailing it to the cross, stripping off for Himself the First Ones, Originators, Leaders, and the authorities, made an example in open boldness, triumphing over them in it (TLT Col.2:13-15).

The participle mood conveys the continuous ongoing process of actively leading in triumph, manifesting tangibly, and saving. The spiritual process is: the more that the Witness is in Christ, the more God will continue through the implied experiential knowledge of the Witness, the celebratory triumph of Christ who is God manifest. The Witness is an ongoing manifestation of the person of Christ in nature and in character and is therefore, to emanate the ontological expression of Christ wherever that be. This truth suggests a quality that is consciously innate. In this figure all four of the witness principles are expressed at an ontological level. Paul prepares the Witness to understand, to some the perfume will be of death and to others of life. He does not develop further that thought. Ontologically, he perceives the life and death of Christ simultaneously in the believer,385 “… an odour out of death to death and who [are] an odour out of life to life …” (TLT 2Co.2:16),386 the death of Christ is offensive, unacceptable, or foolish, a reflection upon Jesus own rejection387 to some, and therefore will communicate further death to them.

385 2Co.4:10-11; Ph.3:10.
386 A textual note that TR 1550 does not have the ‘ἐκ’ present in WH 1881. According to Hodge, “According to either reading the main idea is the same. Christ and his Gospel, and therefore his ministers, are to believers the source of life, and to unbelievers the source of death” (@5696).
387 Mt.21:42; 1Pe.2:4; Mk.8:31; Lk.10:16; Ac.13:26.
Whereas to those for whom Christ is appealing, acceptable or wise, His fragrance will be life. The scope should extend beyond the strict demarcation of believer and unbeliever. The fact that it be a fragrance, does not suggest the preaching of the word, rather the innate fragrance of the Person of Christ although others may perceive, “… preachers of the Gospel, or the Gospel itself, or Christ, are the cause of life to some, and of death to others” (Hodge @5696). 388

The ontological purport of Church the Witness as a fragrance of Christ is: union in Christ; a quality of being that emanates the very Person and quality of Christ; an existential state of being without the bearing of function, task, or boundary. This implicitly envisages a different kind of growth and means of qualitative ontological development that are to be recovered if Church is to enter its eternal destiny ontologically as Witness.

The characteristics that church the Witness emanates are found in the nature of Christ. They are also values that characterize Him as a divine Person expressing Kingdom: redemption and redemptive attitude towards humankind,\(^{389}\) wisdom,\(^{390}\) mercy,\(^{391}\) faith,\(^{392}\) holistic healing or restoration,\(^{393}\) (whereby the whole person is in view and therefore healing or divine therapy is not limited only to the physical realm); compassion that is not pity, for compassion arises in Christ often initiating a miracle, a further witness to

\[^{388}\] “…the Gospel and the ministers…” (Gill @5696); “…the Gospel preached…” (Barnes @5696).

\[^{389}\] Mk.2:5-9; Lk.7:36-50; Jn.4:1-10; 8:1-11.

\[^{390}\] Lk.2:40, 52; Mt.13:54; 1Co.1:24, 30.

\[^{391}\] Mt.15:21-28; Lk.1:78; Mk.5:19.

\[^{392}\] Mt.18:1; Mt.8:10.

\[^{393}\] Mt.10:7-8; 12:28; Lk.8:47-48.
Him and Kingdom;\textsuperscript{394} forgiveness,\textsuperscript{395} freedom,\textsuperscript{396} humility,\textsuperscript{397} joy,\textsuperscript{398} grace,\textsuperscript{399} justice,\textsuperscript{400} and truth in which is found faithfulness.\textsuperscript{401}

The yeast, perfume and theatre analogies put a distinct emphasis on the ontological character of the Witness, a quality of life where the emphasis of the Witness is found in the demonstration of Trinitarian life and Kingdom values. Proclamation has for too long been separated from a qualitative demonstration of incarnate Trinitarian life ontologically rather than functionally. Church the Witness will become activist, operational, functional and strategist if it refuses to recover these characteristics. Conceptions and proponents of exponential growth movements would do well to consider these qualitative principles in view of a distinct ontological perception and practice. The Witness is essential to Christ reaching transculturally through an existential Witness.

\textbf{ix. The Field}

You have tended to the earth and given abundance to it; you enrich it exceedingly; the river of God is full of water; you provide their grain for so you have prepared it. You drench its furrows with water, you level out its furrows; you softened it with copious showers, you bless its growth. You crown the year with your goodness and your paths trickle with fertility. They trickle on the pastures of the wilderness, and the hills gird themselves with rejoicing. The meadows are clothed with flocks; the valleys are covered with corn; they shout for joy, they sing (TLT Ps.65:9-13).

Now who then is Paul, who moreover Apollos but rather servants through whom you believe and just as the Lord gave to each and every one; I plant, Apollos watered but God made growth. Therefore, neither one planting is someone, neither

\textsuperscript{394} Jn.8:32, 36; Lk.15:20; Mk.6:34.

\textsuperscript{395} Mt.3:3-6; 4:17; 6:14-15.

\textsuperscript{396} Lk.4:18; Jn.8:31-32, 36; Ro.8:2; Gal.5:2.

\textsuperscript{397} Mt.11:11-12; Jn.3:30; Ph.2:8; Col.3:12.

\textsuperscript{398} Jn.15:11; 17:13; Ro.14:17; Heb.12:2.

\textsuperscript{399} Lk.4:19; 15:1-24; Jn.1:14-17; Ac.15:11; Ro.1:5.

\textsuperscript{400} Mt.12:18, 20; Ro.3:24; 14:17.

\textsuperscript{401} Jn.1:17; 8:32; 14:6; Ep.4:15.
one watering but the one growing, God. So, the one planting and the one watering are one, each and every one his own salary will receive according to his own labour. As we are God’s collaborators, God’s field, God’s building you are (TLT 1Co.3:4-9).

Nowhere is the ontological conception of church more important and explicitly explained than in this text portraying Church the Field. Where it is straightforward to take a functional approach to defining roles, the ontology of the text naturally defines relationship and service. Psalm sixty-five could be seen as precursory and in some respects fulfilled in Christ and in God. The theme underlying the normative agricultural activity is the ownership of the cultivated field or pastures. Through the Psalmist and Paul’s writings, God is undoubtedly the one to whom belongs the field.

Contextually, the Corinthians are, “… In every way enriched in Him … you are not lacking in any spiritual gift …” (ESV 1Co.1:5-7) and yet Paul calls them ‘νηπιός’ while the term can be applied to the innocence and simplicity of a child,\(^\text{402}\) however in this context it is employed pejoratively as childish, immature or childishness.\(^\text{403}\) The contradiction of being spiritually enabled and yet functionally infantile is at the heart of the issue. Despite such spiritual resource, somewhere a choice has been made to function according to human wisdom and means. Paul shows what that spiritual childishness produces in regard to church and ministry. The extent to which the Corinthian vision of church – the Field is excessively deformed is observed, “At issue is their radically misguided perception of the nature of the church and its leadership … They are viewing things from below …” (Fee 128, 132). Paul addressing this issue, restores a true perspective for who or what is church and who or what is ministry. “Paul’s thesis is this: if they had a true view of the church, they would have a true view of the leaders of the church” (Stott 89), yet Paul goes further still in redefining church and ministry according to Godhead in Person. Godhead stands as the source and model of church and of ministry to the church: definition and cause, form, and function, only source, expressed by extension, in that they reflect Godhead. Church the Field ‘γεώργιον’ recognizes no other

\(^{402}\) Mt.21:16; Lk.10:21; Gal.4:1.

\(^{403}\) Ro.2:30; 1Co.13:11; Ep.4:14; Heb.5:13-14.
authority, for at no point do ministers or organizations have any legitimate claim to property rights. The Field is God’s, ministering believers are ‘sowers’ or ‘irrigators’ or ‘hired workers’ as Jesus illustrated, simply stewards.404 This distinction converts into a right attitude as God establishes His relationship to His field.

Jesus makes it clear that productivity is important in the stewardship accorded. Those who do not produce the corresponding fruits of the divine deposit lose it in favour of those producing the appropriate fruits. The ministering believers are exhorted to enter fully into the relationship that the Owner has intended. It is a reminder that all that happens in the field belongs to the owner: the seeds, the plants, the growth, and the fruits, nothing as such belongs to the stewards, other than what the Owner chooses. There is no room in church the Field for possessivity, personal control or branding; egocentrism or feeding one’s need for security, esteem, recognition, or accomplishment. Only in Christ and personal union with Him can these fundamental and legitimate needs be met. To use church to fill them is wholly illegitimate.

The source and means of growth remain a mystery, “… the seed sprouts and grows; he [the sower] knows not how. The earth produces from the seed, by itself, first the blade, then the ear, then the full grain in the ear” (ESV Mk.4:27-28). In correlation with God who causes growth, this thought underlines the absolute recognition of the supernatural causes and operations that produce characterized growth. This is a hallmark, in the field that has been tilled, planted, and bears fruit. The integral working of the Trinity must be seen producing divine life in believers,405 from the seed of the divine person of Christ and of God.406 The tillage and nourishing of the soil is not associated with ministering believers but implicitly as the work of God, in this the Holy Spirit,

and coming he will convince effectively with cause the world concerning sin and concerning righteousness and concerning judgment … however as soon as He the Spirit may come he will lead you into all truth because He will not speak out of Himself but whatever he might hear he will speak, he will announce to you the

---

404 Mt.20:1; 21:33, 38; 25:14-25; 1Co.4:1, 2; 9:17; Col.1:25; Tit.1:7; 1Pe.4:10.

405 Jn.6:44-45; Mt.11:27; Jn.5:21, 24; 6:63; 7:38-39; 2Co.3:6; 1Jn.4:9.

406 Lk.8:11 and Jn.1:14; Gal.3:16; 1Jn.3:9.
things coming … all things whatever the Father possesses are Mine, for this reason this I say that out of Me He will take hold of and declare to you (TLT Jn.16:8, 13).

Working the soil suggests the supernatural working of the Holy Spirit in the sphere of the world, of the individual and of the community of believers, Church the Field. The power of persuasion then is placed rightfully in the sphere of operation of the Spirit within a Trinitarian concept. Human wrangling, manipulating, convincing, and coercing to produce some spiritual fruit is doomed to failure and transgresses the boundaries of the Holy Spirit’s sphere of action in breaking up, turning over, and preparing the soil of the people in the Field.

Having laid this foundation from the divine perspective, it is necessary to consider those called ‘διάκονος’. Paul emphasizes his point as to ‘who’ are Paul and Apollos; using the neutral form of ‘τις’ “being much more emphatic … it expresses greater disdain. ‘As though Apollos or Paul were anything’” (Lightfoot @5271), setting the stage for a fresh understanding of the true nature of ministry confronting the Corinthian partisanship problem, “They are boasting in their individual teachers as though they could “belong” to them in some way” (Fee 129). The significance of ‘διάκονος’ is found in comparison to other forms of servanthood:

i. ‘δοῦλος’ reflects the permanent nature of servitude in relation to a master. He is bound to the master; his will and purpose becomes that of the ‘δοῦλος’.

ii. ‘ὑπηρέτης’ literally means under-rower, an image from galley ships, of the mass of rowers coordinating and collaborating with the rowing rhythm of the master rower.

iii. ‘οἰκέτης’ the household servant, is within the house of the master, and sometimes could refer to an elevation to second in command next to the master, a manager of household affairs, often literate and schooled.

iv. ‘Θεραπεία’ a slave or free man serving voluntarily by his own motivation of love or devotion, indicative of the relationship held with his master. The term also indicates the therapeutic nature of service.

---

407 See also 1Co.2:10-12.
408 ‘διάκονος’ TGEI 2016.
v. ‘λειτουργέω’ refers to the sacerdotal or religious service, reminiscent of the Levitical class and service in the OT.

‘διάκονος’ is a voluntary and willing servant who choosing to execute his masters wishes. The term is more indicative of the kind of relationship rather than describing any specific task. There are only three or four specific references that have traditionally been associated with a specific task or office. The meaning of ‘διάκονος’ should be understood more widely than such a restricted view, as it is accordingly foundational to Christian ontology. Jesus calls Himself by this title and explicitly demonstrates so. Paul roots all forms of service in ‘διάκονος’ and perceives himself in the present text, and elsewhere, as foremostly ‘διάκονος’ of Christ. This is the message of Jesus to the twelve apostles. Paul is careful to underline that this servanthood is to God or to Christ, while the sphere of service is the new covenant of the Spirit and the church. He also emphasizes that ‘διάκονος’ is not the means to service and therefore corrects the false assumption that ‘office’ implicitly means ‘ministry’, “… I became a minister according to the stewardship from God which was given to me for you, to fulfill the word of God…” (NKJV Col.1:25) or again, “… according to the gift of the grace of God given to me by the effective working of His power” (NKJV Ep.3:7). Paul, by setting out the fundamental nature of ‘διάκονος’, indicates it is something he became, it therefore not of natural order but of the spiritual order, that is a gift of the grace of God. The giving by God, is in the passive voice and participle mood, therefore Paul has passively received and does so on an ongoing basis for the ‘διάκονος’ to which God has entrusted and enabled him. The next clause identifies the ‘ἐνέργεια’ God’s supernatural operative power demonstrated through His ‘δύναμις’ inherent enabling power in Paul. Paul

409 Ac.6:2; 1Ti.3:10-13.
410 Mk.10:45; Lk22:27; Jn.13:3-16; Ro.15:8.
411 2Co.3:5-6; 6:4; Ep.3:7; Col.1:23, 25.
412 Mk.9:35; 2Co.3:6; Ep.3:6-7; Col.1:23.
413 Ro.13:4; 1Co.3:5; 2Co.6:4; 11:23; Ep.6:21; Col.1:7; 4:7; 1Th.3:2; 1Ti.4:6.
414 2Co.3:6; Ro.16:1.
415 1Co.12:5, 10, 11; Ep.4:16.
416 See also Ep.1:19; 3:20; Col.1:29.
defines ultimately the nature of ministry not as directly nor primarily to the church rather to God. Church perceives and receives the effects of that primacy. Stott interestingly comments on the verse five of the key text, regarding ‘διάκονος’ as ‘agency’ through whom God works, and ‘assignment’ doing work given. (95) However, the text demands more, as outside of Christ, in Godhead, there is no ‘ἐνέργεια’, no proceeding ‘δύναμις’, there is no ‘διάκονος’. Paul is making clear his utter dependency upon the indwelling presence, the manifesting of the nature of God in him, from whom these qualities originate and manifest themselves in the servant; thereby defining the servant disposition, means and task, according to God, not according to agency or task.

Stewardship does not escape divine procession, in the passive voice and participle mood (as in the previous text cited), communicates passive – reception of the divine on an ongoing basis, filling up that designated word in and through Paul for as long as that is God’s ministry in him. A further reflection on this ‘διάκονος’ DNA, perceives it as the fruit of the Godhead’s tilling and turning the soil. Believers ministering are also part of the field and as God intends, operate as ‘διάκονος’ to God, in the Field, and in favour of the Field.

Jesus’ use of ‘διάκονος’ compounds the matter, “moreover it will absolutely not be in this manner among you but if whoever might desire to become great among you will be your servant” (TLT Mk.10:43), as he deals with James’ and John’s conception of authority at Jesus right and left hand in the Kingdom. He compares their aspirations to the non-Jews striving to be ‘ἄρχω’. The synoptic record 417 develops a conception of having authority, as domination, control ‘over’; those putting others into subjection ‘under’ in view of greatness (‘μέγας’) and pre-eminence (‘ἄρχω’), to which His response is in the form of an absolute negation. Jesus in one phrase confronts the hierarchal and authority constructs that attribute to people rank and office, with which comes authority of this type. If Church is to be Field, then a long overdue wrestle with Jesus’ words, “it shall not be so among you” (ESV Mk.10:43), will be required to eradicate such hierarchical authoritarian structures and offices that are in direct opposition to the words of Jesus. What Jesus perceives suggests one of the greatest obstacles to the restoration of ‘διάκονος’ ministry in the field, of which He was the perfect example. The affirmative response to such a

417 Mk.10:42-46; Mt.20:25-28; Lk.22:25-27.
strong negation, is a conception of the indwelling Godhead, by which every aspect of a servant relationship to the field is defined, operated, and enabled. The critical point is that God will consequently order the work in his field according to Himself, His nature, His operation. The work of the believers as the field is to identify and receive those who emerge as ‘διάκονος’ to the field, from within the field. This dimension of God’s working is very often usurped by constructs melanged with genuine religious sentiment, psychological, sociological, or strategic principles and practices which are contrary to the rediscovery of God’s source, means and operation in His field.

Servanthood in the Field requires labour, (‘κοπιάω’), the toil implying much effort, trouble and fatigue.418 The apostle will often refer to the nature of his labours and the difficulties encountered,419 that do not deter him from his ‘διακονέω’ but are a witness to the supernatural nature of that, “But by the grace of God I am what I am, and His grace toward me was not in vain; but I labored more abundantly than they all, yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me” (NKJV 1Co.15:10). Paul also exhorts all believers, as church, in the labour of love and service.420 It is the words of Jesus that hold the key to labour that does not end in burn out or weariness as Paul seems to have discovered, “Carry my yoke upon you and learn out from Me, for I Am gentle and humble of heart and you will find rest from labour for these souls of yours, because my yoke is well fitting and my load is light” (TLT Mt.11:29-30). If the ontology of ‘διάκονος’, as developed, is enacted then Jesus words make perfect sense. The yoke of His service is perfectly fitted to each labourer. The rest is not inactivity necessarily but better reflects the primacy of service ‘ἀπό’ the Divine Person with divine means, enabling, and operating. There is an ontological repose, not inertia that comes from learning out of Christ, to be and function in such a way. The yoke could refer not only to the service God desires to accomplish in the Field but to carrying this new DNA which is an authentic sign of the restored ontology of Church the Field.

---

418 ‘κοπιάω’ ‘κόπος’ TGE1 2016.

419 Ac.20:35; 1Co.4:12; 2Th.3:8; Ep.4:28; 2Co.6:5; 2Co.11:23, 27; 1Ti.4:6, 10.

420 1Th.1:3; 1Co.15:58; Ro.16:2, 12; Heb.6:10.
Paul refers to himself and Apollos as ‘συνεργός’⁴²¹ the concept has been treated under Church the Building; however, it stands in this transition between the two images and does has repercussions to ‘διάκονος’ in Church the Field. Fee comments,

Some have suggested that Paul here intends … “We are labourers together with God.” But everything in the context speaks against it: The emphatic position of the genitive “God’s” suggests possession … The argument of the whole paragraph emphasizes their unity in fellow labour under God… these new slogans serve as the climax of the whole paragraph, in which the emphasis is decidedly on God’s ownership, not on Paul’s and Apollos’s working with him in Corinth (134).

The argument from belonging is comprehensible yet does not fully reflect the etymological considerations of the conception, means and demonstration of ministering believers. ‘συνεργός’ a composite term ‘συν’ referring to a union or intimate joining together – instrumentality is connected to completeness when used in composition such as is the case with ‘εργός’ energy dispensed in work or toil. The reference is, in context, to Divine relationship and means, suggesting strongly a collaboration with an inner sense of fullness in view of the Divine purpose. The grammatical considerations clearly indicate that this kind of ministry without ‘συνεργός’ reduces ‘διάκονος’ to puppet style manipulating, or to inactivity, in contrast to the prevalence of human originated, empowered, and operated works, in both cases, “Every plant which My heavenly Father has not planted will be uprooted” (NKJV Mt.15:13). The point in hand is that ownership is neither in question nor challenged as already affirmed. Notwithstanding, for the above reasons, there is sufficient justification to suggest that Paul and all the other serving believers are invited into a collaborative work where: the source, the means, the ability, the agency, the substance, and the transmission, are utterly dependent upon the indwelling work of the Trinity in the believer in favour of the Field. This perfectly reflects the nature of the Son’s relationship and ministry with the Father in Godhead,⁴²² and therefore finds substantiation.

In the same way that Paul and Jesus define ‘διάκονος’ ontologically and functionally and establish it as the foundational standard, similarly, there are other terms that take identical

---

⁴²¹ 2Co.6:1; Mk.16:20.
⁴²² For further development consult chapter two section “Six Key Ontological Principles.”
preponderance: ‘συνεργός’, ‘οἰκονομέω’, ‘παράκλησις’\textsuperscript{423} as foundational characteristics that distinguish the ontological DNA under consideration. In the present text, Paul employs the sower and the irrigator as distinct yet inseparable in terms of the final outcome of the field and their part in that.\textsuperscript{424} In light of the nature of ‘διάκονος’ the ‘sower’ and the ‘irrigator’ are to be focused upon the quality of the seed that is their assurance, their security, their promise for the harvest. They cannot see the harvest nor imagine what it will be like and therefore they do not have the experience of the reaper and his joy, even though they will share in it. The Pauline resilience is the utmost confidence in God and in the quality of the divine seed that is sown.\textsuperscript{425}

In conclusion God’s Field, is constituted of every believer, based on the divine resource for the Field, creating a constant growth movement of supernatural origin, agency and operation. This being so, the Field should reflect the nature of God in every servant and service, recognizable by this spiritual DNA impregnating the whole. In this way the qualitative divine life and operation will cause genuine growth. The figure and the lessons all lead to organic supernatural patterns of growth, (in which there are other significant principles beyond the scope of the text under consideration).

