

blood of Christ. The Council of Trent, in one of its sessions in 1562, supported its withholding Communion from children by saying that Communion, for them, is "not a divine command."

Protestantism in general has likewise withheld Communion from infants—except that, if a child accepts Christ at a very early age, he is usually considered to be a proper recipient for the Communion Supper.

See CHILD (CHILDREN), SACRAMENTS.

For Further Reading: Smith, *A Short History of Christian Theophagy*, 83-91; Smith, *A Sacramental Society*.
J. KENNETH GRIDER

INFANT SALVATION. Infant salvation refers to the destiny of those who die in infancy. Wesleyan-Arminians affirm that all infants who die will be saved through Christ's atonement, though they are born in pollution and in some sense bearing legal guilt. Jesus said, "Do not look down on one of these little ones. For I tell you that their angels in heaven always see the face of my Father in heaven" (Matt. 18:10, NIV). In Romans 5, Paul contrasts the consequences of Adam's sin with the benefits of the atonement made by Jesus Christ. Verse 18 declares, "So then as through one transgression there resulted condemnation to all men, even so through one act of righteousness there resulted justification of life to all men" (NASB).

All who fell in Adam are provisionally restored in Christ. His atonement provides salvation for all men—not to justify them immediately and unconditionally, but according to God's plan. Adults are justified by faith when they repent and believe. If an infant dies, the Spirit of God regenerates, justifies, and prepares it for heaven. Infant salvation thus depends on the prevenient grace of God, and not on baptism.

Olin A. Curtis (*The Christian Faith*, 403-4) rejects any concept of "unconditional regeneration." He contends infants are moral persons who reach full personal experience in the "intermediate state," as children do in this life. They come to know and freely accept the Savior as individuals under moral test. In companionship with Him, they achieve the equivalent of Christian perfection.

See PREVENIENT GRACE, ORIGINAL SIN, INFANT BAPTISM (PRO, CON).

For Further Reading: Hills, *Fundamental Christian Theology*, 1:433-38.
IVAN A. BEALS

INFANTICIDE. This has to do with the intended killing of an infant after it has been born. The practice has had a long history in primitive soci-

eties, especially in the case of unwanted females and of malformed infants. It is illegal in most societies today. But the permission, as in the U.S.A. (unless states make special prohibitions), of abortions even during the last three months of the gestation period is considered by many to be not entirely different from the permission of infanticide. In fact, when there are late abortions, and the fetus exits the womb alive, it is sometimes at least permitted to die.

See MURDER, ABORTION, CHILD (CHILDREN).

J. KENNETH GRIDER

INFIDELITY. See UNBELIEF.

INFINITE, INFINITY. *Infinite* (Lat. *infinitos*) is defined by Webster as "without limits of any kind." *Infinity* is defined as "unlimited extent of time, space or quantity." Webster quotes Raleigh: "There cannot be more infinities than one; for one of them would limit the other." Since this is true, only God can be said to be infinite. In Christian theology infinity is treated as one of the absolute attributes of God. All created beings, including man, are limited in respect to space, size, origin, power, and mind; hence, finite.

Man finds it impossible to comprehend infinitude even though he may define it. In mathematics, optics, music, logic, metaphysics, or any other discipline he can do no more than point toward what he calls infinity.

One of the problems of theology is that of describing the interrelation between infinity and finiteness. Leighton says: "God cannot be infinite in the sense that he can be anything we can think of . . . He cannot will things that contradict his fundamental purposes and aims . . . the only limitations on his actions are the self limitations involved in his own creative love and providence . . . God must be an unchanging being, the changeless ground of the coherent and intelligible order of change" (*The Field of Philosophy*, 337 ff).

See GOD, ATTRIBUTES (DIVINE), DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY.

For Further Reading: Wiley, *CT*, 3:217 ff.

JOHN E. RILEY

INFIRMITIES. The NT word *astheneia* is translated "weakness," "infirmity," and "sickness." In Rom. 15:1 infirmities refer to errors arising from weakness of mind or judgment.

Scriptures refer to infirmities in a non-judgmental way and assure us of God's gracious

enabling in the face of infirmity (see Rom. 6:19; 8:26; 2 Cor. 12:5, 10; Heb. 4:15).

There is no scriptural warrant for regarding either physical infirmities or mental weaknesses and any of their proper consequences as culpable sins, though they are part of the human condition resulting from the Fall.

Theologically, infirmities may be defined as involuntary faults and weaknesses in mental, emotional, and physical dimensions. They fall short of Adamic and divine perfection in ways other than by wilful transgression. So-called sins of ignorance, for instance, are violations of God's perfect law due to the infirmity of ignorance. While theologians differ in assigning culpability to such violations of perfection, all agree that there is no one so perfect in this life as to be free from these natural imperfections of impaired human finiteness.

Wesleyan theology carefully distinguishes mistakes (involuntary shortcomings) from sins (wilful transgressions); and infirmity from carnality. While the complete remedy of infirmities awaits the resurrection and glorification, redemption from perversity and carnality is possible now. Infirmities require compassion and healing, whereas sin provokes God's displeasure and needs forgiveness and cleansing. Infirmities of various kinds, are, therefore, not inconsistent with entire sanctification, as John Wesley clearly enunciated in his *Plain Account of Christian Perfection*.