Reproduction, multiplication, and extension are all direct results of the organic patterns of growth: in planting, burying, growing, dying, and rising figures cohesive to the pattern of death, burial and resurrection. Growth of this kind is not dependent upon a numerical principle rather a qualitative one. The recovery of the truths of the Field will engender a reproduction that is incarnate in every believer – the person and work of the Godhead. Growth of this kind is called the ‘multiplication of Christ’. Church multiplying or reproducing based on this ontological DNA will demonstrate the principles in view. Church, as believers that are so full of the Godhead as purported, will in growth, be faced with the imperative of multiplication because of the greater measure and intensity of Godhead in one field – a divine and qualitative multiplication of Christ in Godhead occurs. Church the Field rises to challenge the many organizational and functional conceptions of church, ministry, and growth, in order that Godhead recover the

\textsuperscript{423} See Church the Building, the Body for further development of the thought.

\textsuperscript{424} 1Co.3:8; Jn.4:36-38; 2Co.9:6; Gal.6:7-10.

\textsuperscript{425} 1Co.15:36-44; 2Co.9:6, 8, 10-12; Gal.6:7-9; Ro.15:14; Ph.1:6; 1Co.15:58.
ontological and operational primacy in source, means and operation that are rightfully theirs, as the extended reflection of the Trinity.

**Conclusion**

This chapter responds to the question “What does God say about His Church?” by examining the nine images in Scripture that reveal the nature, substance, and expression of Church of His eternal purpose. That analysis has permitted the development of an ontological conception of Church in the light of her history, sociological, psychological and philosophical influences that have conformed Church.

This argumentation has reconnected Church to the Trinity ontologically and demonstrated that Church utterly depends upon Trinitarian substance and operation to exist according to divine intentions. Christ as ‘τέλος’ restores Christo-centricity to the originality of the New Man and the incarnate manifestation of the new Household, characterized by the realization of Christ in her. Where Trinity are one in substance and in operation, the Church reflects the oneness of utter dependency as in the Vine; the indwelling of divine presence and encounter, where Christo-centricity defines all relationships of the Temple; defines and operates all gifts, ministries and operations of the Body, being built through Trinity, upon Christ Foundation, Source and Head as the Building. Where God labours his Field through the indwelling and enabling of Godhead that reproductive growth be reflected in the superabundant measure of Christ incarnate; where Church recovers the passionate uncompromising radicality of intimate attachment of the Bride in the world, a Witness to the reality of Godhead, to which she is united in heaven as on earth, a demonstration of Trinitarian existence on earth.
AN ONTOLOGICAL MODEL

Introduction

This section proposes an ontological construct founded upon the Trinitarian developments and the significance of the ontological believer in union in Trinity. The purpose is to address the principal characteristics that bind Trinitarian ontology and operation to a renewed and restored Church.

Trinity and Church

The biblical examination of the Church defined and intended by God, demonstrates undeniably that it is impossible for the church of divine intention to exist outside of the three persons of the Godhead. The relationship of origin (‘ἐκ’) source (‘ἀπό’) through union establishes the raison d’être of the church as the Godhead. Manifestly, the means of church are uniquely found likewise in the Godhead; the means therefore reflect the nature of the Godhead rather than human, natural or any other contextual consideration. The fundamental message is that Church is to be impregnated with the Divine nature and means. The cycle of thought is that church comes out of Trinity, the believers are in union with Trinity and therefore come out in church as an earthly demonstration of the inner workings of Godhead in her midst, with the ultimate purpose of returning to Trinity. This being so, the purpose of Church is to be the extension of Trinitarian life and nature. She has no life of her own. Church is this incarnation because her origins and means are of Godhead’s nature, intra-relationship, and operation. In doing so, she is part of the unity of the Godhead. Jesus witnesses to this reality, the Father in him and Jesus in the Father, the Father dwelling and working in Him; of believers in Christ and Him in them, living because He lives as Jesus in the Father; being one unity believers in Godhead just as Christ and the Father;¹ Church exists by definition because it experiences this union and consciously lives as the extension of the divine life. This Church permeated by the nature and presence of the Godhead, can only be and demonstrate what God is in all his perfection to her, universally and locally. As such, there is no distinction because whether microcosm or macrocosm, the origins and substance of her existence are ontological and rooted in Godhead – the defining criterion.

¹ Jn.14:10-11, 19-20, 6 57; 16:15; 17:10, 21, 23.
If this is so, then the structure of church by consequence and necessity is relational, as developed in chapter two “Ontological Considerations in Trinity” the structure of the Trinitarian life is profoundly relational and orders their interactions collectively and individually. The Trinity structure is the relationship of the three persons therefore, church is only the extension of that relational construct. The challenge for the renewal of the ontological church is to recover relational primacy. Due to the post-apostolic construction of church, a vast majority of relating happens through office, structure or organization. The renewal of an ontological perspective is the recovery of the centrality of relationship through Trinity in origin, source, means and operation, and in Christ as ministers of Christ. If the unique criterion for ‘κοινωνία’ is the Person of Jesus Christ in each one, then no matter what sphere of ministry this principle imperatively stands. The unity of believers is singularly found in Christ. To use Ephesians chapter four\(^2\) as the basis to create unity will inevitably centre ontologically Christ and elevate the function of faith and baptism, and even doctrine and sacrament, as with the fathers and reformers, albeit misconstrued as means of unity. The text is Trinitarian and therefore points to Godhead as source and the reason for ontological unity in light of the preceding union-extension discussion. Christological re-centring is vital. The ‘κοινωνία’ of the saints is only an expression of the measure of Christ manifest in believers because of reciprocal union in Him and in Trinity. Church relating, whether that be internal or intercommunal, if ontological renewal is to be restored, requires a breaking down of human, personality, and organizational or structural constructs to find Christ sufficient in relationship and ministry to express a greater measure of Trinitarian nature and life, for that is the divine intention. If the believer experiences church through the ontological theology developed, because of the nature of Trinity in church, it is impossible for her not to recover the relational order that of the operations of the Father, Christ, and Spirit; their Persons and operations are the structure of the Church, that are experienced by believer’s in union and indwelt, no other structure need be imposed to compromise the divine intended order.

Practically, the apostles, especially the apostle Paul, demonstrate the primacy of relationship in his dealings with the churches, those he has direct involvement with and those he has not, such as Rome. Every aspect of ministry concurs with the relational model perceived in Pauline reflection on Trinitarian relationship, as developed in Church

\(^2\) Ep.4:3-6.
the Household. He perceives himself and believers as ‘συγκοινωνός’, “just as it is right for me to think this of you all, because I have you in my heart, inasmuch as both in my chains and in the defense and confirmation of the Gospel, you all are partakers with me of grace” (NKJV Ph.1:7). Paul will relate personally and collectively,³ with whole-hearted attachment,⁴

Make room in your hearts for us. We have wronged no one, we have corrupted no one, we have taken advantage of no one. I do not say this to condemn you, for I said before that you are in our hearts, to die together and to live together. I am acting with great boldness toward you; I have great pride in you; I am filled with comfort. In all our affliction, I am overflowing with joy (ESV 2Co.7:2-4).

To capture accurately Paul’s intent, the centrality of Christ in ‘κοινωνία’ and ‘συγκοινωνός’ is critical, otherwise the spiritual nature of Church relating is reduced or debased to sociological principles of human alterity and compassion. Psychologically, Paul’s relating could be perceived as mutual need meeting, his stronger interventions as father figure and corrector would be considered manipulative or even abusive in humanistic terms. In Christ and in Christ-centred relationship, where the apostolic purpose is the edifying of Christ in believers individually and collectively in church, Paul’s relating finds justification not in himself but in Christ.

A relational observation from the Gospel writers concerning Jesus ministry is that there is quantifiably more text given over to personal encounters than to the teaching and ministry to the crowds. Mark, the shortest Gospel, emphasizes this, in that often his account of the personal, small group narratives is the longest. The textual emphasis only affirms the relational principle in Jesus (Fig.XIX illustrates): from the multitudes,⁵ to the

---
³ The lists of names such as Romans 16 exemplify the maintenance of personal and collective relationship; see also Col.4:7-17.

⁴ Ac.20:31; 2Co.7:2, 6; 2:4; Ga.1:6; 4:14, 19; 1Th.2:8; 3:6.

⁵ Mt.4:24-25; 12:15-16; Mk.6:32-44.
five hundred,⁶ the one hundred and twenty,⁷ the seventy,⁸ the twelve,⁹ the three,¹⁰ and the individual encounters.¹¹ This relational connectivity in Christ represents a personalization of church again, a re-prioritizing according to the relational principle that will inevitably reshape Church prerogatives.

The ontological will restore the Trinitarian primacy for relationship. It will distinguish between ‘the scaffolding’ and ‘the edifice’. The historical structural and hierarchal constructs inevitably lead to confusion at this point. The measure of time, energy, resources financially and materially, humanly, and spiritually reduced to a form of management that invests in maintaining the scaffolding, eclipses the ontological and relational investment in being built into Godhead and emerging in union as Church, distinctively hallmarked by Christo-centricity and the building of Christ into people and into Church. The practical proof is that scaffolding is temporary and always taken down and so it should be with any organizational frameworks used to facilitate Church ‘being’ Church. A radical inversion of priorities due to the confusion between scaffolding and edifice is required to conform to the ontological priority.

**Apostolicity in God and in church**

The apostolic nature of God is the basis on which one can speak of an apostolic church, based on Godhead being apostolic. The Trinitarian example of mutual sending within the Father, Jesus and the Spirit relating together,¹² as developed in the preceding chapter “Ontological Considerations in Trinity,” becomes the nature of the church not upon the function, neither upon the apostolic proclamation, nor upon organization, but upon Trinitarian relating. Apostolic by nature is the restoration of a Trinitarian reality that is

---

⁶ 1Co.15:1-11.
⁹ Mt.10:1-16; Mk.6:6-13; Lk.9:1-6; Mk.10:23-34.
¹⁰ Mt.17:1-9; Mk.5:37-43; 13:3; 14:32-34.
¹¹ Jn.3; Jn.4; Mk.5:1-20, 21-43; 10:17-22.
¹² Father sends the Son: Jn.6:57; 8:42; Gal.4:4; Father sends the Spirit: Lk.3:22; 11:13; Jn.14:26; Gal.4:6; Jesus sends the Spirit: Lk.24:49; Jn.15:26; 16:7; Ac.2:33; Spirit sends Jesus: Lk.4:18-19; Mt.4:1.
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the hallmark of Church, the extension of the nature of the Godhead. This reason alone validates further investigation into the apostolicity of church.

The principle of plurality is authenticated by Trinity and corroborated by the NT witness. As a model for ministry Jesus says, “… and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with Me” (NKJV Jn.12:24), because the Father is in Him and He in the Father, union then is the foundational criterion. The first plurality is the union through which the Godhead minister collaboratively through the serving believer. The apostle Paul often affirms ‘apostle of, through or in Christ … by the will of God’, in doing so he is affirming ontologically his apostleship is in God and in Christ in terms of causality, agency, and origin, conscious that the purpose of this grace is the revealing of Jesus Christ in him. Held in tension are two dimensions of apostleship ‘ἀποστέλλω’ and ‘πέμπω’ both of which are applied to Jesus and therefore also reflected in apostolic NT period. The mandating and equipping for that liberation to the sending out to accomplish is the first notion of ‘ἀποστέλλω’, however there is another sending, ‘πέμπω’, which appears synonymous but carries the additional concept of accompaniment by God, the emphasis is of unbroken, continuous relationship. In Christ, the inseparability of relationship and of function identifies Godhead as source, cause, and agency in operation. Jesus never functions outside of the ontological state of unity with the Father and the Spirit. This is the relationship basis for ministry. Paul translates this ontological culture into the apostolic ministry team where both dimensions of ‘ἀποστέλλω’ and ‘πέμπω’ sending are demonstrated. The relational network of churches depends upon the constant movement of servants with a ‘μέτρον’ in Christ that corresponds to the sphere of ministry

---

13 Ro.1:1; 1Co.1:1; 2Co.1:1; Gal.1:1; Ep.1:11; Col.1:1; 1Th.1:1; 1Ti.1:1; 2Ti.1:1; Tit.1:1.

14 The use of ‘διά’ refers to cause and/or agency while ‘ἀπό’ (Gal.1:1) refers to source.

15 Gal.1:15.

16 Jesus to believers Jn.17:18, 21; 20:21; Peter and John to Samaria: Ac.8:14; Ananias to Paul for healing, salvation, and mission: Ac.9:17; God sending Paul to nations: Ac.26:17-18; Jerusalem apostles send Judas and Silas to Antioch: Ac.15:27; Timothy and Erastus sent to Macedonia: Ac.19:22.

17 Jesus to disciples: Jn.20:21; Judas and Silas sent with Paul and Barnabas: Ac.15:22; Timothy, Paul’s faithful, well-loved child, to Corinth: 1Co.4:17; to Philippi because of genuine care: Ph.2:19-20; to Thessalonica God’s collaborator: 1Th.3:2; Tychicus, much loved and faithful servant, to Ephesus: Ep.6:21-22; to Colossae: Col.4:8; Epaphroditus, brother, collaborator, co-soldier, and apostle, to Philippi: Ph.2:25-30; Artemas or Tychicus to Crete: Tit.3:12.
they are in. In these organic movements, the relational ebb and flow of responsive ministry is written into these apostolic values. The Trinitarian principle for collegial ministry is on the basis of Jesus model, whereby particular emphasis is on the ‘πέμπω’ sending: his will perfectly united to the Father’s for eternal life;\(^{18}\) Christ doing nothing out of Himself;\(^{19}\) His teaching,\(^{20}\) his judgment,\(^{21}\) his witness of authenticity,\(^{22}\) and the works.\(^{23}\) Likewise, the Spirit will take from the Father and Jesus and reveal it, teach it, lead into the experience of truth-Christ. Collegiality begins with a Christ-like apostolic spirit. The spirit is ultimately that it does not really matter who acts or ministers; if it originates from union in the Trinity, equal in nature and substance, united in relationship, enabled and willing in function. Apostolic team is the extension of the Trinitarian model exemplified in Jesus and attested by Paul. The same principles apply as Scripture witnesses in Paul. The Father Son relationship has previously been considered and with the same principles in view, there are implications for apostolic ministry. From John chapter five, the six founding principles for ontological and Trinitarian ministering are analyzed and transposed into apostolic ontology.

i. Collaboration (Jn.5:17)

In Trinity, the term is defined as ‘complicity between Perfects’; because believers do not share the infinite attributes, they are not divinely God, therefore the transposition is ‘complicity towards fullness’.

Paul describes his apostolic band and specifically Timothy as ‘συνεργός’.\(^{24}\) The nature of this collaboration is most clearly understood by Paul, “… as originated in God, before the face of God in Christ we speak” (NTIG 2Co.2:17). His use of the passive and middle voice in describing ministry in Christ portrays with clarity the ontological relationship to

\(^{18}\) Jn.4:34; 5:30; 6:38-40.

\(^{19}\) Jn.6:30.

\(^{20}\) Jn.7:16; 8:26; 12:49; 14:24.

\(^{21}\) Jn.5:27, 30.

\(^{22}\) Jn.8:18.

\(^{23}\) Jn.9:14; 14:10.

\(^{24}\) 1Co.3:9; 1Th.3:2.
Christ, “… I became a servant according to the gift of grace God being given to me according to the operative power the inherent power of Him” (TLT Ep.3:7). Paul is collaboratively the ‘διάκονος’, voluntary choosing the will of another. He is collaborating with the gift of God, ‘ἐνέργεια’ (His operating power) in Him which in turn produces ‘δύναμις’ inherent capacity or ability power. This is not of Paul’s doing, he is passively receiving the measure through God indwelling. The exercise of ‘διακονέω’ therefore resides in the indwelling divine nature, the means and agency of the Godhead, and is the means to experiencing fullness. In practice, the perfect fullness of the Father, of Jesus and the Spirit is a complicity of Perfects; the model for ministry is articulated in the measure given defined as fullness not infinite perfection. Collegiality, is therefore not just an exercise in plurality of ministry, which can be established etymologically through the plural terms employed in the NT texts. In collaboration and complicity, when team ministry is exercised with different ministries of Christ manifest, it is built upon this Trinitarian principle of fullness towards completeness, as one full measure of Christ’s apostolic ministry adds to another full measure, etc. This reflects an aspect of the nature of Godhead, wherein believers or ministers are to seek out the alterity of Christ in the other collaboratively. This understanding of ministry awakens servants through whom Christ manifests His ministry to the purpose of ‘fullness to completeness’. Paul’s ‘συνεργός’ together in Christ with his many co-‘διάκονος’ demonstrates his Trinitarian conception of service in Church. The sending both ‘ἀποστέλλω’ and ‘πέμπω’ are herein founded.

ii. Entire dependency (Jn.5:19)
For believers and servants, it is the choice of origin for one’s existence, life and service, which translates as ‘living out of Trinity’.

Paul teaches, “… we are absolutely not [of] sufficient ability sourced out of ourselves, to reason certain as originated out of ourselves but our sufficient ability originates out of God that also He made us sufficient servants a new quality covenant, not a written letter, but Spirit; because the letter kills and deprives, moreover the Spirit causes to live (TLT

25 ‘Δίδωμι’ is in the participle mood: present and continuous.

26 Other texts which reflect the collaborative nature particularly in relation to power in Christ: Ep.3:20; 4:11; 4:22-24; Col.3:9-10; Ep.6:10; Ph.2:12-13; Col.1:29.

27 Ro.16:3, 9.
2Co.3:4-6). Taking into consideration the passive and therefore dependent clause of the Ephesians text in chapter three, the above citation serves Paul’s emphasis to reinforce the utter dependency upon God in an existential perspective. If Christ refused to function outside of total reliance upon the unity and means possessed in Trinitarian relationship, then in ontological terms, Paul explains that those ministering believers should confront the question of origin and source that directly affects the qualitative communication of Christ. Paul is greatly misunderstood particularly by the Corinthians because his choice of human and natural insufficiency because of his choice of Trinitarian origin, source and quality. ²⁸ His disposition both theologically and relationally is epitomized as,

… My grace to you possesses unfailing strength because my inherent power in weakness is perfect therefore all the more gladly I will glory in my weaknesses in order that might reside on me the inherent power of Christ (TLT 2Co.12:9) … for also if he was crucified originating out of weakness but he lives originating out of the inherent power of God because also we are weak in him but will live intimately joined to him originating out of the inherent power of God into us (TLT 2Co.13:4).

The spirit of ‘διάκονος’ is therefore utter dependency upon the Godhead as the unique origin, source and means of ministry. Paul is so convinced that he glorifies his weaknesses or insufficiencies, (distinct from imperfections that necessitate the Spirit’s regenerative transformation). The principle is reflective of the utter uselessness of human means in the face of divine and supernatural ministry. ²⁹

The challenge addresses the core construct of ministry whereby the structure and organization, the self-imposed pressures of programme and format risk detachment from the only source of legitimate ministry. This pleads for the restoration of ontological principles to the exercise of ministry where origin, source, and quality take tangible pre-eminence; where plurality is more than principle it is the nature of ministry because of Trinity.

²⁸ 2Co.11:30; 12:5, 9; 10:10; Gal.2:20; Ep.4:7; Col.1:11, 25; 2:19.

²⁹ Jn.6:63; 1Co.2:1-5; 2Co.12:8-10; Ph.3:4-8.
iii. Unity, equality and honour (Jn.5:23)

The unity, equality and glory that exists between the Father and the Son (and the Spirit), manifests in believers as being beneficiary, being participant and being perfected in the Divine nature.

The believer’s unity is union in Godhead and inversely, so that the ontological holds primacy when exercising ministry; the flow of ministry is Christocentric, the primal imperative. Paul confirms, “… we regard no one according to the flesh. Even though we once regarded Christ according to the flesh, we regard him thus no longer” (ESV 2Co.5:16), in the present context, conveys forms or categories of service that become irrelevant, favouring recognition of Christ in the person and vice versa. What defines, is the tangible evidence of Christ, the form of expression is secondary, Trinity will decide and operate that.

Due to the ontological nature of relationship in Godhead, the beneficiary is in a process, “we all moreover, having been unveiled face the glory of [the] Lord reflecting in a mirror, the image [of] him are metamorphosed originated from glory to glory, just as originated from Lord [the] Spirit” (TLT 2Co.3:18). Participation in the Trinity then intensifies the incarnate likeness of Christ that in turn should be characteristic of the servant ministering Christ – an intensification of the unity and the spirituality resulting from participation in the divine nature. Paul’s total dependency, living in the tension of weakness and inherent divine capability, logically leads to the affirmation of the beneficiary and participant. The nature of ministry in team, should be an expression of the ontological unity in Christ; the binding together not of human personalities but of the mutual expressing and receiving of the measure of Christ in its alterity and homogeneity. The security of this genre of spiritual unity, is the apostolic basis for releasing and sending into service, just as Christ expresses of the Father, and rightly so, the most important source of security is Trinity. Yet those through whom Christ is ministering are to incarnate this security as an extension of the divine model. This conception stands in response to the problems of team addressed based on human psychology, secular mentoring, mediatory or corporate troubleshooting principles that are disparate.

30 Col.2:6, 9-10; 19-20; Col.3:1-3; Ep.1:19; 2:5-7.
The principle of ‘honour’ or ‘glory’ concurs on the basis of union, as Jesus language portrays, “… everyone who acknowledges me before men, I also will acknowledge before my Father who is in heaven, but whoever denies me before men, I also will deny before my Father who is in heaven” (ESV Mt.10:32-33). The unity of union is expressed as oneness in the face of confession of the Son and the Father, also the believer, “In that day you will know by personal experience that I in my Father and you in me in the same manner I in you … I in them and you in me that they having been perfected …” (TLT Jn.14:20; 17:22), the inseparability of the Father and Christ, extends to the believer’s union in them. The ontological union that is perfected, is better understood as made complete through Christ and the Father. Introducing the believer into that union, wherein there is no other means by which the believer can enter this unique relationship. The passive voice suggests that the provision of divine union is in view. The sequential effect is that the person in union is perfected because of the nature of the union into which he has been brought. The point reinforces the quality of relationship whereby intended ministry expresses qualitatively the nature of union.

The purpose and necessity of these aspects is expressed the conception of mutual ‘honour’, “The glory that you have given me I have given to them, that they may be one even as we are one” (ESV Jn.17:22). This glory of oneness has been interpreted as “… in feeling, in principle, in purpose…not in nature, or in the mode of existence …” (Barnes @3637) Or “… the power to work miracles, and to preach unadulterated truth … the glorious [or] the glorious privilege of becoming sons of God” (Clarke Ibid.), “Not the glory of his deity … nor his mediatorial glory … nor the glory, of working miracles … rather the Gospel is meant, which is glorious in its author, matter and subject …” affirming that unity is in the Gospel, of faith, (Gill Ibid.). “… here some understand the heavenly glory … Others understand the Divine nature … Others understand the power of working miracles …Others understand the preaching of the Gospel …” (Poole Ibid.). Calvin brings additional thought, “… having the image of God restored and formed anew in us, [just as Christ is] … the likeness of the glory of the Father has been engraved, so as to form his members to the resemblance of it” (Calvin Ibid.). The apostle Paul says, “For God, who said, “Let light shine out of darkness,” has shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ” (ESV 2Co.4:6). Jesus

---

31 Mt.10:40.
prays in a context preoccupied with glory,\textsuperscript{32} the Father’s in the Son and conversely Christ’s glory in believers. “… I have been glorified in them …”\textsuperscript{33} (TLT Jn.17:10), is suggestive of the ontological relationship that reaches climax in the latter verses. A cycle of glory is established into which the ministering believer is introduced. It is an integral part of union in Trinity, in the divine nature, reflecting the purpose of relationship and of ministry, mutually glorifying the Persons of the Godhead. The believer’s glory is Christ, the perfect image of God. In the cycle of glory, glory is in the mirrored reflection sent between the Persons of the Godhead; the believer in Christ and being perfected in Him, glory, according to the measure is reflected back onto Christ, in Paul’s words. The cycle of glory, comes out from God on the throne, it catches the four living creatures, the elders, the angels and the multitude in a glorifying response back to God on the throne.\textsuperscript{34} Jesus Christ, on the throne, who is glory, comes out from it with glory; in union, puts glory into believers so that the glory of Christ in them responds back to Godhead on the throne: ‘the cycle of glory’.\textsuperscript{35} Ministry is situated in union and in this cycle, where an ontology of glory is comprehended as the framework for Trinitarian ministry. What comes from the throne, sent out apostolically, to captivate, generate glory in and through the believer because the Christ of glory indwells, returns a ‘greater’ glory’ to the throne; and so, the cycle of increasing glory continues. This sets the foundation of Christ’s relationship and ministry and on the grounds of the Godhead incarnate, and is the reality into which believers and those serving alike are to exist.

The nature of ministry in terms of function, as the above cited commentators affirm, necessitates rootedness in union and in the ontology of the cycle of glory, to define these operations as source rather than means, is to fail to contextualize their ultimate origin and purpose. In other words, the functions of Gospel announced, miracles and works of divine power, and faith, require purpose that is only found in the cycle of glory. The purpose of ministry whatever its definition or form, has for purpose the glory of the Godhead ontologically in the believer, both in the heavenly reality and the earthly reality. Church

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{32} Jn.17:1, 4, 5, 10, 22, 24.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Col.1:27.
\item \textsuperscript{34} Rev.4; 5; 7; 14:1-5.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Heb.1:3; Is.40:5; Jn.1:14-18; 17:5.
\end{itemize}
therefore, is the intensified demonstration of the cycle of glory which is her principal purpose.36 The glory that is to fill the earth and the heavens finds fullest expression in the Christ of glory both in heaven and on earth in believers and in church; the glory is propagated through Christ and his ministry into believers.37

iv. Revelation (Jn.5:20)

Jesus speaks of a unique revelation of the Father because of intimacy, “… in the Father’s bosom …”38 The term ‘φιλέω’, as previously developed, refers to reciprocal friendship love, here between the Father and Jesus. The nature of this relationship is explicitly related to revelation,39 with a special connection made between friendship with God and revelation.40 In the case of Abraham and Moses the friendship with God, brought them into the particularity of special revelation regarding God’s purposes. The mediatorial roles of both Abraham and Moses, indicate that God listened and took account of their words in the divine purpose; both occur for the outworking of covenant promise. Christ stands as the perfect mediator, specifically in context of relationship and revelation. “No longer do I call you servants, for the servant does not know what his master is doing; but I have called you friends, for all that I have heard from my Father I have made known to you” (ESV Jn.15:15), indicates that Christ draws believers into a friendship quality of relationship with Himself, whereby he reveals all that the Father has spoken. The ‘τέλος’ of mediation and of revelation is complete in Christ, which opens the way for believers to know intimacy and friendship with God.

Revelation, through use of ‘οιδα’ indicates His self-disclosure enters the realm of physical sight and perception. The use of ‘γνωρίζω’ denotes the divine intention for revelation that connects with knowledge by personal experience, “subjective knowledge.”41 The nature of the believer’s knowledge is by revelation, distinct from Christ’s omniscience. To

36 Ep.3:10.
37 Num.14:21; Is.6:3; 60:2; Hab.2:14; Ep.1:6, 12, 14.
38 Jn.1:18, 14; Mt.11:27; Mt.17:1-8; Jn.14:8.
39 Dt.5:24, 26; Ez.40:4; 1Kg.19:9-18.
40 Jm.2:23; Ge.18:16-33; Ex.33:11; Jn.21:15-19.
41 ‘γνωρίζω’ SECB 2015; derivative of ‘γνώσκο’.
further the scope of revelation, the NT employs three principal terms: ‘ἀποκαλύπτω’, internal disclosure of something previously unknown or knowable but veiled;⁴² ‘δῆλος’, internal comprehension with clarity and certainty, and an absence of conjecture;⁴³ and ‘φανερόω’ external tangible demonstration, visible, apparent, and actual.⁴⁴ There is a perceptible order from internal disclosure to internal comprehension with clarity followed by the corresponding external demonstration. The ‘ἀποκαλύπτω’ is Christocentric as Paul expresses his encounter with Christ and the purpose of Christ revealed in Him;⁴⁵ the term is actualised in the context of church body ministry, a comprehensible and prioritized ministry within the Body.⁴⁶ This usage unmistakably distinguishes the partial measure of revelation with the omniscience of Godhead. Therefore, church ministry is not bound by a closed revelation of Scripture, but a partial and progressive continuing revelation of the Christ, edifying Him and the body. This is exemplified in the Spirit’s revelatory ministry, revealing the undisclosed things of God; the same Spirit giving perception of the person of God and of humankind, to which Paul concludes that the believer in this relationship to the Spirit knows by personal experience the mind of Christ.⁴⁷ In principle, the three stages in revelation are present. ‘φανερόω’ is employed to expression the visible and demonstrative nature of the Father and Christ indwelling believers; the church likewise is a manifestation of Christ. Similarly, Paul refers to the carrying Christ’s death and life in our bodies.⁴⁸

The consequences for ministry restore the ontology of revelation in its entirety as an absolute requirement, “… which also we speak, absolutely not in teaching of human wisdom discourses, but in teaching [of the] Spirit Holy, spiritual things with spiritual things examining together connections …” (TLT 1Co.2:13). This depth of God given insight is sourced, according to Jesus, in the intimacy of friendship with Him, with the

---

⁴⁵ Gal.1:12, 15-16.
⁴⁶ 1Co.14:6, 26, 30.
⁴⁷ 1Co.2:10, 11, 12, 16.
Father and with the Spirit. Ministry therefore is an expression of intimacy, of disclosure, of comprehension and demonstration, of a life lived accordingly.\(^49\)

As long as I was a little child, like a child I spoke, like a child I was disposed, like a child I reasoned; but whenever I had become an adult I had done away with things of the child. Because we see physically now at this time through a mirror obscurely but at that time face towards face; now at this time we know by personal experience out of a part assigned, but at that time will know thoroughly and accurately just as even I am thoroughly and accurately known (TLT 1Co.13:11-12),

The Father, Christ and the Spirit have invited believers as ministers into intimacy because revelation comes from relationship. Paul elucidates the tension and the distinction between Christ and ministering believers whereby, the quest for omniscience will only be satisfied in the ‘παρουσία’ and the Kingdom. However, present day ministry from ontological friendship flows fresh, partial, measured, yet increasing revelation of God’s Person and purposes in the believer and the church. Conversely, Paul’s text indicates that to not engage in such a quality of relationship is to not live and minister from revelation but acquired human founded understanding, which is equated to the stature of childlike or childish. The maturity of church depends upon it.

v. Delegation (Jn.5:30)
While all authority, life, judgment, all creation has been attributed to the Son; the delegation to believers becomes the source and necessary means received.

Jesus witnesses that all things have been delegated to Him.\(^50\) The quality of the relationship of union between Father and Son and Spirit, reveals that whatever it said to belong to one also belongs to the other, where consubstantiality meets operation. Delegation flows naturally from the previous characteristics, particularly total dependence and unity, equality, and honour. The relational quality perceived in the unity of mutual belonging, whether it be in attributes or person, enables each member of the Trinity to affirm they minister out of shared equal perfection.

\(^49\) Ep.1:9; 3:3-6, 7; Col.1:25-27.

\(^50\) Jn.3:35; 13:3; 16:15; life Jn.5:26; judgment Jn.5:22, 27; people Jn.17:2, 6-7.
What is delegated to the ministering believer? Paul responds, “each and all things are potentially possible to me, in this Christ causing inherent capability “(TLT Ph.4:13). In setting out the ontological ministry principles, the believer has no power, no authority, no anointing, no word, no operative power, sourced within him or herself.

Similarly, in the belonging precept, the ministering believer has no converts, no disciples, no church, no network, or family of churches, neither the Kingdom, for in none of these things has he been attributed ownership – a belonging right.

Just as “Passover” indicated a change of ownership and belonging; likewise, with the first born among Israel, redeemed by the ministering tribe of Levi in a change of ownership, so in Christ there is a change of ownership. In the same way that the Lord was the inheritance of the Levites, correspondingly Christ to the believer in union, becomes inheritance. The relationship of Church the Body demonstrated that the ‘δωρεά’ was the Person of Christ, and likewise the Person of God and that of the Spirit. That being the case, the believer’s first inheritance is confirmed because of the belonging to God. Nothing belongs to the ministering believer, all belongs to God in Christ. Paradoxically, Paul’s key text begins with an ‘all powerful assertion’ but Paul is clearly not promoting possessiveness nor omnipotence in those ministering, which by his own example, is one of glorifying in weakness. This glorifying confirms the principle that in and off himself Paul possesses nothing and yet everything, he is powerless yet knows true power, etc.

The key verse indicates the principle of ‘delegation by incarnation,’ in and of Christ. In Acts and the apostolic sending of believers, “but you will receive inherent ability, the Holy Spirit coming upon you; and you will be my witnesses to Jerusalem and in all Judaea, and Samaria and to the ends of the earth” (TLT Ac.1:8), reflects the same principle in the case of the Holy Spirit who also generates by His personal indwelling, His inherent ability (‘δύναμις’) in the believer whereby God is cause and agency of His divine purpose in the him/her. Similarly, when Jesus sends out the twelve and the seventy, a specific ‘μέτρον’ of ‘δύναμις’ and ‘ἐξουσία’ are attributed that, in accordance with the principles of delegation, do not give ownership of the attribute nor of the Kingdom for
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51 Ex.12:12-13, 17, 42; 13:1, 15-2+; Num.3:41; See also Abraham Ge.17:1-8; 1Co.6:19-20.

52 1Pe.4:11; Rev.7:10.

53 2Co.6:8b-10.
which they were shown in demonstration. They are exercised in the believer by the indwelling Godhead and in the corresponding ‘μέτρον’. The three apostolic uses of ‘οἰκονομία’, the stewardship accounted to Paul, are all in the passive voice and concur unanimously with this thought.\textsuperscript{54}

The hallmark of the ontological ministering believer is therefore authenticated in the internal operation of the Godhead manifesting source, means, agency and ‘μέτρον’. The believer who exists and functions in this reality will experience a continuous state of measured fullness and divine equipping for whatever should be found before him or her. This reflects the extension of the Trinitarian relationship of delegation into which believers are introduced. The consequences for collegial leadership are also to reflect the Trinitarian principles whereby team and ministry are continuously defined by these precepts. The principle of complicit fullness will be manifest. This consequentially breaks out from endless re-structuring and re-strategizing over functions, capacities, methods of functioning collegially, which inevitably orient towards to hierarchal and positional, and as such, compromise the effectiveness of the ontological ministering believers operating consciously within delegation.

\textbf{vi. Autonomy (Jn.5:21, 22, 26)}

Jesus autonomy, freedom to be and say and do, because of perfection in divinity and Godhead, becomes in believers the measure of Christ, and Godhead, incarnate, for “you are made full in Him …” (NKJV Col.2:10).

The autonomy of the persons of the Trinity, particularly Jesus, draws meaning from the inseparability in ontological and functional unity. The ‘ἐγώ εἰμι’ statements of Jesus in the Gospels are contextualized by inseparability of the distinctive identity of Christ affirmed within the framework of Trinitarian Oneness. The use of ‘autonomy’ is hereby distinguished from ‘independency’. The sphere of autonomy is defined by the ‘μέτρον’ considered above. Jesus has all authority in heaven, on earth and under the earth, therefore his ‘μέτρον’ is situated in the sphere of ‘κόσμος’.\textsuperscript{55} Paul also recognizes the significance of ‘μέτρον’,

\textsuperscript{54} 1Co.9:17; Ep.3:2; Col.1:25. Lk.12:32 should be interpreted in this light.

\textsuperscript{55} Ph.2:9-10; Rev.5:13.
But we will not boast beyond our measure, but within the measure of the sphere which God apportioned to us as a measure, to reach even as far as you. For we are not overextending ourselves, as if we did not reach to you, for we were the first to come even as far as you in the Gospel of Christ; not boasting beyond our measure, that is, in other men’s labors, but with the hope that as your faith grows, we will be, within our sphere, enlarged even more by you, so as to preach the Gospel even to the regions beyond you, and not to boast in what has been accomplished in the sphere of another. But HE WHO BOASTS IS TO BOAST IN THE LORD. For it is not he who commends Himself that is approved, but he whom the Lord commends (NAS 2Co.10:13-18).

Paul sets his own autonomy in the framework of God’s given ‘μέτρον’ of enabling in the personally or collectively assigned ‘κανών’. Paul makes it clear that he did not transgress the assigned limits of his own sphere into that of another. The sphere is also flexible and subject to movement, expansion as the fruit of the measure and the sphere become evident. Jesus also confirms this by the rewards of the stewards entrusted with talents, “for to everyone who has will more be given, and he will have abundance. But from the one who has not, even what he has will be taken away” (ESV Mt.25:29). Thoughts of expansion, are to be rooted in the ontology of operating in the ‘μέτρον’ and within the assigned and identifiable ‘κανών’ for each one individually and collectively. Paul’s example is not only in pioneer ministry but in the church of Rome where he senses the ‘μέτρον’ extending to communicate some spiritual gift to the ‘κανών’ of the church of Rome entering a sphere of edifying constructive growth to the church, “I know that when I come to you, I will come in the fullness of the blessing of Christ” (ESV Ro.15:29). The criteria for autonomy resides in the measure of incarnate Godhead, metamorphosed through their union in the believer. “For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand that we should walk in them (NKJV Ep.2:10), suggests that the regenerative creative work in Christ precedes living in the good works of God. The purpose found in fatherhood is a helpful analogy. A father training a child, is looking for that child to reach a point where he understands, has been shaped by certain truths until the young adult possesses them for him or herself, making them his or her own, proven by demonstrating them in living. The critical concept is that

56 Ro.1:8-15; 15:14-20, 29
‘μέτρον’ and ‘κανών’ are effectively growing and expanding when the ontology of the person in Christ is of equal measure for the believer to bear them effectively. In other terms, the believer metamorphosed in Christ, and in Him has scaffolding to enable effective ministry. Consequently, the ‘μέτρον’ and ‘κανών’ should always reflect the measure of divine nature integrated in the believer. To fail to perceive this is to continue a long line of well-meaning believers desiring and passionate for service, with signs of ‘μέτρον’ and ‘κανών’ that in the face of difficulty, tribulation, persecution, or suffering in and out of the church sphere could potentially finish in breakdown and abandoning faith altogether. The analogy of the father points to the regenerative ministry of Godhead in the believer; the believer being shaped and ordered internally for the ‘μέτρον’ and ‘κανών’. To not operate within the ‘μέτρον’ of Trinity indwelling is to transgress the limits that they are setting down at any given time. The entire ontological construct in autonomy will fail to operate according to divine intention to the extent that the believer moves from the ‘πνευματικός’ state to another.

**Conclusion**

This section has expounded the six principles that operate in Trinity that apply to the believer in church and in ministry upon the postulation that identity, church, and ministry originate imperatively in Trinity. This demonstration of the same principles that Jesus substantiates in Trinitarian relationship are unequivocally established as the basis for Church and ministering believers. Thereby, the divine intention is found in the believer and in church being the organic extension demonstrating the divine nature, for outside of that the believer is no longer believer nor is church, church by definition and intention.

*’ἀποστέλλω’ Church*

*’ἀποστέλλω’* is significant ontologically for church because of the apostolic Trinity rather than the Patristic period where apostolicity underwent a significant transformation, superseded by ‘offices’ and the implications of that previously discussed. This present section considers the nature of apostolic DNA as integral to the nature and recovery of the ontological church. Etymologically, the synonymous meaning shared between *’ἀποστέλλω’* and ‘καταρτισμός’ sets the vision of church as the body, and the five founding ministries as apostolic by definition and by nature. It is not only the apostle that is apostolic, rather all five ministries are apostolic in substance and expression, which is
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perfectly coherent with the apostolicity of the Trinity and of church. These foundational edifying ministries manifest as an extension of Godhead, and are therefore impregnated with the same apostolic nature. It is in this light; the following six concepts emerge from the etymology of the original words and therefore define what is to be understood by ontological apostolicity. They characterize the essence of church and the substance of ministries perfected in Christ in order that the body of believers be apt to edify themselves and to be perfected in the full measure of Christ (Fig.XVIII).57

i. to prepare, to be prepared/ready:

The sense of preparation originates in God who: prepared a Kingdom from eternity; prepared for Christ a body; prepared the Holy Spirit and revelation for his own; prepared a legitimate and filial people in Christ; created for good works.58 Godhead are therefore ‘Preparer’.59 The apostolic sense from Trinity is embodied in John-Baptist, to whom the Gospel writers and Jesus attribute prophetic fulfilment as the ‘Preparer’ the ‘Precursor’ of the coming Christ.60 The ‘Precursor’ like all ‘Preparers’ results from the divine preparation and impulsion in time and with people. The prophetic word of God concerning John-Baptist,61 is the source of John’s coming and apostolic mandate. Mark expresses this in the sending out of the twelve, “And He called the twelve to Himself, and began to send them out …” (NKJV Mk.6:7). The ‘Preparer’ initiates in this same way with Paul and Peter, and the anonymous servants from Cyprus and Cyrene.62 Paul himself exercises the same preparatory ministry during his service.63 The task results from God doing a new thing and as such requires the creating of a new path, that has not previously existed; in the case of John-Baptist, Christ incarnate and him incarnate in those believing.

58 Mt.25:43; Jn.14:2-3; Heb.11:16; Heb.10:5; 1Co.2:9; Ro.9:23; Ep.1:4; Ep.2:10; 2Ti.2:21.
59 1Co.2:9; Heb.6:20; Jn.16:13.
60 Mt.3:3; 11:10; Mk.1:2; Lk.1:17, 76; 3:4.
61 Is.40:3-5; Mal.3:1.
63 Ac.19:8-10; 20:17-21, 28-32.
If God in Trinity is ‘Preparer’, the typical concept of preparation alters. In preparing his disciples Jesus conveys,

> Behold, I send you out as sheep in the midst of wolves; so be shrewd as serpents and innocent as doves … But when they hand you over, do not worry about how or what you are to say; for it will be given you in that hour what you are to say For it is not you who speak, but *it is* the Spirit of your Father who speaks in you” (NAS Mt.10:16, 19-20),

The preparatory concept is altered by a lack of preparedness in human terms and utter reliance upon the supernatural means. Jesus lays down a principle of immediacy that is only experienced in this way. The apostolic preparation is less method, structure, or system based than ontological. The preparation in view is the measure of Christ in Godhead dwelling within in order to face of the measure of whatever forces and powers present before believers, “You are originated out of God, little children, and have overcome them, because He who is in you is greater than he who is in the world” (TLT 1Jn.4:4). The preparatory ministry is then Christocentric for Christ speaks the words of God, because the Spirit out of all measure is given.\(^{64}\) This ‘out of measure’ Christ indwelling the believer corresponds to the victory over the ‘μέτρον’ of the world. The qualities Jesus promotes are: ‘φρόνιμος’ refers to a person’s disposition, “… one who has quick and correct perceptions”\(^{65}\) and ‘ἀκέραιος’, an innocence that is free from any admixture.\(^{66}\) Paul testifies, “So, as much as is in me, I am ready to preach the Gospel to you who are in Rome also” (NKJV Ro 1:15); likewise Peter, “But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts, and always be ready to give a defense to everyone who asks you a reason for the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear …” (NKJV 1Pe.3:15). The apostolic preparatory characteristic should express the Christo-centricity and focus upon the ontological reality of the incarnate Christ and nurturing the relationship with the indwelling Spirit who is to speak. There is no method that can anticipate the diversity of human identity and temperament, nor of life and contextual experience. The apostolic

---

\(^{64}\) Jn.3:34.

\(^{65}\) ‘φρόνιμος’ TGE, 2016.

\(^{66}\) ‘ἀκέραιος’ TGE, 2016.
church is preoccupied by the ontological preparation of Christ and Spirit and Father built into believers.

ii. to repair or restore

The apostolic restoration ministry is reflected in the regenerative union in Christ, expressing the overarching framework of Christ’s restoring all things to God’s original intentions in Christ Jesus. The five apostolic ministries evidence this by their characterization in ‘καταρτισμός’ towards believers reaching towards full maturity in Christ. The purpose of restoration as an apostolic characteristic is coherent with the metanarrative of God and the church. By definition, this is the work of Trinity metamorphosing believers in nature to the image of Christ, through a process of death, to all that is contrary to Christ in human identity and temperament; of burial, that is separation and rupture to freedom in Godhead; and of resurrection that is the Trinity in the believer operating resurrection as that experienced by Jesus; into the indivisible human and spiritual nature that takes its origin for life in Trinity and is manifest in a new quality of life. Being part of Trinitarian ministry in believers individually and collectively, the apostolic ministries in focus and exercise will be characterized by an ontological emphasis on the restorative movement of the Trinity within the body of the church. It is distinctively void of emphasising external rites, rituals and practices that includes therapeutic sociological and psychological methods that do not always recognize the primary ontological understanding of Christ and Godhead in the believer; neither will religious or secular approaches enable the primary means of regenerative transformation as critical to the life of the believer or the church, “… I am again in labor until Christ is formed in you” (NAS Gal.4:19), restores the ontological centrality of understanding human beings in Christ in substance and nature. A unique and new ‘πνευματικός’ humanity, to demonstrate the apostolic foundation of ontological restoration.

67 ἀποκαταλάσσω’ Ep.2:14-16; Col.1:16-20.
69 Ro.8:29; 12:2; Ph.3:21.
70 Jn.12:24; Ro.6:1-5.
71 Ep.4:22-24; Col.3:9-10; 2Co.5:17.
iii. to equip or train

The apostolic impulsion to train is innate, yet the concept of training raises a plethora of pedagogical considerations as to means, method, purpose and outcome. The typical dictionary definition includes training as providing form and structure, to cultivate, educate, instruct and teach: aptitudes, competences, knowledge and practices.\(^{72}\) The modernist era, for a number of reasons, emphasized ‘method’ empirical, rational, experiential, inductive and deductive, among the many categorizations; the mastery of knowledge in the form of defined and structured thought, as developed rationally into systematic approaches to knowledge, science and God. The distinctiveness of the ontological approach rests upon the nature of God: the infinity of God both, unrevealed and revealed remains the measure of human objectivity which is in reality subjectivity.\(^{73}\) The practice of the apostolic church was characterized by steadfast adherence or constant devotion to the apostle’s teaching,\(^{74}\) likewise Paul engaged in sustained periods of teaching.\(^{75}\) A construct from biblical texts renders evident the specificity of the apostolic equipping and training focused upon the Person of Christ: the Head and Source, the Foundation and structure, the building up of Christ in each believer through body ministry clearly sets the objective of teaching as the ontology of Father, Jesus and Spirit.\(^{76}\) The body of Paul’s teaching reflects the ontological primacy of Trinity indwelling the believer. Equipping and training then has essentially an ontological basis, it is the scaffolding for Christian existence.

There is a recurring trend of focusing upon method and programme based training and while Christ might be the subject of the material, the learning and mastery of a method, while providing in a human perspective a certain sense of security and knowledge, that in itself might be quite accurate, the method supplants the significance of ontologically being formed in Godhead. In reality the more manuals, guidelines, resource materials

---


\(^{73}\) Of God: Ps.57:5; Is.41:4; 45:6-7, 12, 18; 46:9-10; 48:12-13; of Christ: Heb.7:3, 15-16; Rev.1:8; of Spirit: Ps.139:1-12, esp.vs.6-7.

\(^{74}\) ‘προσκαρτερέω’ TGEL 2016.

\(^{75}\) Ac.11:26 Antioch 1yr; 18:9-11 – Corinth 18 months; 19:8-11 – Ephesus/Asia Minor 2 years.

\(^{76}\) Gal.4:19; Ep.2:22; 1Co.3:9-15; Ep.4:11-14; Col.1:28; 2:6-7; 3:16.
provided, the more dependent the trainee becomes, and the less sufficient Christ becomes. The more formatted a person becomes the further removed they are from the ontological purpose in equipping and training in the Person of Father, the all-sufficient Christ and eternal Revealer and Teacher Spirit.77

The purpose of Paul is to be a model of Christ and to bring people, not to follow himself, but to follow or model Christ directly.78 In formation, the focus is upon identity and temperament that which is unique in a person; the discerning of Christ as he manifests Himself in that person, is the grounds for formation. In doing so, the origin in God, the means and the perfecting in Christ, in, through and for Him, are sufficient to equip a person to maturity in Christ. This ensures that a person is not conformed to stereotypical roles, offices or functions, but that Christ and the ministry of the Father and the Spirit define who that person is and manifest in and through them the gifts, ministries and works they so desire, so that Trinity define identity and the substance and form of ministry. The end result is a diversity of expressions of any of the five ministries and within each indwelt person, any of the five can be expressed according to divine μέτρον. The one trained and equipped will express a measure and assigned part of the perfection of Christ distinct from the others. Several prophets or teachers in whom Christ is identifiably manifest will present genuine distinctives in expression. Some limited measure of the infinity of Godhead will be manifest. The alterity inherent in the holiness or consecration of God in the believer finds diverse and fuller expression.

The transient longevity in terms of source and origin is questionable when the formation relies upon the inspiration, divine or human, of a trainer or teacher. The method is limited in inspiration to one person; the longevity in transmission will expire between the second and third generations on account of the distance between the source and that latter point being so great that the original inspiration is diminished. When the formation is Christocentric and ontological the longevity is dependent on how long Christ seeks to communicate a particular content, in a particular way, to a specific purpose and end. The question of the eternal nature of ontological formation addresses the question of longevity when training focuses upon the Persons of the Trinity who are sources of revelation and

77 2Co.3:5; Col.2:9-10; Jn.14:16-17, 26; 1Co.2:10-13.

78 1Co.11:1; Ep.5:1; Ph.3:12, 14, 17.
understanding. Each generation is reliant upon the divine eternal source – longevity is assured. The final objective in the ontological church is imperatively increased perfection in Christ rather than a purely increased knowledge base.

iv. to gather (with the idea of putting in order)

Gathering or assembling is not an end in itself, it is precursory to building, liberating and sending, in contrast to ‘κοινωνία’ which is an end in itself, indicative of intentional filial relationship – belonging.79 The ‘προσκαρτερέω’ in relation to the apostolic teaching is also reflective of the attitude towards the gathering. ‘ὁμοθυμόδον’ in composite form means people assembled together in one accord and ardent passion.80 The locality is not fixed by one physical building, it is uniquely employed of the assembled community.81 In each case, the gathering was for purpose: in the Gospels, whether the disciples, the apostles, or the multitudes, the sense is a gathering not to function but to the person of Jesus.82 Function can be identified: gathering for teaching,83 for witness,84 for prayer,85 for communion,86 for life-sharing.87 It is clear that the gathering is key to the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, equipping with the full measure required in accomplishing the mission in view;88 and from that visitation an intensification in: boldness, word, miracles, numerical growth, resulting in an outward apostolic impulsion.89 The apostolic gathering of Jerusalem uniting apostles, elders, and the church, came together with the Spirit. In

79 Ac.2:46; 20:36-38; Ro.15:5-6; Mt.23:37-39; Lk.19:41-44.

80 From ‘ὁμοθυμό’ people assembled together locally and ‘θυμός’ contextually passion, glow, ardour TGEL 2016; SECB 2015.

81 The Kingdom according to Jesus is described as able to gather: Mt.13:31-32, 47-48.

82 Mk.2:2; 6:30; Mt.13:1-2; 18:20.

83 Mt.13:21; Mk.2:2; Ac.2:46; 8:4-6; 11:26; 13:44; 20:7-11.

84 Mk.6:30; Ac.2:46-47; 5:12-13; 14:27.

85 Ac.4:24, 31.

86 Ac.2:46-47; 20:7-11.

87 Ac.4:46-47.


doing so they sent prophets Silas and Judas, the prophets of exhortation, Paul and Barnabas, with the letter in a fresh momentum. As such, they confirm that the apostolically gathering is formational; it requires and results in new stimuli and apostolic sending movement. The concept of ordering is rooted in Trinity, perceived in creation. God’s dealings with Israel collectively in the desert formative years in covenant was an attempt to put order in the hearts of the people. God’s personal encounters with: Abraham and Sara for Isaac; Elijah in hiding, Peter envisioned at Joppa; Paul at Damascus; Jesus teaching the disciples; as with many other examples, give proof to the Trinity as the Pedagogue, gathering to encounter and to order. God gathering, confirms the formative purpose of ordering lives ontologically through being invited into his mindset, heart, reactions, and purposes.

v. to liberate

Two principal terms are used to describe this action, ‘ἀπολλύω’ in contrast to being captive, notably applied by Jesus to people in situations of: divorce, of illness or need, finding provision and healing, of Himself, and more widely of the apostles before the authorities. The second term ‘ἐλεύθερος’ contrasts dominion; the latter is used primarily in relation to the redemptive freedom in Christ, Paul often sets this freedom in contrast to slavery to sin, and identifies the freedom to a new servanthood or slavery to God. This term is also used in redefining the uniqueness of being in Christ.

---

91 Ac.15:6, 22, 28, 30-35; Lk.9:1; Mk.6:30; Ac.19:8-11.
92 Ge.1; 2:18; Ps.33:6; Job 10:8.
94 Mt.5:31-32; 19:3, 7-9.
95 Mt.14:15, 23; 18:27; Lk.8:38; 13:12; 14:4.
96 Lk.23:16-23; Jn.19:10-12; Ac.4:21-23; 5:40.
97 Jn.8:32, 36; Ro.8:2; Gal.2:4; 2Co.3:17-18.
98 Ro.6:18, 22; 7:3-5; Gal.5:1, 13; 1Co.9:19; 1Pe.2:16.
99 1Co.12:13; Gal.3:28; Col.3:11; 1Co.7:22.
The concept of liberation or setting free, in the ontological and apostolic context, is reflected as indissociable in both realms. The freedom that the Spirit operates, setting free from other dominating powers such as law, sin and death into union in Christ is indicative. The freedom the Spirit and Christ produce is for regenerative transformation into Christ and that is glory continuing and increasing.\textsuperscript{100}

This tangible reality stands with the liberation from captivity in order to fulfill the divine mandate. Captivity in this context is simply being tied to a present situation, negative or positive, compared to the impetus of liberation into the forward movement of God.\textsuperscript{101} The liberating dynamic is innate to the apostolic and ontological. The contrary designation is retention, which is the converse of Jesus’ way with people, exemplified with Legion delivered and restored to his right mind, pleading to accompany Jesus, he is sent to the towns of the Decapolis.\textsuperscript{102} The description of Jesus going from village to village,\textsuperscript{103} inherently bears the liberating and expansive character of his mission. The liberation in Jesus’ movement: he gathered, taught and ministered and then set free and in doing so created a people movement each time. In like manner, the sending of the twelve and the seventy disciples represent the importance of liberating believers and disciples.\textsuperscript{104} The sending of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost when the seventy nations representing the world were present in Jerusalem again signifies that liberating principle, as experience of the Spirit touches the gathered one hundred and twenty, who go out, liberated by the impulsion and demonstration of the incarnate Spirit, instigate an uncontainable movement.\textsuperscript{105} The dispersion of the diaspora is the liberating effect of the retention building up through the concentration of believers in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{106} Paul and Barnabas sent out from the young church in Antioch by the Holy Spirit, is again indicative of anti-retainment. This narrative specifies the microcosm of the apostolic: some of the five

\textsuperscript{100} Ro.8:1-3; 2Co.3:18.
\textsuperscript{102} Mk.5:19-20.
\textsuperscript{103} ἐξάρχομαι' Mt.9:35-38; see also Mk.1:21-28; 38-39; 2:13-14; Lk.4:14; Ac.15:40.
\textsuperscript{104} Lk.8, 9, 10.
\textsuperscript{105} Ac.2:1-11.
\textsuperscript{106} Ac.8:1; 11:19.
foundational ministries are gathered together locally, they exercise worship and ministry and as they do so the Holy Spirit speaks, calling Paul and Barnabas to Himself and to a work characterized by the supernatural operation of God; the other ministries liberate Paul and Barnabas, as the Holy Spirit is the apostolic Sender.\textsuperscript{107}

These examples establish the apostolic principle to liberate as inherent to the ontological model and nature of church and ministry. If the gathering does not lead to liberating then then gathering becomes a ‘mega’ entity which does not conform to the liberating principle of the apostolic church that adheres to a multiplicative and reproductive principle. The metanarrative exposes the principle demonstrated above: a gathering of people, a movement of God, a dispersion, (liberation, sending out), in view of expansive growth.

If the ontological model of union in Christ is to propagate, then the liberating principle requires restoration in order that from the inner circle (Jerusalem) of local familiarity, security and confidence; break out from the centre to the region, (Judaea), enlarging through liberating but still in a mono-cultural context; liberating further to cross cultural environments confronting Christo-centricity and Identity in Him as source of security and purpose, rather than in cultural origins, history, distinctions, and interrelations; reaching beyond to reach the profusion of ethnicities whereby the ontological and existential Christ and union of the believer in that absolute reality of Godhead transcends all distinctions. The ontological model sets this foundation that should permeate every circle impelling gathering, liberation and movement.

vi. to send mandated with purpose

The nature of the ‘\textsuperscript{107}Ἀποστέλλω’ and ‘\textsuperscript{108}πέμπω’ is profoundly integral to the nature of intra-Trinitarian relationships and as through union in Godhead, the ontological believer and church are also in essence profoundly apostolic. The reminder that sending originates, with the Father, in Godhead. Of first importance is the recognition that Godhead sends one and the other and that in union, therein the members of Godhead manifest their reciprocal apostolic relationship in ministry.\textsuperscript{108} The role of fellow sent ones then is

\textsuperscript{107} Ac.13:1-4; See also the liberating of Stephen (Ac.6:8-10), Philip (Ac.8:5-8, 26-31, 39-40), and Barnabas (Ac.4:36; 26-28; 11:22, 25-26).

\textsuperscript{108} Gal.2:7-8.
recognition of this first mandate, a sending to be.\textsuperscript{109} The use of ‘ἡγέομαι’, normally used of secular leaders in the context of church and ministers, suggests that the choice of sending is based upon careful and attentive deliberation of demonstrable qualities; it is later that they are called prophets, as one of the five apostolic ministries, accentuating the recognition of the ministry of Christ in them. The culture of mutual sending therefore maintains roots in Christ and gives evidence of Him in the choice of sending.\textsuperscript{110} The possible combinations of apostolic sending are varied and recorded in such a way as to communicate a normative practice whether it be some sent from among the twelve ‘ἀποστολοί’,\textsuperscript{111} or by the twelve.\textsuperscript{112} Paul and Barnabas, ‘ἀπόστολος’, are received and sent by the twelve not on any structural or hierarchal basis, rather they perceived the assigned part from God in them. Peter is sent to the Jews and Paul to the Non-Jews; God operating in them apostleship as ‘grace being given,’ recognized by the hand of ‘κοινωνία’ in Christ.\textsuperscript{113} This summarizes the apostolic discernment that warrants the sending.

Paul and his apostolic band are also a reflection of the mutual sending in a fluid movement of discerning the demonstration of Christ and liberating that person with apostolic sending to nourish the divine movement of which they are a part. There is no identifiable, nor necessary effort required, to define a strategy, beyond the discerning of the Godhead’s working in a person and the recognition of the sphere in accordance with the six apostolic principles. The exercise of Paul does however define qualities that accentuate the prerequisites to sending by Paul or by the church.\textsuperscript{114} The quality of relationship that Paul has with his fellow apostles is defined by usage of the preposition ‘συν’ indicating an intimate joining together as in union together with. It is not restricted geographically but

\begin{footnotes}
\item[110] Ac.15:22, 32-33; See also Paul’ sending of Timothy: 1Co.4:17; Ph.2:19-22) and Epaphroditus: Ph.2:25, 28-29.
\item[111] Ac.8:14.
\item[112] Ac.15:22, 27.
\item[113] Gal.2:7-9.
\item[114] 1Co.4:17; 2Co.9:3; Ep.6:22; 1Th.3:2; of church: Ac.15:22; 2Co.8:23.
\end{footnotes}
indicates the nature of relationship. To this Paul adds terms such as ‘ἀγαπητός’ signifying a bond of affection qualifying that attachment. In this light Timothy is as a ‘son’ and Titus a ‘κοινωνός’ designating a servanthood in which they are yielded to the will of God, joined to Paul, being ‘διάκονος’ of God, in the Lord or church, and consequently fellow servants. He also refers to the quality of ‘συνεργός’ which designates the joining together in the operations of God, by nature the works are divine and supernatural character therefore, the means are entirely of the same nature. However, in his apostolic team, Paul qualifies ‘συνεργός’ as pulling together in the same direction, collaborating together for the same purpose. Epaphroditus and Archippus are described as ‘συστρατιώτης’ soldiers or champions for Christ and the church. The words of Paul to the Philippians concerning Timothy resonate the spirit of these apostolic qualities,

And I hope expectantly and confidently in Lord Jesus, to send quickly Timothy (‘πέμπω’) in order that I also might be in good spirits knowing personally concerning you. Because I have not [even] one of kindred heart (‘ἰσόψυχο’ similar, equal, agree, like in whole self) any that genuinely, will thoughtfully care [for] you [and] the circumstances surrounding [you]. Because these all [their] own selves seek out, absolutely not the things of Christ Jesus. But his tested trustworthiness you know by personal experience that in the manner of a father and son, united together with me serves (‘δουλεύω’) to the Gospel. This one therefore I hope expectantly and confidently) to send (‘πέμπω’) (TLT Ph.2:19-23).

115 1Co.4:17; 1Ti.1:2 – Timothy; Ep.6:21; Col.4:12 – Tychicus; Col.1:7 – Epaphras; Col.4:9 Onesimus; Col.4:14 – Luke; Phi.1:16 - Philemon.

116 1Co.4:17; Ph.2:22; 1Ti.1:2; 2Co.8:23.

117 Col.1:7 – Epaphras; Col.4:7 – Tychicus; Paul and Timothy Ph.1:1.

118 Ro.16:1 – Phoebe; 1Co.3:5 Paul and Apollos; Ep.6:21; Col.4:17 – Tychicus; Col.1:7 – Epaphras; 1Th.3:2; 1Ti.4:6 – Timothy.

119 Ro.16:3 – Priscilla and Aquilas; 16:9 – Urbanus; 16:21 – Timothy; 2Co.8:23 – Titus; Ph.2:25 Epaphroditus; Ph.4:2-3 - Euodia and Syntyche; 1Th.3:2 – Timothy; Phi.1:1 – Philemon; 1:24 Mark, Arta rchus, Demas, and Luke.

120 Ph.2:25; Ph.1:2.
These characteristics define the nature of those who are apostolically sent. These qualities are anchor points for the relational apostolic network that Paul operates in. His conception reflects the apostolicity of the Trinity.

This section has developed the Trinitarian origins, means, agency and operations in union in believers, whereby all those in Christ are potential ministers according the principles of Christ’s relationship with the Father. This ontology constitutes the foundation for restoration of the apostolic church recovering its roots in Trinity and N.T. The six foundational truths of the apostolic nature and practice, rooted in Trinity, represent a renewed ontology of church and ministry in the movement of God.

**Leadership: Bishops, Elders, and Deacons**

To restore ontological leadership will confront historical and traditional understanding and practices. The weight of Judaist interpretation and its significance in the Sanhedrin, upon the tradition of Moses, might well be imposing. Likewise, as has been developed, the weight of twenty centuries of leadership defined by office, hierarchy, governance, and administration, forces a certain meaning upon leadership terms and concepts. The authenticity and legitimacy of the ontological view rests upon its rootedness in Trinity. In this section key leadership terms and concepts will be analyzed with an ontological proposal.

‘πρεσβύτερος’ is translated elder, often a reference to age and implicitly of wisdom and to identifiable ministry: of shepherding or feeding the flock. Peter the apostle identifies Himself as ‘πρεσβύτερος’ and witness, having received the mandate to shepherd directly from Jesus. He affirms that an elder is a pastor or shepherd which naturally and primarily refers to nourishing, cherishing, and caring for the flock. In this, ‘πρεσβύτερος’ is synonymous with ‘ἐπίσκοπος’, specifically. The text specifies the

---

121 Ac.11:30; 14:23; 15:2, 4, 6, 22, 23; 16:4; 20:17; 21:18; 1Ti.5:17; Tit.1:5,19;* Heb.11:2; Jn.5:14; 1Pe.5:1,5; 2Jn.1:1;*;3Jn.1:1,* Rev.4:4, 10; 5:5-11; 7:11,13; 11:16; 14:3; 19:4. * in the singular ¤ female elder *.

122 1Pe.5:1-4.

123 Jn.21:15-17.

124 Ac.20:28; Ph.1:1; 1Ti.3:1; Tit.1:7.

125 Ac.20:28.
nature of the ministry as ‘ποιμαίνω’ which naturally and primarily refers to nourishing, cherishing, and caring for the sheep. It is a ministry set in place by the Holy Spirit; as to position, the use of ‘ἐν’ clearly places the shepherd-elder as in, in the middle of the flock. Etymologically, there is no scope for the connotation of governance nor of hierarchy. In this, Peter confirms Jesus words, “… it shall not be so among you” (ESV Mk.10:42-44), by employing the same term ‘κατακυριεύω’ control over or bring under one’s control,\(^{126}\) whereas ‘πρεσβύτερος’ are models to the flock. Of ‘πρεσβύτερος’ teaching to edify the church;\(^ {127}\) a reference to the labour of the Word and teaching the church. The ‘πρεσβύτερος’ can also exercise ‘προστημ’ from the preposition before and the verb care for and give attention to. The explication of this word follows, but suffice to mention here that the inference of ‘ruling over’ is etymologically absent. The teaching has the purpose of caring for the flock, in the ontological and Christological conception it is exercised before Godhead and in Godhead, in favour of the Church. The implicit reference to edifying the Church in view is confirmed explicitly in Titus and synonymous with the nature of ‘ἐπισκόπος’, ‘οἰκονόμος’ and ‘παρακάλεω’, characteristic of Church the Building and the Body.\(^ {128}\) The term also refers to witnessing to Christ and the Gospel, just as Peter. Paul also refers to this witness to the Ephesian elders, the evangelistic ministry is also implicitly referred to in his letter to Timothy concerning elders.\(^ {129}\)

The ontological conclusions are several: this perspective reunites ‘πρεσβύτερος’ and ‘ἐπισκόπος’ with the five foundational ministries of Church. Eldership is defined by the exercise of one or more of the five ministries: apostle, prophet, teacher, evangelist, and pastor. The significance of these persons is that God, Christ, and Spirit exercise their gifts, ministries, and operations in them with a ‘μέτρον’ that equates to the collective Church sphere of which they are a part.\(^ {130}\)

\(^{126}\) 1Pe.5:3.

\(^{127}\) Jn.3:1, 10; 1Ti.5:17.

\(^{128}\) 1Ti.3:2; Tit.1:7,9; 1Pe.5:1.

\(^{129}\) 1Pe.5:1; Ac.20:24-25; 1Ti.5:17; ESV and NAS translate ‘λόγος’ as ‘preaching’ see Ac.4:31; 8:4, 25; 10:44; 15:7; 15:35; 2Ti.4:2; 1Pe.1:25.

\(^{130}\) To Titus Paul asks him to recognize elders for the town Tit.1:5; Paul and Barnabas do so for individual churches Ac.14:23.
The second observation is that in such exercise there is no inherent hierarchal position or office, which historically implies control and governance from a position of being ‘over’. Eldership is established upon a principle of the exercise of the Trinitarian ministry for the building up of the body in Christ. This is accomplished by being ‘ἐν’ the Church body. The principle developed for the body function was one of ‘member and articulation’ which is the founding principle for ‘elder’ ministry integrated into the Body and serving from within.

Etymologically, ‘πρεσβύτερος’ and ‘ἐπίσκοπος’ both define the position or place of the elder. ‘ἐπί’ in this context means beside, in front of or on. The traditional view will always accentuate ‘on’ to justify hierarchy and a principle of governance. However, as with the former term, the concept of being ‘first’ from seniority puts the ministering believer in a special position. From the ontological viewpoint, Christ is the ‘κεφαλή’ of the Church as source, centre, and foundation, therefore the ‘elder’ is also in union with and turned towards Christ, as every believer. If he or she is facing Christ, then they are not facing the Church in a position of authority. This suggests that the elder is the first to see, understand, demonstrate, and model the way towards that goal, the goal being the practising of a teaching, a prophesy, a revelation, or a direction given. In simple terms he is modelling the ministry of Christ in Godhead to the Church as a tangible demonstration for all to see.

Authority therefore moves from ‘office’ to Christ’s exercise of ministry through the believer. Any conception of personal authority is not in governance but in the tangible demonstration of Trinity’s ministry to the body, thereby showing demonstrably the way. ‘προστήμι’ 131 often translates as to lead, used of a ministry of God in the body, and of deacons and elders. In the traditional construct this is one who directs the others and therefore leads. However, ‘πρό’ means ‘before’, as previously explained this is in the face of Christ not the facing the church congregation. ‘ἰστήμι’ means to cause or make to stand, with reference to being immovable, firm, and ready, without hesitation. 132 It suggests one who models the rootedness and resilience of integrated truth in Christ. Again, it is one facing Christ and the first one to model by example, demonstrating Christ to the whole

---

131 ‘Προστήμι’ Rm.12:8; 1Th.5:24; 1Ti.3:4, 5, 12; 5:17. The term is not strictly synonymous with ‘πρεσβύτερος’ or ‘ἐπίσκοπος’ but the meaning has some similarities.

132 ‘προστήμι’ TGEL 2016.
body. There are in effect, few texts that support the traditional interpretation, in the light of this evidence, consequently, the elder as ‘model’ is reinforced.

Paul in particular employs two words to describe the model: ‘μιμητής’ imitator and ‘τύπος’ a die or stamp, an image, figure, pattern, or resemblance. Paul originates modelling in God and in Christ. It is to this model that he calls the believers and the church to imitate him. Paul apostolically demonstrates through his own experience of Christ, of life and service, in a ‘no holds barred’ approach, in order that believers get to Christ the perfect model. This is observed in: attitudes to ministry and tribulation, to ethical principles of freedom to edify; to spiritual character traits, attitudes to receptivity of God, his word, and his servants. Paul never fails to root his example in Christ and in God; to fail to do so is to lose the Christological centricity he spent his life teaching and emulating. He says to the Thessalonians, “… so that you became an example to all the believers in Macedonia and in Achaia” (NAS 1Th.1:7), renowned for their reception of the word of God in all its fullness, producing a likeness to Paul and the Lord. He tells of the exponential effect of their model reaching neighbouring regions, encapsulating the organic and Christocentric nature of modelling and the expansive effect of the ‘μέτρον’ in Trinity reaching trans-nationally.

The definition of ‘διάκονος’ has been treated in Church the Field, however in the context of Church leadership further comment is necessary. The traditional conception perceives an office of practical administration when the word is mentioned. However, in Scripture there are only four possible references where without further consideration, the term is automatically applied to an office. In wider application ‘διάκονος’ applies to all believers and all ministries: apostles, prophets, teachers, evangelists and pastors and

---

133 Ph.3:17; 1Th.1:7; 2Th.3:9; 1Ti.4:12; Tit.2:7; 1Pe.5:3.
135 Ep.5:1; 1Co.11:1; 1Th.1:6; 2:14; Ph.3:12, 17.
136 1Co.4:16; 1Co.11:1; 1Th.1:6; Ph.3:17.
137 2Th.3:7, 9; Heb.6:12; 1Pe.3:13; Heb.13:7.
138 Ac.6:1, 2; 1Ti.3:2, 8; Ph.1:1; 1Ti.3:10, 13 from 66 mentions in the NT.
therefore this wider interpretation redefines the constricted one.\textsuperscript{139} There is a recalibration of the ‘διάκονος’ that pervades all of Church as the hallmark of the Trinity.\textsuperscript{140} If ‘διάκονος’ is a mind-set and disposition, then it applies much more effectively to all the texts of Scripture. Philip and Stephen are both named ‘διάκονος’ among the seven in Acts chapter six. Stephen is engaged in apologetic preaching that ends in martyrdom.\textsuperscript{141} Philip similarly heads out to preach in Samaria, to Azotus and then to Caesarea where he is found later in Acts.\textsuperscript{142} Unmistakably, neither Stephen nor Philip is constrained by an ‘office’ of practical service; they are liberated and sent, demonstrated through effective evangelistic ministry in Christ. The majority of mentions in the NT describe the disposition to Christ and to the voluntary service which He is manifesting; Jesus being Himself the perfect ‘διάκονος’.\textsuperscript{143} It is incumbent then to Church to discern the spirit of the believer and to recognize the Trinity’s gift, service and operation, whatever form that take, liberated to edify. All of church is to be imbued with Christ’s ‘διάκονος’; that said, ontologically the task or office no longer has a defining bearing, rather the presence of Christ is the definition that will be demonstrated in every manifestation of Christ in Trinity.

‘ἐξουσία’ and Governance

The ontological model of Church seeks to restore authority, governance, and submission to their rightful places, in source and in evidence. The traditional and historical perceptions indicate that these qualities rest upon the office and consequentially devolve upon the person filling or exercising the office. The appeal to spiritual qualities of the office bearer, the general acceptability of the person in the community through democratic vote to office, and even prayerful consensus are insufficient. In these cases, ‘ἐξουσία’ necessarily reposes on structure or on the function rather than on Christ in the person manifesting His authority collaboratively.

\textsuperscript{139} Ac.6:4; 20:24; Ro.11:13; Ep.4:12; Col.4:17; 1Ti.1:12; 2Ti.4:5; Ac.19:21-22; Heb.6:10; 1Pe.1:12; 4:10, 11.

\textsuperscript{140} Heb.6:10; 1Co.12:5; 2Co.3:3, 8.

\textsuperscript{141} Ac.6:5, 8-10, 15, 55-56.

\textsuperscript{142} Ac.6:5, 8:4-8, 12-13, 26-40; 21:8.

\textsuperscript{143} Mk.10:45.
The danger is that models of ‘ἐξουσία’ reflect the degeneracy of ‘The Fall’, rather than regeneration in Christ. It is further remoteness from the Trinitarian reality of which believers and church are the extension. Firstly, exhibited in Adam and Eve’s relationship, typical of divine intention, the biblical text relates, “… your husband you shall desire to conquer and he shall dominate you” (TLT Ge.3:16). In the present discussion this signifies that the nature of authority subsequent to ‘The Fall’ is hierarchal in intent for both Adam and Eve and ensuing generations. By nature, authority exercised by both has the same purpose to control the other, an impulse engendered by fear. It is characterized as seductive, manipulative, and pretentious, in that any intentions manifest such as: dependency, submission, or cooperation, to name three, have the goal of conquering to control or dominate. Likewise, domination plays upon: intimidation, force, mastery, ascendancy, and superiority, often abusively, to gain control and dominate. Such is the nature of degenerate authority, to which subconsciously many do react and should. In the context of Church when: accusations of disobedience, rebellion, contention, discontent, or criticism are evident; the first question to be addressed should concern the nature of the authority being exercised.

‘ἐξουσία’ translates as the ability or freedom to act, to exercise influence; secondly the term applies to a delegated influence in the sphere of: responsibility in human, legal, domestic, and judicial affairs. To accurately define the term, it is important to consider how Jesus who has all authority and the apostles, relate to ‘ἐξουσία’. The principle of liberty is most keenly observed in Jesus ministry as he sets free by exercising authority ‘over’ demons and sickness, He exercises authority ‘over’, because in His person is that ‘μέτρον’ of ‘all authority’ to set free. His setting free from these powers is Jesus’ setting them free to continue their journey or lives. His exercise of authority to freedom is not conditioned by them following Him. Herein Jesus indicates that it is from a place of freedom that one responds to Him.  

---

144 Mt.28:16; Jn.17:2; Col.1:16; 1Pe.3:22.
145 Lk.4:33-37; Mk.1:32, 34; Mt.8:16.
146 ‘ἐξουσία επί’ by Jesus is not used of people always demons, disease, Satan: Mt.9:6; Lk.5:24; Lk.9:1; 10:19.
147 Mt.8:4, 13; 10:21, 45; Mk.5:18-20; Lk.17:19; Jn.4:50.
In the realm of nature, Jesus having all authority is not bound by the laws of nature nor their inherent authority to function in a certain way. It is because of this, the effects of wind, waves, fish, trees are also subject to Him.\(^{148}\) It is the freedom that Christ experiences in his own authority, for example: the creator of natural order has authority over it; the sinless one has the authority to forgive; the one who is perfectly Divine has authority to cast out the occult-spiritual.\(^{149}\) Likewise, through the authority in his person as Son of God and his redemptive work at the cross, he overturns the authority of Satan, but it is also overturning the nature of the authority of The Fall;\(^{150}\) Christ exercises freely his own authority over Himself to give and take back his life; this He does because he has life in Himself.\(^{151}\) The spiritual logic is that Christ being life and possessing authority in Himself, freely gives life to those believing, the purpose of his authority is life.\(^{152}\) It is evident that Jesus does not exercise authority over people, rather his authority is exercised in favour of them, the purpose being freedom. He understands the response to His exercised ‘ἐξουσία’ is faith in Him.\(^{153}\) The conclusion is that Christ empirically has all authority; the believer has no authority in and of him or herself; that person receives delegated and measured authority in sphere and in time.\(^{154}\) Jesus says “Truly, I say to you, as much/many you might possibly bind upon the earth will be, having been bound in the heavens; and as much/many you will possibly loose on the earth will be, having been loosened in the heavens” (TLT Mt.18:18; 16:19), indicating that the exercise of authority is not done outside of the intention in heaven, the heavens point to the person of God, in Christ, having all authority. Peter or believers to whom Jesus speaks these words have not ‘ἐξουσία’ outside of the Godhead’s in the heavens. Paul affirms to the Colossians, “in Him permanently resides all fullness [of] Godhead bodily, having been made complete and you are in Him having been made complete who is the source of all beginnings and

\(^{148}\) Mt.14:26; Mk.4:41; Mt.21:19-21.

\(^{149}\) Mt.9:6-8; Mk.5:2-16; Lk.11:18-20; Ac.26:18.

\(^{150}\) Mt.3:3-11; Ac.26:18; Col.1:13; 2:15.

\(^{151}\) Jn.10:17-18; Mk.10:45; Jn.5:21, 26; 1Jn.5:11.

\(^{152}\) Jn.17:2; 20:31; 1Jn.5:13, 20.

\(^{153}\) Mt.8:10; 14:28-33; Mk.9:14-29; Mt.17:19-21; 21:23-24; Jn.1:12.

\(^{154}\) Mt.10:1; Mk.6:7; Lk.9:1; 10:19; Ac.19:11-16.
authority” (TLT Col.2:9-10). He intimates that ontological union in Christ brings the believer into Him who has all authority. Christ, also being in the believer, will intend to demonstrate His authority. ‘ἐξουσία’ moves from an external entity to be obtained and exercised, to the model of Jesus whereby He is ‘ἐξουσία’ and demonstrates his being in the perfect measure he possesses. The ontological ‘ἐξουσία’ resides in Christ, in the believer, according to the measure of Christ which determines the measure of ἐξουσία exhibited. Christ is the believer’s authority, and the measure in perfect correlation with the sphere of operation. Similarly, Christ will manifest His authority according to His nature in the measure that He desires, at any time and any given situation. The experiences of Peter and the nine disciples trying to cast out a demon, and of James and John calling fire from heaven in a Samaritan village demonstrate negatively the failure to understand the true nature and measure of ‘ἐξουσία’. The missional passages concerning the twelve and the seventy provide evidence of the measure and the criteria of the sphere of exercise.

The apostle Paul portrays the purpose of authority as edification. In the wider context of Christo-centricity: bringing every thought captive; ministering in Christ and through Christ signs of true apostleship; setting Christ as the penultimate reference for relationship, belief, and practice. For Paul, in the same manner as with the Corinthians, in correction or exhortation if Christ is ‘centred’, Paul considers that Christ is exercising through Him with authority in the assigned spheres for edification. He provides two images for the nature of apostolic authority: a nursing mother and an exhorting father, the maternal and paternal aspects together, define true authority, both aspects in one person, Paul the man, (also equally and implicitly of any female servant).

Being enabled in weight in order to be as apostles of Christ, conversely, we became gentle among you, in the same manner as a nursing mother would take care of her

155 Mt.14:28-31; 17:17, 19-20; Lk.9:51-56.
156 2Co.10:8; 12:19; 13:10.
157 2Co.10:5, 7.
159 2Co.11:2-3; 13:3-5.
own children, in like manner languishing for you, willingly with pleasure we impart to you not only the Gospel of God, but also our own lives as you have become our much-loved ones (TLT 1Th.1:6b-8).

Paul compares the authority of some as a heavy weight that is laid upon believers and the churches, implicitly with demands and expectations, and hierarchal in practice, with the authentic authority demonstrated by the quality of relationship of a nursing mother. In view is the: tender care, cherishing, educating, nurturing development, covering protectively; Jesus also demonstrates this maternal authority of care. This characterizes true 'ἐξουσία' not as egocentric rather altruistic. It is the pure affectionate attachment that solely desires the utmost best for that child in care. The genuine authentication of the ministering servant is sufficiently secure in Christ and in self; able to cause the receptors to experience this reality: being an object of such affectionate attachment and ontological investment. The purity of Christ the husband relating to Church the Bride analogy confirms the principle. The nursing mother analogy stands as the restoration of the dynamics of the Fall.

You, Witnesses and God of this intrinsic, divinely suitable, equitable, and irreproachable manner towards you those having faith, we have been precisely as you have seen, the manner towards each and all of you, as a father with his children exhorting you, encouraging and witnessing to the way of living appropriately to God, He calling you to his kingdom and glory (TLT 1Th.2:10-12).

Paul completes the portrait of apostolic authority with a paternal dimension. The position of relating is of critical importance as it reflects the nature of the Trinity exercising the

160 1Th.2:7 “ἀλλ’ ἐγενηθήμεν ηπιοί” or “νηπιοί”. TR, IPNT support “νηπιοί” reading, whereas WH, NTIG support “ηπιοί” reading. Lightfoot observes Origen, Clement of Alexandria and Ireneaus following this reading too (1Th.2:7 @6433) which does not corroborate contextually. Confusion that is easily conceived here and in Ep.4:14; 2Ti.2:24.


162 ‘θάλπω’ TGEL 2016.

same ministry. The terms ‘παρακαλέω’ and ‘παραμυθέομαι’ employ the preposition ‘παρα’ referring to: from beside, alongside, and near. The ontological ‘position’ of authority relating in ministry is ‘παρα’ those concerned. It is the position of a pedagogue, father, encourager, and constructor, attested by the Trinity as ‘παράκλητος’. The ‘object’ being the church of believers, is made to sense the paternal relationship making them the object of paternal authority, encouragement, and care. This defines the necessary relationship to ‘ἐξουσία’ to facilitate proper development and maturity. Any other hierarchal or structural role or office by implication, is what Paul calls the unbearable ‘βάρος’ that signifies pseudo-authority and pseudo-ministry. These are the true characteristics of the Fall that portray: fear, intimidation, domination, mastery and superiority having for effect suffocation, paralysis, and impediment in normal development and maturation; therefore, by nature is not conform to the divine model.

Just as the incarnate Spirit takes from the Father and Christ, revealing and teaching the believer, in the same manner the Father takes from Trinity and communicates the Christ and the Spirit to the believer. In the likeness of Paul, the paternal authority is Theocentric, his modelling and emulating is rooted uniquely in that reality and so the father leads others not to himself but to Father, Jesus, and Spirit as the legitimate and original source of authority. The paternal authority, from the ‘παρα’ position, is to exhort, encourage, teach, counsel, comfort, correct. ‘παραμυθέομαι’ also emphasizes, in this context, the word with prophetic inspiration spoken out for building up.

The paternal process is the constructing, building of the person and contextually the collective church in Christ to, “… into the full-grown man to the mature measure the complete fullness in Christ, in order that no longer we should be immature …” (TLT Ep.4:13). Paternity is exercised in the process of growing up into Christ who is the source, the means, and the purpose. The paternal error of making children ‘like’ the father should be replaced with this Christological centrism. The common maxim, teachers make teacher, prophets will produce prophets, and so on, is a uniquely human exercise that

164 God: Ro.15:5; 2Co.1:3-4; 5:20; 7:6-7; 2Th.2:16-17; Jesus: Lk.2:25; Ph.2:1; Jn.2:1; Spirit: Jn.14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7; Ac.9:31.


166 ‘παραμυθέομαι’ and derivatives Ibid 1Co.14:3; Ph.2:1.
serves ‘ego’ and not Christ. The paternal authority contributes, with the means of Christ, to seeing the nature of Christ formed, that will produce a unique imprint on whatever Trinity will and desire to produce within that Person. Such is the paternal altruism. To understand the Father Vinedresser and Church the branches of the Vine, the process of pruning, equips the paternal authority to properly comprehend the correctional. It is not destructive rather constructive, it is not punitive rather formative, it is not detrimental rather exponential, it is not deficiency rather it is perfecting. Paul captures this well, “brothers and sisters if any person should be overtaken by a certain trespass, you the spiritual [ones] perfection such a one in a spirit of gentleness scrutinising yourselves also that you might not be tested” (TLT Gal.6:1). The paternal authority has an apostolic restorative, perfecting, building, and strengthening role, (Fig.XXI, XXII describe the process and development of ‘ἐξουσία’).

Governance also needs treated as much of traditional Church dogma and practice relies upon elders and bishops through office exercising governance over the church, and over individuals. In the ontological model the authority of governance is attributed differently through two means: the Word of God and the ministry of Christ.

The Word of God inherently carries authority because of its nature. The word is ‘ἀποστέλλω’ by nature, “… to you the word of this salvation has been sent” (NKJV Ac.13:26); OT concurs with the principle, “So shall My word be that goes forth from My mouth; It shall not return to Me void [or empty, without effect], But it shall accomplish what I please, And it shall prosper [or succeed in outcome] in the thing for which I sent it” (NKJV Is.55:11). The collective witness to the word is to its apostolicity. The preposition ‘ἀπο’ designates source or origin and concerns the word as it comes from the Godhead. The source establishes its divine nature, for what originates out of God bears a measure or aspect of His nature. The definition also relies upon ‘στέλλω’ which means: to prepare, to repair or restore, to equip or train, to assemble with the idea of putting in order, to liberate and to send mandated with purpose. The OT Hebrew imagery of the word is described as an arrow set in the bow, and propelled from


168 See also Ac.10:36; 28:28; 17:8; du terme ‘πέμπω’ synonym Jn.12:49; 14:24, 26; Rev.1:1.

169 Ps.107:20; 147:15, 18; Is.9:8; Jer.1:9; 21:1; 23:38; 26:12; 42:5; Zc.7:12.
God towards the target.\textsuperscript{170} The meaning emphasizes the origin of the word as in God Himself; it is an apostolically sent word which indisputably reaches the goal, and unequivocally fulfills the divine purpose without frustration.\textsuperscript{171} Paul specifies the nature of this apostolic word further, “our Gospel did absolutely not come into being in you in word only, but also in inherent power, and in Holy Spirit also in entire confidence” (TLT 1Th.1:5). The ‘λόγος’ is the explanatory word that is perfectly accomplished in Jesus Christ;\textsuperscript{172} to this, the ‘λόγος’ comes in ‘δύναμις’ that is the power of inherent or innate ability by which the word that is Christ is characterized in substance and nature;\textsuperscript{173} to this the nature of the word is in Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{174} Jesus says his words, “For He whom God has sent speaks the words of God; for He gives the Spirit without measure … the words that I have spoken to you are Spirit and are life” (NAS Jn.3:34; 6:63). It is not that the Person of the Spirit is restricted to the word, rather as the divinely originated word comes it bears something of the nature of God in revelation, the Spirit ‘source’, ‘on’ or ‘in’ the word compounds the nature of the word and its intention revealed and accomplished by the Spirit;\textsuperscript{175} finally the word comes in ‘πληροφορία πολύς’, much fulfilled assurance or confidence;\textsuperscript{176} this assurance then is part of the innate nature of the divine Word. The ‘word’ originated in God, is utterly convinced of its meaning and purpose, thereby confident to accomplish that for which it is sent. This corroborative evidence reinforces the ontological nature of the word as its apostolic sixfold purpose is made clear: to prepare, to repair or restore, to equip or train, to assemble with the idea of putting in order, to liberate and to send mandated with purpose.

\textsuperscript{170} Ps.18:13-14; 64:7-8; Ps.77:17 and Ex.14:15-16, 26-30; 144:5-6; Jer.9:8; Ze.9:14; Hab.3:9-13.

\textsuperscript{171} Jn.1:1-3.

\textsuperscript{172} Is.45:23; 46:10; 2Kg.10:10.

\textsuperscript{173} Lk.4:36; Ac.2:22; 1Co.1:18; 2:4; 4:19-20; 2Co.6:7.

\textsuperscript{174} 1Co.2:4, 13; 12:8; Ep.6:17 and Heb.4:12; of ‘ῥῆμα’ Ac.6:10; Heb.6:4-5; Ac.20:23; 28:25-26.

\textsuperscript{175} Examples of the ‘word’ enabling distinct and additional action of the Spirit: Ac.10:44; 11:15; Ro.15:18-19; 1Co.2:10-12; Ep.1:13; 1Pe.1:22-23.

\textsuperscript{176} 2Sa.22:21; Ps.12:6; 119:140; Col.2:2 “…being joined intimately together… into all fullness of riches of assurance to joined up comprehension and accurate experiential knowledge of the mystery God also Father and Christ, in whom all the collected treasures of wisdom are kept hidden” (TLT), the reflection is that ‘in’ Christ this assurance is found ontologically.
God’s act of creation was by the word of his mouth.\(^\text{177}\) His word spoken to, and then through his servants, demonstrates the divine commitment to the creative regenerative word.\(^\text{178}\) When God speaks to Ezekiel in the vision of the valley of dry bones, it is a regenerative word, whereby the word spoken by God is explicitly mandated to recreate life where there is death. It could be considered a creational word, and it is most definitely an assembling, to put in order ‘word’. The prophet speaks a divine word, which is not originated in himself to recreate life and breathe in divine life and ‘order’ human beings again.\(^\text{179}\)

The word of the prophets, such as Moses to the desert people who are in a period of being trained in the ways of the Lord; The Lord’s servant, likened to the prophets, is trained by the word.\(^\text{180}\) Haggai and Zechariah in the post-exile period spoke words to equip and to order the rebuilding effort of the post-exile temple. Elijah’s Carmel victory against the prophets of Baal, followed by his deep discouragement to depression and flight where, in the cave on Mount Sinai, God encounters him again, he is restored, he is reordered, he is trained again, liberated and sent with a fresh mandate.\(^\text{181}\) Jonah’s volatile relationship with God and his word indicates the difficulty of being trained, typical of Israel’s recurring attitude: deaf ears, blind eyes and callous hearts.\(^\text{182}\) A preparatory word and a word that arranges in order, witnessing to the unity and integrity of God in that what He is, is what He says, is what He does. The word spoken creates order.\(^\text{183}\)

God’s dealings with Abraham from his departure from Ur; concerning the covenant and the gift of a son of his own flesh, exemplifies the word that orders and structures Abraham’s whole existence. Similarly, Peter’s encounter with Cornelius through God’s spoken word in vision trained and rearranged profoundly his innate attitudes to non-Jews. The apostle Paul’s experience of encountering Christ and the reorientation of his life

\(^{177}\) Ge.1:3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 24, 26; 2:18; Ps.33:6; Heb.11:3; Job 10:8; 31:15.

\(^{178}\) Is.44:24-28.

\(^{179}\) Ez.37:1-14.

\(^{180}\) Is.49:5; 50:4-5; Jer.1:5, 9; 1Sa.3:1, 7, 21.

\(^{181}\) 1Kg.17:1-7; 19:3, 8-16.

\(^{182}\) Is.6:9-10; Mt.13:14-17; Ac.28:25-28.

\(^{183}\) Is.44:6.
witnesses to the regenerative, creational, reordering nature and ministry of the apostolic word.

The point of this discussion is not an exhaustive study of the apostolic word, rather the foundational understanding with some biblical examples to validate and establish the exact nature of the apostolic word and its importance in the ontological church. The government in believers gathered as church, resides in the nature of the word active in and among them. The ontological believer in Christ, as part of the ontological church, has this heightened attention to the significance to the word: discerning origin, intention and means to accomplish. Submission ‘under’ is uniquely to Christ who is the ‘τέλος’ of the ‘λόγος’ and the incarnate ‘λόγος’. The word leads the ontological church to the ‘Λόγος’.

In the development of Church, the Body, it was established that the ‘δωρεά’ is the Person of the Father, the Person of Christ, and the Person of the Spirit. In consideration of how the ‘χάρισμα’, the ‘διακονία’ and the ‘ἐνέργημα’ operate, it was suggested, in accordance with the biblical evidence, that the origin is in Trinity in the believer. Subsequently, it is the Persons of the Trinity who exercise in and collaboratively through the believer. Accordingly, ministering believers were given by God to the church; Jesus and the apostle Paul demonstrated this passive and collaborative ontology. Concerning governance, the ontological church attributes full authority and governance to the Persons of the Trinity, when they exercise ministry and the authority and governance that reside upon the word and ministry of Christ in Trinity rather than upon the ministering believer or upon a particular prominent office. Ontological Church restores the perfect authority of Christ to which all are in singular submission.

**Women and leadership**

Traditional conservative perspectives on women in church are argued on certain interpretative principles of the creational order, ‘κεφαλή’ and ‘ὑποτάσσω’, and Jesus own practice. The principal distinction is between personhood and gender, resulting in determined roles. The tenure of the argument proceeds as follows:

According to the creation order, Jesus could not be a woman because in the male-female relationship the male partner alone is invested with the headship-authority

---

role … and JC alone is Head of the church and King of kings. He is the model for every male leader … By appointing twelve male apostles, Jesus ratified the OT creation order of male headship, a practice that both Paul and Peter subsequently maintained (Strauch 53).

‘κεφαλή’ and ‘ὑποτάσσω’ are understood uniquely in terms of hierarchal headship and the corresponding subordination – submission. The author explains the dialectical tension holding husband and wife in equality and in distinction, the latter being synonymous with subordination (65). The anchor references are taken from a reading of the creational texts in Genesis and their use in the NT, and from a hierarchal and functional interpretation of Trinity’s intra-relationships.

God created mankind in His own image as male and female, fully equal in terms of personhood. But in terms of relationship among equals, God established a hierarchy of male leadership and female submission. So the headship-subordination relationship of the man and woman is evidenced in the original creation order and in the greater order, the nature of the Godhead (61-62).

The male hierarchal headship is perceived as a foundational building block of the family unit, and therefore reflects the socio-relational structure of church as an extension of family, which is in turn a reflection on the Trinity (58).

In appealing Eve’s fault in the ‘Fall’ as the weaker provides additional support for male leadership, “a major reason that God insists on an all-male eldership is because godly males are more suited by divine design than godly females for leadership, particularly for identifying and fighting off satanic false teaching and subtle doctrinal deceptions” (61).

In order to respond to these principles, the first assertion considers the ontological importance. Godhead as has been previously developed, wherein ‘function’ is only a partial expression of ‘being’, the former proceeding from the latter. The relational descriptions of Jesus with the Father establish an eternal relationship of equals in substance, nature, and attribute. From this defining union-unity emerges an ontological and operational revelation, “And He is the radiance of His glory and the exact representation of His nature …” (NAS Heb.1:3). The first relationship between man and woman, Eve is described as ‘neged ָּצֶר’ for Adam, the term can translate as ‘someone
capable, powerful, intelligent, competent and equal, like you and alongside you’. The relationship is therefore not determined by hierarchal principle, rather by a relationship of: unity, mutuality, reciprocity, complicity, completeness, equality and fullness. By nature, it is not: hierarchal, authoritarian, domineering, superior, or subjugator. The relationship is therefore an explicit reflection of the ontological Trinity in substance, distinction, and operation. While there is order in creation, between man and woman, God has inaugurated a being relationship also in his image rather than a structure of function according to gender.

‘κεφαλή’ and ‘ὑποτάσσω’ have previously been developed etymologically and textually. The evidence concords cohesively with the above, that to Godhead alone belongs hierarchal submission, all other relationships find meaning in the collaborative and cooperative alongside meaning which concurs with the ontological reading of the Genesis narrative. Likewise, Christ alone is ‘κεφαλή’ and in Jesus’ own usage of the term: Head, Source, Origin, and Foundation. For Paul to use ‘κεφαλή’ to mean Head or ruler would “be a rare usage of the word, as seen by the evidence of the Septuagint” (Hamilton 163). The ‘headship’ principles of Paul’s letter to the Corinthians, are applied in chapter eleven. Paul begins with the ‘creational order’ respecting factually the Genesis story, as it occurs in the text (verse three). He adds the honour (verse four to six) and the glory of the creational order (verses seven to ten). In verses eleven and twelve Paul concludes with the glory of the ‘redemptive order in Jesus Christ’, affirming that woman is ‘ἐκ’ (source or origin) man, and man is ‘διὰ’ (means or cause) woman, both cannot be ‘χωρίς’ (separable), for both are ‘ἐκ’ God. The point is interdependency, inseparability, and an equality in the redemptive order in Christ, for both are in Christ and like Christ are in and originated from God. Just as the Father and Christ are of the same substance and therefore ontologically equal, indivisible, and inseparable, so man and woman are an analogous reflection of the same reality in their substance and relating. Hierarchy ‘in κεφαλή’ and ‘ὑποτάσσω’, is not necessary for relationship, for man to be fully who he is and for

185 Ps.33:20; 70:5; 89:19; Num.2:2; Jer.16:17; Ne.13:21; Ps.31:22; Ge.31:32; 1Ch.8:32; Jud.9:17.
186 The Septuagint translates ‘ro’sh’ physical head or leader, ruler by ‘κεφαλή’ in the former sense 226 times of 239 by the former. For the latter usage only 9 times of 180 is ‘κεφαλή’ used. (Hamilton 163).
woman to be fully who she is. The correct ontological understanding of the nature of relationship is vital.\footnote{187 The only biblical text requiring further interpretation is the usage in Ephesians 5 in the Bride analogy, previously examined.}

Based on this interpretation, there is a major divide with the views proposed by Strauch whereby the same assumptions cannot be deduced. The misuse of Galatians chapter three by both conservatives and feminists requires correction. The former make the theological error of separating ‘χάρισμα’, the ‘διακονία’ and the ‘ἐνέργημα’ from the salvific work of Christ. Paul writes to the Ephesians, “But to each one of us grace was given according to the measure of Christ’s gift. Therefore, He says: "When He ascended on high, He led captivity captive, And gave gifts to men” (NKJV Ep.4:7-8) demonstrating the salvific character of the text that binds gifts, ministries and operations to the redemptive covenant work of Christ and are fruits of His Person in the believer. Contextually, Paul continues to enumerate the five foundational apostolic ministries.

To the feminists, the text clearly refers to the redemptive order that is the restoration and perfection of the creational order in Christ. Only in the eternal Kingdom is there any notion of there being no gender distinction,\footnote{188 Mt.22:30.} “… we must assert on the basis of Scripture that in the Kingdom of God women are on a complete par with men – in creation, in sin, and in redemption (Summerton 136). Gender, social class, ethnicity all exist. Paul, at no point abolishes slavery for example. However, in the Christological existence the reference for the believer is uniquely defined and expressed by the demonstration of Christ in union in the believer. This inclusive or redefining principle must be explained. To the Galatians, Paul is teaching them about the transition from a judicial approach to relationship with God in Christ.

For some, the Galatians text has a possible interpretation where by distinctions of gender, race, social standing, ethnic grouping are preceded by being baptised into Christ or putting on the new man, Christ being “all and in all”. He is explaining the way of faith that saves, as being a process that is universally available to all who are baptised into Christ, ‘wearing’ the transformed nature that operates in believers. This is one of the clearest statements of Christ, creating a distinct and
regenerate people, functioning within the values of Christ – who is Creator, Mediator, Sustainer of the Philosophical and Spiritual life source for this new existential people (Henderson Church and Sexuality 59-61).

What is established concerning leadership is that gender is not a valid criterion whereas a definite demonstration of mature union in Christ is the principal reference.

Culturally, Jesus earthly ministry radically confronted the Jewish and Greek views of women. While it is true that Jesus’ circle of twelve were all men, “The argument from the fact that Jesus selected only males to be his inner twelve is based on inference only – the NT does not say explicitly that we are to understand from that action that women have no place in the leadership of the church” (Summerton 139). The biblical texts make it clear that the larger circle included several named women, who were disciples of Christ, and doubtless included in the circle of seventy anonymous disciples. Furthermore Jesus approach to women was innately distinct: speaking to them, speaking alone, allowing them to touch him, to directly question and learn from him. While these examples do not specifically addressing the leadership question they do set Jesus’ wider spiritual approach. Following the Hebrew logic, Summerton suggests “Jesus admitted Mary to his rabbinical school – with the implication that like rabbinical students generally she should eventually take her place as a teacher” (141). The references from the beginning of the Gospels describe an irruption of supernatural inspirations and occurrences of which Elizabeth, Mary, and Anne prophesy. If Joel’s prophecy quoted in Acts holds true,

And in the last days it shall be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; even on my male servants and female servants in those days I will pour out my Spirit, and they shall prophesy (ESV Ac.2:17-18),

189 Lk.8:1-3; 10:38-42.
190 Lk.10:1, 21-24.
191 Jn.4; Mk.5:24-34; Lk.7:11-17; 36-50.
192 Lk.1:39-56; 2:36-38.
Then it is evident that irrespective of gender, culture, social status, universally all born of the Spirit will prophesy. This repercutes meaning upon the OT prophetic vision of the nature of ministry in the future people of God through the accomplishment of this word. This cannot be side-lined when interpreting the more difficult texts from Paul.

The two other problematic texts are found in Paul’s letter to Timothy, “Let a woman learn in silence with all submission. And I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence” (NKJV 1Ti.2:11-12). Can Paul be contradicting himself with a ban on women in church when Pricilla and Aquilas were key founders and teachers in the church and Phoebe was recommended highly as a fellow servant of God of the churches and of Paul? Several textual remarks provide further insight. The call to prayer in the face of pseudo-teachers and pseudo-teachings, addressed the men who were to stay well away from the arguments around. The term ‘ὡσαντείς’ forms a bridge to the next verse concerning women (plural). The term translates ‘even as they, in the same manner’ by which the women are also called to prayer with the men; their holiness concerns leaving the external appearances for godly simple dress code, which culturally is a radical break with trends, and verbal and public confession of their faith accompanied by good works. As Hamilton comments, “You cannot profess something in silence, nor can you profess something in private” (213).

Paul moves from plural to singular ‘γυνή’ in verses eleven to fifteen. This indicates that he is addressing one particular woman, known to Timothy, although not named, who has been teaching in church and exercising authority autocratically or dominating over a man. The issue suggests that this woman is pseudo-teaching, either through ignorance or consciously, like the other deceivers and pseudo-teachers. “I suggest that he had a specific Ephesian woman in mind as he wrote these words to Timothy. The context suggests that she was a vocal promoter of the false teachings troubling the Ephesian church” (Hamilton 214). Secondary issues concern what seems to be self-elected authority and the dominating of another male servant in the church, reflective of the

---

193 Ac.18:18-19; 24-26; Ro.16:3-5; 1Co.16:19. Observation is that Priscilla is often addressed first before Aquilas, perhaps indicative her spiritual consistency or character being honoured; Ro.16:1-2.

194 1Co.5:1, 3, 5, 11; 7:12; 11:4; 12:21 support Paul’s tactic of not always naming. 1Ti.1:19-20 does so.

characteristics of the ‘Fall’. The prohibition to teach appears to be based on the false teaching of one woman rather than a general or universal rule. Silence and submission are the same terms that are employed in verse two and therefore are not perceived as punitive. The terms are reminiscent of Rabbinic tradition where learning preceded teaching, observance and practice.\footnote{Dt.5:1; 17:19.} That specific woman is counselled to withdraw from teaching to give herself to the study of the Word of God. In order to teach, she requires to be correctly and rightly taught. The deceiving of Eve is applicable, although Eve’s action was out of ignorance, where Adam’s was wilful and conscious. In keeping with the context Hamilton comments, “Eve’s problem was Adam, a bad teacher” (223). The reference may also address the content of the false teaching from the religious context of Artemis the mother goddess, creator, and source of life. The final comment about women (plural) is to the childbearing that cannot refer to a literal reality. This is a unique biblical reference employing the definite article preceding the noun, which Hamilton suggests refers to ‘the Child’ of the proto-evangel, Christ the Redeemer, still able to save in this situation (224). Another cultural reading suggests that due to the rate of abortions caused through temple sexual worship, as much as licentious culture, (McKechnie 198-199, 215), keeping a child is encouraged as an expression of redemption. The ontological view finds no substantiate evidence for the generic silence and non-participation of women in Christ and ministering in Him.\footnote{See also Hamilton 221.}

“Let your women keep silent in the churches, for they are not permitted to speak; but they are to be submissive, as the law also says. And if they want to learn something, let And if they want to learn something, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for women to speak in church” (NKJV 1Co.14:34-35).

Context in this text is of the utmost importance. Paul’s major section concerning public worship encompasses chapter eleven to chapter fourteen. Within chapter fourteen, verses twenty-six to forty compose a highly structure chiasm.\footnote{Structure: vs.26 the question; A1: vs.27-28 2 or 3 tongues; B1: vs.29-32 2 or 3 prophecies and revelation; C1 vs.34-35 women silent; D1: vs.33 God of order; C2: vs.33-36 women not to speak; B2 vs.39a prophecy; A2: vs.39:b tongues; D2: vs.40 everything in order.} Structurally, Paul is bringing order to chaos in participative church worship, by three correctives:
A1 two or three speaking in tongues and only with interpretation if not silence
B1 two or three prophets speak, a revelation takes priority to be silent
C1 women not to speak but be silent as ask questions to your husband at home
D1 and D2 place the pivotal point of the section: God is a God of order, literally meaning absence of chaos or confusion. The structure works back up again this time the three ‘silences’ are followed by three affirmations:
C2 Women cannot speak ‘nonsense’\(^{199}\) (Hamilton 189) the word is not originated with women nor limited to men in church;
B2 burn with zeal to prophesy;
A2 do not withhold or deny speaking in tongues.

The argument from structure indicates that it is erroneous to force an imperative and generic silence upon women in church public worship, as it was clearly not the case in Corinth\(^{200}\). The definite article ‘ὁ’ in verse thirty-four is pointing to ‘these’ women, identifying a specific group of women engaged in a particular practice. The context therefore refers to practices that are not explicitly mentioned. Cultural research into Greek Corinth, indicates that women, from whatever background, were: second class citizens, for childbearing, for show in the Greek culture, and without education (Fox 145). The Jewish tradition was much the same. Through his correction Paul opens a radical opportunity to be educated spiritually at home,

This is often seen as a prohibition on participation, but it’s just the opposite: Paul was encouraging the women in their desire to learn. He was urging them not to stay on the side lines but to equip themselves for full participation in the Body of Christ ... Even while he was correcting women who were disrupting public worship, he gave them a way to better their lives… Paul did not make women taboo. He made chaos taboo (Hamilton 201, 202, 203).

\(^{199}\) ‘ě’ is absent in translation from the Greek text (NTIG and IPNT use the emphatic ‘ě’). The normative ‘Ě’ in a direct question implies a negative if something preceding (Zodhiates 706). Thereby comparing the silent command to an affirmative command to speak coherent with Paul’s thought structure.

\(^{200}\) 1Co.11:5.
In cultic terms Greek worship was frenetic, hypnotic trance, likened to ascent to an ecstatic spiritual state or connection. Paul’s word of ‘order’ is as radical as his word on women. His concern is that the whole body participate as member or articulation and that all be edified in Christ. It is understandable that the spiritual exercise of gifts in the young Corinthian church could be apprehended with the old habitual cultic patterns. That being so, the interruptions of chaotic practices in quantity and content; the questioning or challenging of the uneducated women who could not understand what was being spoken would interrupt the purpose of orderly inclusive edification. These women are to receive the teaching in an appropriate context, so that they too may participate fully in building the body in Christ. This interpretation is coherent with the ontological foundation laid and faithful to the wider biblical context.

**Some servant women**

Andronicus and Junia, a husband and wife, who are stamped as illustrious (‘ἐπίσημος’) in the apostles, clearly Paul perceives Junia as a quality of apostle in collaboration with her husband and the other apostles. On the basis of an ontological understanding of service and apostleship, both could be exercised in any of the five ministries in favour of the body of Christ. Mary, Tryphena and Tryphosa labour in the Lord, Paul’s term often refers to the exercise of ministry to the churches; likewise: Chloe and Kyria, Aristobulus and Narcissus, Nymphia and Lydia. Aquilas and Pricilla have already been mentioned as ministers and mature teachers of the Christian faith. Paul makes special mention of Euodia and Syntyche who are yoked intimately together with Paul, collaborators who have strived in the Gospel together with him. Implicitly they are preachers of the Gospel as with other members of Paul’s apostolic team such as Timothy, Titus, Tychicus, and Epaphras, etc. While they obviously have a broken relationship, Paul exhorts them to reunite with each other as they were with him. It is evident that he has

---

201 1Co.14:5, 23, 24, 27, 31 emphasize contextually the ‘all inclusivity’.

202 Ro.16:7.

203 Ro.16:6, 12; Ac.20:35; 1Co.15:10; 16:16; Gal.4:11; Ph.2:16; Col.1:29; 1Th.5:12; 1Ti.4:10; 5:17; Rev.2:3; Jn.4:38; Col.4:15; Ac.16:13-15, 40.

204 1Co.1:11; 2Jn.1:1; Ro.16:11.
future perspectives of collaboration with them in view.205 A final mention of Phoebe206 who Paul commends to the Romans. The term he employs of himself as apostle to apostolic ministry of building Christ, to exemplify the genuine sufferings of the apostolic ministry team with him; and of the Lord’s commendation.207 She is ‘διάκονος’ in the church of Cenchrea. The inference is that Phoebe is not in the office of deacon but, as this paper has sought to restore, ‘διάκονος’ as the disposition of those being exercised in the ministry of Christ. Paul asks the church to honour her and provide whatever she might need for she is a ‘προστάτης’. The term means protective caring guardian of the church including a strong sense of giving generously of herself. The verb is used of ‘πρεσβύτερος’, ‘ἐπίσκοπος’ and ‘διάκονος’.208 If viewed in terms of function and office then, Phoebe could be ‘positioned’ as deacon. But the ontological imperative demonstrates that she is considered a ministering elder, Christ exercising a primarily pastor, shepherding ministry through her. A reminder that the term places her facing Christ, one of the first ones to learn, integrate and demonstrate the truth in the church. She is therefore model in Christ, manifesting her ability to stand immovable as a model and to cause others to stand in like manner.

This concludes the key elements in the ontological model of church and ministry concerning the biblical place and significance of women.

**How ontological church works**

Ontological church is expressed in the gathering of believers in union in Christ and Trinity indwelling them. The images God employs to describe the church of his intentions reinforce continuously the Christo-centricity of being and operation. In this light, every believer is a worshipper and a minister because of the Trinitarian indwelling. If each one receives the gift of the Persons of the Godhead, then Godhead in them will exercise any ‘χάρισμα’, the ‘διακονία’ and the ‘ἐνέργημα’ according to the measure of the indwelling Trinity. The five ministries: apostle, prophet, teacher, evangelist, and pastor are given particularly to the body to accomplish the six apostolic priorities, as explicated

---

205 Ph.4:1-3.

206 Ro.16:1-3.

207 2Co.3:1-3; 4:2; 5:12; 6:4-11; 10:18.

208 1Th.5:12; 1Ti.3:4, 5, 12, 17; of the believers Tit.3:8,14.
precedently. Each believer will exercise the necessary measure to perfect the body of believers. This redirects ministry with clarity in ‘καταρτισμός’ purpose: restoration, preparation, equipping, making ready thoroughly and completely which is largely synonymous with ‘ἀποστέλλω’. The mature ontological church reflects the ministries of Christ apostolically enabling the body of believers to operate organically in Christ to edify effectively and autonomously itself as the body - the purpose of the five ministries. The process is: that which originates in Godhead, incarnate in believers, exercised for the building up of the believers into Christ the ‘κεφαλή’ for qualitative perfecting in Him.

The concept of the traditional church service follows a structured linear approach whereby through the various observances and rituals performed, participatory or not, time is allotted to primary functions that form part of the structure of worship: preaching, worship in song, prayer, communion, financial giving, fellowship, etc.\textsuperscript{209} In general, the primary text in Acts chapter two justifies the format. However, this interpretation is based on function and therefore an assumption is required to conclude that this is church defined. The ontological church understands that she is an existential entity and as such exists in God, outside of function. The cycle also indicates that it is not what can be offered to God, rather it is what originates in Godhead, flows through believers whereby Spirit, Christ, or Father exercise collaboratively their ministry to the body, in whatever form that take, within the biblical parameters. In this, the sole leadership of the Spirit takes prominence. Ontological Church is not a pre-programmed event rather a live immediate experience of what God delights to reveal and minister to His church. The language is constructing an experience of church whereby: believers in Christ participate as ‘limb and articulation’; the Spirit builds a collective experience of presence, encounter, and demonstration\textsuperscript{210} as distinguished from the functional, directional, and linear. The potential participation of all gathered upon these truths, puts the emphasis on being church. This is realized and experienced through the ‘κοινωνία’ of Christ, relating each one gathered; Christ in each one discerning and relating to Him in the other person – that is the first experience of church. The apostolic ministries enable the gathering together of the threads of the participants, ‘building’ an experience of Church the Body of Christ whereby the participation in word, prayer, prophesy, teaching, encouragement or song

\textsuperscript{209} Ac.2:42.

\textsuperscript{210} Ex.29:46; 40:33-38; Lev.26:11-12; Dt.10:21; Zc.2:5; Mt.18:19-20; Jn.4:23-24; Ph.3:3.
find inspiration in the Spirit’s presiding, which builds one stone of edification upon another following the inspiration. This collective action leading to a sense of the Spirit accomplishing what is necessary to enable the body to receive from and divinely growth into the ‘κεφαλή’ that is Christ – the completion of the cycle renewed at every gathering to be church.

Growth Movement: Reproduction, Multiplication, Spheres

Besides current strategic and research-based visions calculated and implemented for growth, there is an ontological and organic model that respects the Christo-centricity of Church. If church is in Christ, if the growth of God deepens and expands, towards perfecting union in believers, then the greater the measure of Christ in anyone gathering, equates to the greater potential for organic growth. In this view, ontological growth is the multiplication or reproduction of Christ. In this model, whatever size of church group, the principle stands that in Christ and Godhead every ‘χάρισμα’, the ‘διακονία’ and the ‘ἐνέργημα’ and every ministry are available according the exercise of the Trinity in each believer individually and collectively, not because of the believers but because of God. If believers participate in Godhead, growing in the measure of Their ministry, into Christ the ‘κεφαλὴ’ Head, Source and Centre, then they will be perfected to the full measure and stature in Christ, through the apostolic principles being ministered. There will come a time when the presence and demonstration of Christ is intensified qualitatively and quantitatively that one gathered church cannot contain the fullness manifest. At that specific point, growth will organically multiply or reproduce. The infinite Christ reproduces His DNA in each believer and therefore the perennation is assured, because of who He is rather than human resource or strategy. According to a principle of innate human nature, with each generational transition there is a diminution or loss of the quality of the original intention. As multiplication occurs due to the increasing measure of Christ, simultaneously will increase the ‘μέτρον’ of the incarnate Christ, Spirit and Father to develop the corresponding measure of apostolic ministries whose exercise draws the threads of multiplied churches together into Christ.

While Paul struggled to maintain these relational and spiritual qualities in some churches,\(^\text{211}\) he nonetheless does not detract from the ontological reality of Christ in the

\(^{211}\) Gal.4:19-20; 5:7-9; Ep.5:17-24; Ph.2:1-2; Col.1:24-29; 2:6, 20-3:4; 1Th.1:5-8; 2:13; 3:11-13.
believer and church and them in Him - the unshakeable cornerstone, and the sufficiency of Christ.

Movement

God instigates movements in this likeness: Creation, by the spoken divine word, was the beginning of a far-reaching movement of human relational history with creation more so with God. God called Abraham and initiated a covenant movement in view of a people of faith and relationship with a collaborative God that would provide identity, belonging, purpose and destiny. The greater the degree of institutionalization of the people of Israel, the more God’s movement manifest itself through the Prophets, to show the centrality of God in His movement and in His history. Trinity in the NT continues to engender significant movements.212 The significance of the incarnation in Christ with regards to an ontological movement of God, is the prototype of existential and ontological reciprocal union as the basis for a new humanity. A movement founded upon qualitative life of substance, essence, and nature.213 Jesus incarnates a movement of regeneration and renewal.214 The observable criteria for such a movement apply to the present ontological development of church: the origin and initiation are identified as specifically in Godhead;215 it can only be manifest through divine means;216 it is firstly qualitative in nature;217 it is exponential, beyond human control or management;218 it assembles then it releases and diffuses.219

This concludes some practical principles that give ontological form to church.

212 Six key movements engendered by God and distinguished by the innate reflection of the divine existentially or operationally: Incarnation in Christ, Kingdom Come, Relational Disciples, Bind and Loosen in heaven and on earth, Missional Witness, Apostolicity.


214 Mt.9:16-17; Mk.2:18-22.

215 Mt.21:42; Ac.4:11-12; Gal.4:4-5; Ac.1:4-5; 2:1-4; 13:1-4.

216 Jn.15:4; Ac.1:8; Gal.1:15-16.

217 Mt.13:18-23; 31-33; 21:33, 43; Jn.7:38-39; Jn.15:5.

218 Ac.2:5-12; 8:1, 4; 9:15.
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Chapter Two

Fig. 1  ATTRIBUTES OF THE THREE PERSONS OF THE GODHEAD

Demonstrating divinity and equality in consubstantiality through ontological and moral attributes of the three Persons of the Godhead.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>FATHER</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>SPIRIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omnipresence</td>
<td>Jer.23:23-24; Ps.139:7-12</td>
<td>Mt.18:20; 28:20; Jn.3:13; Ph.3:21</td>
<td>Ps.139:7-12; Jer.23:23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omniscience</td>
<td>Ps.139:1-4; 147:4-5; Mt.11:21</td>
<td>Mt.11:27; Jn.2:24-25; 21:17; Rev.2:23</td>
<td>Is.40:13-14; 1Co.2:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnipotence</td>
<td>Ge.17:1; Mt.19:26; Rev.19:6</td>
<td>Is.9:6; Jn.5:17; Ph.3:21; Heb.1:3; Rev.11:17</td>
<td>Ez.37:5-8; Ro.15:19; 1Co.12:4-6, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto-existence</td>
<td>Ex.3:14; “I Am”</td>
<td>Jn.8:58; 8:18</td>
<td>Ge.1:2; Job.32:8, 33:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immutability</td>
<td>Ps.102:27; Mal.3:6; Jm.1:17</td>
<td>Heb.1:1; 10-12; 13:8</td>
<td>Is.40:13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality/Identity</td>
<td>Ex.6:2, 6, 29; Lev.18:4 “Your God”; 20:26; Ps.50:7; Is.41:13; 43:1, 21; 45:3</td>
<td>Jn.14:9-10</td>
<td>Identity by action: Num.11:17, 29; Num.24:2; 27:18; Jud.3:10; 6:34; 1Sa 10:6; 1Sa.16:13; Jn.4:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinite</td>
<td>Ex.3:14; Ex.44:6; Is.41:4; 43:10, 13; 44:24-25; 45:7, 11-12, 18; 48:6-7; 48:12-13; 1Kg.8:27; Ps.145:3; Ac.17:24</td>
<td>Mt.18:20; Jn 6:51; Jn.17:10; Rev.1:8, 18</td>
<td>1Kg.18:12; 2Kg.2:16; Is.40:6-7, 13; Ez.37:9; Jn.14:17; Ac.1:8; Jl. 2:17-18; Ac.2:17; 1Co.2:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eternity</td>
<td>Ge.1:21:23; Ps.90:2</td>
<td>Is.9:6; Jn.1:1-2; 8:58; Jn.11:25; Jn.17:5; Ro.14:11; Rev.1:8, 17, 18; 22:13</td>
<td>Jn.14:17; Heb.9:14; Ro.8:11; Ro.14:17; 1Pe.4:14;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>Jn.4:23-24</td>
<td>Jn.3:34; 2Co.3:17-18</td>
<td>1Co.2:10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfection</td>
<td>Lev.19:4, 31 (no other gods); Is.44:6; Is.46:5, 9; Mal.3:6; Dt.32:4</td>
<td>Is.11:2-3; 42:3; Jn.14:9-10; Jn.17:10</td>
<td>Is.11:2-3; Jn.3:34; Rev.22:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovereignty</td>
<td>Ep.1:21</td>
<td>Mt.28:19; 1Pe.3:22; Ph.2:10-11</td>
<td>Is.40:13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just/Justice</td>
<td>Is.50:8-9; Jer.9:24; 33:17</td>
<td>Jer.33:15; 1Jn.1:9; 2:2</td>
<td>Is.28:6; Ro.14:17; 1Ti.3:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>Ex.34:6; Dt.7:9, Ps.36:5; 100:5; 1Pe.4:19</td>
<td>2Th.3:3; Heb.2:17; 3:2, 5; 1Jn.1:9</td>
<td>Jn.14:25-26; 16:13-15; Heb.10:15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. II  FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT IN TRINITY

In order to evidence consubstantiality in nature, and ontological equality where attribution appears to differentiate individual properties as distinct when they are part of consubstantial sharing of the perfect nature.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
<th>Relevant Scripture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Love 'φιλαδελφία'</td>
<td>2Pe.1:7</td>
<td>Jn.11:3, 36; 15:14-15; 16:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy 'χαρά'</td>
<td>Gal.5:22-23;</td>
<td>Jn.15:11; 16:24; 17:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cause, opportunity, to give</td>
<td>Ro.14:17-18; 15:13; 1Th.1:6; 2Co.7:4; Ac.13:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace 'εἰρήνη'</td>
<td>Gal.5:22-23;</td>
<td>Jn.14:27; 16:33; Ro.5:1; Ac.10:36; Ep.2:14; Col.3:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Holistic term)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience, Constance √</td>
<td>Gal.5:22-23;</td>
<td>Ep.4:2; 2Th.3:5; 2Pe.3:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'μακροθυμία' (self</td>
<td>2Pe.1:6; 2Co.6:6; Ro.8:25-6</td>
<td>Ro.2:4, 3:25; 9:22; Ex.34:6; Ro.12:12 (9-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good* 'ἀγαθωσύνη'</td>
<td>Gal.5:22-23;</td>
<td>Mt.20:15; Jn.10:11; Ep.5:8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upright heart, life in</td>
<td>2Co.6:6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goodness, kindness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness* 'χρηστότης'</td>
<td>Gal.5:22-23;</td>
<td>2Co.10:1; 1Pe.2:3; Col.3:12; Heb.2:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrity, benevolence,</td>
<td>Lk.11:13; Ne.9:20; Ps.143:10; 2Co.6:6</td>
<td>2Ch.1:8; Ps.106:4; Is.45:4; Ep.2:7; Tit.3:4; Ex.34:6; Ps.40:11; Ro.2:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good, gentle character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faithfulness 'πίστις'</td>
<td>Gal.5:22-23;</td>
<td>2Th.3:3; Heb.2:17; 3:2; 1Jn.1:9; Rev.1:5, 3:14,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true, reliable, believing; trusting</td>
<td>Hg.2:5</td>
<td>19:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Scripture References</th>
<th>Scripture References</th>
<th>Scripture References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gentleness ‘προφυτής’ § (Natural response of humility)</td>
<td>Gal.5:22-23</td>
<td>Ep.4:2; 2Ti.2:25; 2Co.10:1; Ps.45:4; Mt.21:5; Mt.11:29; Col.3:12</td>
<td>Ro.12:1; Ps.147:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-control ‘ἐγκράτεια’ √ (Prevail over self, with capability and authority (self-possession) compare to ‘μακροθυμία’ (self-restraint))</td>
<td>Gal.5:22-23; 2Pe.1:6; 2Co.6:6</td>
<td>Col.1:11, 3:12; Ep.4:2; 2Pe.3:15</td>
<td>Ro.2:4; 3:25; 9:22; 1Ti.1:16; 1Pe.3:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humility § ‘ταπεινοφροσύνη’ (have a just vision, estimation of one’s true value)</td>
<td>Ps.18:35; Ps.45:4; Ep.4:2</td>
<td>Ep.4:2; Ph.2:3, 5; Zc.9:9; Mt.11:29; Col.3:12</td>
<td>2Sa.22:36; Ps.18:35; Zp.2:3; 1Pe.5:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue ‘ἀρέτη’ (good, goodness, excellence, purity “Howd” splendour, majesté, vigueur)</td>
<td>2Pe.1:3, 5</td>
<td>1Pe.2:9; Zc.6:12-13</td>
<td>Job.37:22; Ps.96:6; 104:1; 148:13; 2Co.10:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godliness ‘εὐσέβεια’ (reverence, respect towards God)</td>
<td>2Pe.1:7</td>
<td>1Ti.3:16; 6:3, 11-12; Heb.5:7</td>
<td>1Ti.3:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just, Just right ‘δικαιοσύνη’ (righteousness)</td>
<td>Ro.14:17-18; Ro.8:10; Gal.5:5; Jn.16:8</td>
<td>Is.42:1; Ro.1:17; 3:25; 5:17, 21; 10:4; 1Co.1:30; Ph.1:11: 3:9</td>
<td>Mt.6:33; Is.50:8-9; Ro.3:25-26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TRINITARIAN ONENESS IN FUNCTION/ECONOMY**

Illustrative and indicative operations that exemplify unity, oneness in relationship in potency and working collaboratively, irrespective of which Person appears to be prominent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATION/FUNCTION</th>
<th>FATHER</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
<th>SPIRIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation of the Cosmos and Humanity</td>
<td>Ac.17:24-26; Is.45:7-12</td>
<td>Jn.1:3, 10; Col.1:16-17; Heb.1:2, 10</td>
<td>Ge.1:1-2; Job 26:13; 33:14; Is.40:12 à 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ’s birth</td>
<td>Ro.1:3</td>
<td>Jn.6:38, 1Co.15:47</td>
<td>Mt.1:18, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ’s Baptism and believers</td>
<td>Mt.3:17, 6:10; Ro.6:4-5, 11; Col.2:12; Ep.1:19-20</td>
<td>Mt.3:15; Ro.6:3-4, 8</td>
<td>Mt.3:16; Mt.28:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temptation</td>
<td>Lk.4:4, 7, 10</td>
<td>Lk.4:1</td>
<td>Lk.4:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ’s death and resurrection</td>
<td>Lk.23:46; Ac.2:24, 27, 32</td>
<td>Jn.2:19, 21; Jn.10:18; Ph.2:7-8</td>
<td>Ro.8:11; Heb.9:14; 1Pe.3:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redemption et Salvation (generally)</td>
<td>Ro.8:3; 1Ti.1:1; Jude 1:25; Job.19:25; Ps.106:21; Is.43:3, 11, 14; 49:26b</td>
<td>Gal.4:4-5; Jn.4:42; Ph.3:20; Tit.2:13</td>
<td>1Co.6:11; Ro.8:2-3; Lk.4:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indwell by Incarnation</td>
<td>Jn.14:16</td>
<td>Jn.15:4</td>
<td>Jn.14:23; 1Jn.3:24; 4:12, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATION/FUNCTION</td>
<td>FATHER</td>
<td>JESUS</td>
<td>SPIRIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communion ‘κοινωνία’</td>
<td>Ph.2:1; 2Co.13:14</td>
<td>1Jn.1:1-3; 1Co.1:9; Ph.3:10</td>
<td>1Jn.1:1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td>Ep.1:5</td>
<td>Gal.4:5</td>
<td>Ro.8:14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apostolic sending</td>
<td>Lk.24:49; 11:13</td>
<td>Jn.15:26; 3:34</td>
<td>Jn.16:13; Ac.10:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Spirit</td>
<td>Gal.4:4-5</td>
<td>Jn.8:14; 6:38</td>
<td>Lk.4:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church existence</td>
<td>1Co.3:16-17; Ep.2:19</td>
<td>Mt.16:18; Ep.2:20-21; Col.1:18</td>
<td>1Co.3:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graces, Services, Operations</td>
<td>Ro.12:3</td>
<td>Ep.4:7</td>
<td>1Co.12:4-7,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Lk.10:21-22</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mt.9:37-38</td>
<td>Lk.9:1, 10:1; Jn.17:18</td>
<td>Lk.4:14; Ac.13:1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence / Transformation</td>
<td>Ep.2:18; Jn.14:21; Ac.7:55</td>
<td>Ro.8:9, 11; Ro.6:3-5; 2Co.3:18</td>
<td>Jn.3:3-5; 2Co.3:18; Tit.3:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhortation ‘παράκλητος’</td>
<td>2Co.1:3</td>
<td>1Jn.2:1</td>
<td>Jn.14:16,26, 16:7,13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ILLUSTRATIVE OF UNITY, ONENESS IN RELATIONSHIP, INTENT AND OPERATIONS DEMONSTRATING SALVATION PROCESS TO BE A TRINITARIAN OPERATION ACCENTUATING INDIVISIBILITY AND INSEPARABILITY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATIONS</th>
<th>Holy Spirit</th>
<th>Jesus Christ</th>
<th>God Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberate/Set free</td>
<td>Ro.8:2</td>
<td>Jn.8:36; Gal.5:1</td>
<td>Ro.6:17-18, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justify</td>
<td>1Ti.3:16; 1Co.6:11</td>
<td>Ro.10:4; 1Co.6:11; Gal.2:16-17</td>
<td>Ro.3:30; 8:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash, Purify</td>
<td>1Co.6:11; Tit.3:5</td>
<td>1Jn.1:9; Tit.2:14</td>
<td>Ps.51:2; Ac.11:9; Jn.4:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regenerate</td>
<td>Tit.3:5</td>
<td>2Co.3:18</td>
<td>Ro.12:2; 1Pe.1:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctify</td>
<td>Ro.15:16, 2Th.2:13; 1Pe.1:2; 1Co.6:11</td>
<td>1Co.1:2, 30; 1Co.6:11; Heb.10:10, 14; 13:12</td>
<td>Jn.17:17; 1Th.5:23; Heb.2:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transform</td>
<td>Tit.3:5; 2Co.3:17-18; Ep.4:23</td>
<td>Ph.3:21; Gal.4:19</td>
<td>Ro.12:2; Col.3:10; 1Jn.3:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt</td>
<td>Gal.4:4-6; Ro.8:15</td>
<td>Ep.1:5</td>
<td>Ep.1:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate life</td>
<td>Jn.4:14; 6:63; 7:37-38; Ro.8:2, 11; 2Co.3:6; 1Co.15:45; 2Co.3:3; Gal.5:25; 1Pe.3:18</td>
<td>Jn.1:4; 5:21, 26; 6:35, 51, 54; 10:10; Jn.11:25-26 Jn.14:6, 19; Ro.8:11; 1Co.15:45; 2Co.4:10; Gal.2:20; Ep.2:5; Ph.1:21; Col.2:13; 3:3, 4; 1Pe.2:4</td>
<td>Jn.5:21, 26; 6:57; Ac.17:25, 28; Ro.4:17; 2Co.6:16; Ep.4:18; 1Ti.6:13; 1Pe.4:6; 1Jn.5:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Scriptures</td>
<td>1Jn.1:1; 5:11; Rev.1:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power/Strengthen or Enable</td>
<td>Lk.4:14; Ac.1:8; Ro.15:13, 19; 1Co.12:10, 28; Gal.3:5; Ep.3:16, 20; 1Th.1:5; 2Ti.2:7</td>
<td>Mt.11:20; Lk.4:14; 9:1; Ac.2:22; 1Co.5:4; Ph.3:10; Col.1:11; Heb.1:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reveal, Give understanding</td>
<td>1Ch.28:12; Lk.24:45; 1Co.2:10, 12; Ep.3:5; Heb.5:8; 1Pe.1:11-12; 1Jn.4:6</td>
<td>Mt.11:27; Gal.1:12; Lk.24:45; Rev.2:23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warn</td>
<td>Lk.2:25; Ac.20:22-23, 21:4, 11</td>
<td>Ac.16:7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent, Prohibit</td>
<td>Ac.16:6; 20:22</td>
<td>1Sa.9:15; 2Kg.17:13; Is.8:11; Ez.3:17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach</td>
<td>Lk.12:12; Jn.14:26; 1Co.2:13; 1Jn.2:27</td>
<td>Mt.7:19; 9:35; 10:5; 11:29; 22:16; 1Co.2:16; Ep.4:21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remind</td>
<td>Jn.14:26</td>
<td>Jn.16:4; Lk.22:19; 1Co.11:24-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>Jn.15:26; Ro.8:16; 9:1; Heb.10:15; 1Jn.5:6</td>
<td>Jn.3:32-33; Jn.8:14, 18, Ac.14:3;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Verses</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graces, Services and Operations</td>
<td>1Co.12:11, Heb.2:4; 2Co.3:6</td>
<td>1Co.1:6; Rev.1:5; 3:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Render Worship</td>
<td>1Co.14:14, Ep.6:17; Ph.3:3; Jude 1:20</td>
<td>Ep.4:7-8; Ep.3:7; Ro.12:3; Heb.2:4; 1Pe.4:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercede and Access</td>
<td>Ro.8:26-27; Ep.2:18</td>
<td>Ro.5:1; 8:34; Ep.2:18; Heb.4:14-16; 10:19-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love of Godhead for the believer</td>
<td>Ro.5:5; 15:30; Col.1:8</td>
<td>Jn.14:21; 15:9; Ro.8:39; Ep.3:17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose, establish, send</td>
<td>Ac.13:2-4, 20:28</td>
<td>Mk.6:7; Lk.9:1; Jn.15:26; 17:18; 20:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Console, support</td>
<td>Ph.1:19; Ro.8:26; Ac.9:31; Jn.14:24-26</td>
<td>Heb.1:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincce</td>
<td>Jn.16:4</td>
<td>Jn.8:9-10; Rev.3:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead, Guide</td>
<td>Ps.143:10; Mt.4:1; [Lk.2:27], 22:43; 2Pe.1:21; Ac.21:4; Jn.16:13; Ro.8:14; Gal.5:16, 18</td>
<td>Is.42:6-7; Lk.4:1; Jn.10:27; 14:6; Heb.2:10; Rev.7:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence and Govern</td>
<td>Jm.4:5; Ep.2:22; Ro.8:9-11; 2Ti.1:14</td>
<td>Gal.2:20; Ro.6:3-11; Ro.7:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1Co.6:19-20; Ro.6:13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fig. V</td>
<td>‘רûaḥ’ or ‘πνεῦμα’ as Character (integral to conscious self)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Spirit of jealousy: between a husband and wife (Nom.5:14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Spirit of rebellion: Moses to the Levites (Dt.31:27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Spirit of wisdom: Joshua (Dt.34:9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Spirit of lies: in the mouth of false prophets, ex. Micah (1Kg.22:22-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Lord awakened the spirit of Cyrus (2Ch.3:22) ; Zorobabel, Joshua, the people (Hg.1:14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Spirit of good will (Ps.51:12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>Spirit of Egypt to disappear out of Israel (Is.19:3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii.</td>
<td>Spirit of dizziness against Egypt (Is.19:14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix.</td>
<td>Spirit of justice (Is.28:6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.</td>
<td>Spirit of prostitution (Ho.4:12; 5:4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi.</td>
<td>Spirit of grace and supplication (Zc.12:10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii.</td>
<td>Spirit of python (Ac.16:6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii.</td>
<td>Spirit of holiness (2Co.7:1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv.</td>
<td>Spirit of dispute (Ro.2:8; Ph.1:17; Jm.3:14, 16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv.</td>
<td>Spirit of servitude (Ro.8:15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi.</td>
<td>Spirit of human: understanding or not revelation (1Co.2:11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvii.</td>
<td>Spirit of gentleness (1Co.4:21; Gal.6:1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xviii.</td>
<td>Spirit of faith (2Co.4:1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xix.</td>
<td>Spirit of your intelligence (Ep.4:30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx.</td>
<td>Spirit of partiality (Ph.2:3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxi.</td>
<td>Spirit of the world (1Co.2:12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxii.</td>
<td>Spirit of truth and error (1Jn.4:6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Chapter Three**

**Fig. VI**  DEFINITION AND FUNCTION OF THE SOUL IN JUDAISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rational soul Wisdom and moral judgment</td>
<td>Nutritive</td>
<td>‘nefesh’ vital element entering body at birth physical and psychological aspects of self Originates in ‘sefirah’ Malkhut (“kingdom”) – the congregation of Israel. (lowest form) at death hovers over the body 3 days in hope of restoration</td>
<td>Breath Literal or figurative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal soul Sensorial perceptions, controls motion or action</td>
<td>Sensorial (5)</td>
<td>‘ruah’ Comes into being when a person has overcome body and desires Ethical life Originates from ‘Tiferet’ (“grandeur”),</td>
<td>Inner being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

xxiii. Spirit of purity (2Co.7:1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vegetative soul</th>
<th>Imaginative</th>
<th>Religious teaching and practice</th>
<th>‘neshamah’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition, growth, reproduction</td>
<td></td>
<td>shape will and emotions rather than reason</td>
<td>Highest part of the soul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contains the spark of the divine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Produced through study of Tôrâh and commandments (‘Mishnah’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attains capacity to apprehend God and the secrets of creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emerges from ‘Binah’ (‘understanding’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At death returns to home with the divine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only part exempt from punishment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appetitive</th>
<th>Rational Reflective: acquisition of knowledge</th>
<th>Animating force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desires, emotions</td>
<td>Rational not alone; emotion and will form</td>
<td>Of a person, or at death</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Animals
| Substantiality Immortality | Coextensive with the body and inseparable from | Separable Immortal | 'hayyah’
'yehidah’
Added after Zohar compilation
Higher levels than ‘neshamah’
Acquired by spiritually evolved persons.
Soul of Messiah was ‘yehidah’ originated in ‘sefirah Keter’ (“crown”) – the highest emanation. |
Fig. VII  A DIAGRAMMATICAL REPRESENTATION OF THE SEVEN DYNAMIC COMPONENTS OF HUMAN NATURE

Human Being Composition – Identity

Fig. VIII  STAGES IN FRIENDSHIP

STAGES IN FRIENDSHIP

Random, General
Discovery
Complimentary
Proximity
2 or 3
Loyalty
Building
Reveal Self
Common Ground
Fig. IX DEGREES OF FREQUENCY AND PROXIMITY

21st Century Witness – Friendship

FREQUENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANDOM</th>
<th>OCCASIONAL</th>
<th>REGULAR</th>
<th>HABITUAL</th>
<th>SOUGHT AFTERT</th>
<th>DEGREES OF OPENNESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 OFF</th>
<th>VAGUE KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>GENERAL KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>PERSONAL</th>
<th>INCLUSIVE</th>
<th>DEGREES OF INTIMACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. X DEVELOPMENT OF SPIRIT DYNAMICS FROM OT TO NT

DEVELOPMENT OF HOLY SPIRIT O.T. → N.T.

i. Background → i. Forefront
ii. Preparatory/Prophetic → ii. Experiential
iii. Selective → iii. Available to all
iv. Sporadic → iv. Permanent
v. Temporal / Transitory → v. Eternal
vi. Measured → vi. Fullness
vii. Specific to mission/task → vii. Origin of life & expression
viii. Exceptional → viii. Normative
ix. Provisional, Precursor → ix. Definitive
x. Promise → x. Accomplishment
xi. Symbolic → xi. Reality
xii. External → xii. Internal
xiii. Places → xiii. People
Fig. XI  HOLY SPIRIT RELATIONSHIP TO THE SEVEN COMPONENTS OF HUMANKIND

To show in diagrammatic form the substance of identity in the ‘πνευματικός’ believer, an integral member of the new humanity in Christ.

Figure XIII  DYNAMICS OF THE SPIRIT OPERATION

To demonstrate the collaborative nature of the existential relationship with the Spirit. In Romans chapter six Christ is actively operating death, burial and resurrection in the believer, who is passive. Romans chapter seven reflects the converse of human activity and the passivity of God. Romans chapter eight reflects the new origin and new ontological existence which in continuity operates on a collaborative basis. Fuller development of this concept would take into consideration the six ontological principles
of Christ’s relationship and operation with the Father and the Spirit.

**Dynamics of the Spirit operation**

**Fig. XIII** A SYNTHESIS OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO ESTABLISHING AN ‘ORDO SALUTIS’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>John Murray¹</th>
<th>Louis Berkhof²</th>
<th>Wayne Grudem³</th>
<th>R.J. Gore⁴</th>
<th>J.M. Boice⁵</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godhead: passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naivety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentimentality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person with/in the Spirit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansionist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godhead: active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of the unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skepticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis/Un-belief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectual Calling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospel Call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectual Calling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(faith &amp; repentance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


⁴ Gore, R.J. *Outline of Systematic Theology Revised Edition* 133.
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Fig. XIII  COMPLETE VISUAL REPRESENTATION OF UNION IN CHRIST
Chapter Four

Figure XV

CHRISTIANITY MOVEMENT OF EXPANSION IN FIRST THREE CENTURIES

The three diagrams represent a visual appreciation of the exponential growth.

---

Fig. XIV  
**MASLOW SCALE OF HUMAN FUNDAMENTAL NEEDS.**

A representation of human needs showing the biblical distinction whereby the Spirit in Trinity speaks, relates, and operates at each level of human need or development. The ladder is perceived in Jesus’ encounters however, the origin and source are not found in self or others rather in Trinity.
THE DEVELOPING OF ‘ΜΈΤΡΟΝ’ IN TRINITARIAN EXERCISED MINISTRY OF CHURCH THE BODY

Demonstrating how the ‘μέτρον’ of Christ in Trinity operating ministries is the origin of the specific measure which corresponds to the measure of Christ in a person. The greater the measure of Him the more expansive the sphere of operation, thereby correlating the two.
Fig. XVIII THE APOSTOLICITY OF ONTOLOGICAL CHURCH

Illustrating visually the Christocentricity of the apostolic church and the five founding ministries, and the six core values that are innate in Christ, each ministry manifest in Him and therefore in the apostolic church.

![Diagram of apostolic church]

Fig. XIX MODEL OF RELATIONAL PRINCIPLES IN CHURCH AND MINISTRY

Corresponding to the intent of Christ to invest Himself in people by degrees. Demonstrating the significance of qualitative, personal, and relational investment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2-1</td>
<td>Encounters with Jesus ‘en route’</td>
<td>The Gospel writers accord large portions to describing the personal interaction with individuals. The relational immediacy and time priority often result in supernatural demonstrations.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Peter, James &amp; John;</td>
<td>Three form an inner circle present at key moments in Jesus private and public ministry; greater insight and revelation of</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Group Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazarus, Mary and Martha</td>
<td>Jesus identity, (Transfiguration, Jairus’ daughter Tabitha). A circle of intimate friends; an open house: privileged relationship, teaching, ministry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Disciple band</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discipleship commitment to relationship, to learning, to sharing life through all circumstances; listeners and observers of Jesus in person and in ministry; school of learning Kingdom values and ways; an emphasis on questions and answers. Apostolically and divinely enabled and sent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Anonymous enlarged disciple group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Followers, Listeners, Learners, demonstrating discipleship commitment to Jesus; apostolically recognized, authenticated, divinely enabled by Jesus and sent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul’s apostolic band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul travelled often in a small team (2-5), within a wider network of collaborators. Known by Paul and in ongoing relationship with him, they were liberated into the service of Christ and the church. The relational quality between Paul and many of his collaborators testify to qualities, both personal and relational, shared values and commitment that result in apostolic sending.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Post-Resurrection/Pre-Pentecost</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They group of disciples Jesus ministered to during his 40-day post resurrection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciple Gathering</td>
<td>ministry; those in the upper room awaiting the effusion of the Spirit. To this group is given the universal mandate from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Eyewitnesses to the resurrected Jesus.</td>
<td>Paul speaks of this widespread group of people, already at work as witnesses and disciples. They are anonymous but known and empowered by what they have seen. These are already contributing to the expansion and transmission of Christ who may not have direct relationship or collaboration with Paul but are recognized by him.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multitudes Large crowd ministry</td>
<td>The generic crowd, a mix of the curious, sceptics, fans, fanatiques, and authentics. His teaching and ministry distinguish those who hear, see and understand with spiritual perception of Jesus, and the others. The crowd is fickle: the ‘hosanna’ of the Jerusalem entrance contrasts the crowd crying ‘crucify’. Jesus does not speak of the faith or fruits of the crowd who witness supernatural works and spiritual teaching. His concentration increases as the circle size diminishes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. XVIIX  DYNAMICS OF PARENTAL ‘ἐξουσία’ I

The following diagram figures the dynamics of parental authority with a child in the natural creational order and the same principles apply in the NT teaching of the heavenly Father and parental ‘ἐξουσία’ exercised in His Household, the family of God. The decreasing trajectory of the parent and the increasing trajectory of the developing child, traversing the adolescent crisis switchover towards mature autonomous adulthood.

![Diagram of Authority Dynamics](image)

Fig. XVIII  DYNAMICS OF PARENTAL ‘ἐξουσία’ II

This illustration concerns the dysfunctionality of authority; whether through a lack or the imposition of too much authority, in either case it is exaggeration; relevant to the development of a healthy spiritual authority in relationship to the Father in Trinity and Christ’s exercise of authority in the believer.
This trajectory is a person lacking identity, willpower, relationship. Fears, awkwardness with others, frustration - to want but not be able to do... Caused by a suffocating authority hindering the natural progression of development. The result is a person who is incapacitated to live their own life, destiny, projects, aspirations, desires.

The knot is the unavoidable passage from childhood towards adulthood. The relation of confidence, the desire to share are the only realities if they have been constructed during childhood. It is the healthy functioning of a « free » relationship between two adults who consent to live maturity and autonomy respectfully together.

This trajectory is a person having too much freedom and consequentially lacks internal structure. His will become negative & dangerous – chaotic lifestyle. It is no longer possible to take back parental authority.