Some infirmities—such as deficiencies of knowledge, immaturity, forgetfulness, prejudice, emotional impairment, weaknesses of temperament—are capable of improvement in this life. Others, such as certain birth defects, are not.

A catalogue of infirmities would include such diverse defects as poor judgment, dullness, errors of discernment, faulty reasoning, inferiority complexes, misconceptions, clumsy communication, etc. It is evident that infirmities bring much pain and inconvenience to others. They are, however, quite different in kind to sin, which requires God's forgiveness. An infirmity which is capable of correction may become sin, if, after detecting our fault, we choose to continue in it.

See MISTAKES, LEGAL SIN (ETHICAL SIN), SIN, GROW (GROWTH).

For Further Reading: Baldwin, *Holiness and the Human Element*; Taylor, *A Right Conception of Sin*; Geiger, ed., *Insights into Holiness and Further Insights into Holiness*.
JAMES M. RIDGWAY

INFRALAPSARIANISM. Infralapsarianism is one answer to the question in Calvinistic thought of the chronological order of the decrees of God re-

lating to creation and the fall of mankind. That is, it is one possible way of explaining predestination. Formulated in question form, the issue is: "Did God decree to save and damn certain men *before* the act of creation, or did He decree to create men and then *after* the Fall decree their election or reprobation?"

The assertion that God decreed salvation or damnation prior to creation is termed supralapsarianism ("*before* the Fall"). This view holds that before the foundations of the world were laid, God issued His eternal decrees. Thus the fall of Adam becomes a part of God's plan. In a sense, God is responsible for the Fall (*lapsus* means "Fall"), making election necessary. Placement of election subsequent to creation and the Fall is known as infralapsarianism ("*after* the Fall"). According to this position, God issued His decrees of election *after* the Fall, so as to redeem a part of His creation.

The respective positions are of theological consequence only for those subscribing to some type of Reformed or Calvinistic theology. John Calvin found it repugnant to speculate about the thought processes of God, but contrary to his pupil, Theodore Beza, Calvin's theology in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (esp. Book 3) is generally infralapsarian.

Wesleyan-Arminian theologians are not confronted with the dilemma within the boundaries of Wesleyan dogmatics. The question does not arise, for the nature of election is defined in different terms. Rather than referring to the election of certain individuals, Wesleyans define election in terms of class, namely believers. The gracious purpose of God is to save mankind, as many as believe. This plan includes provisionally all men and is conditioned solely on faith in Jesus Christ.

See PREDESTINATION, FOREKNOWLEDGE, CALVINISM, ARMINIANISM.

For Further Reading: Toon, *Hyper-Calvinism*, 3-31, 104-19; Wiley, *CT*, 2:334-79; Dayton, "A Wesleyan Note on Election," *Perspectives on Evangelical Theology*, ed. Kantzer and Gundry.
JOHN A. KNIGHT

INHERITANCE. In theology, inheritance refers to the benefits that come to man as a child of God. In the OT the word includes not only "an estate received by a child from its parents, but also to the land received by the children of Israel as a gift from Jehovah" (ISBE, 3:1468).

This inheritance was promised to Abram on the basis of obedience: "Go from your country and your kindred and your father's house . . . And I will make of you a great nation" (Gen. 12:1-2, RSV). The inheritance was to be "for ever"

(13:15), yet was contingent upon continued faithfulness to Jehovah.

"The patriarchs and people certainly looked to the possession of the land . . . but the light in which they regarded it, was that of a settled place of abode with God, where he would be fully present, and where they would find repose in his fellowship" (*HDB*, 2:472). In a similar vein David sings, "The Lord is the portion of mine inheritance" (Ps. 16:5).

The NT counterpart is the new covenant given to God's people—"the promise of eternal inheritance" (Heb. 9:15). "God . . . hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things" (1:1-2).

Paul reasons that if we are children of God, we are heirs of the Father. To make that concept fully Christian, he relates it to Christ, the Son and Heir. In Him we become joint-heirs of all the blessings from a Heavenly Father. Here the NT also indicates obedience as the condition for enjoying our inheritance. If we walk with our Lord in His obedience to suffering, we shall "be also glorified together" (Rom. 8:16-17).

In Christ we have "an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith" (1 Pet. 1:4-5).

See HEIR, EARNEST, ETERNAL LIFE.

For Further Reading: Bennett, "Heir" and Martin, "Inheritance," *HDB*; Baker's *DT*, 266; Easton, "Heir," and Hirsch, "Inheritance," *ISBE*. A. F. HARPER

INHERITED SIN. See ORIGINAL SIN.

INIQUITY. Iniquity describes man's violation of God's character. When a person denies God's holy sovereignty, by whatever attitude or act, he commits iniquity. As first demonstrated by Adam, iniquity primarily consists of disobedience to God (Gen. 2:17; 3:12). This has caused a breach between man and God. And only God can bridge that rift.

The biblical usage of iniquity teaches four key concepts. First, man is personally accountable for iniquity (Num. 5:31). Second, the ensuing punishment is only just (Amos 3:2; Isa. 26:21). Third, man stands helpless when faced with the enormity of his iniquity: "For my iniquities are gone over my head; as a heavy burden they weigh too much for me" (Ps. 38:4, NASB). Finally, the Bible teaches a sole solution. God alone can provide the forgiveness required to cancel man's guilt (Isa. 40:2; Ps. 51:2; Jer. 31:34).

The principal Hebrew (OT) terms translated

"iniquity" depict futile deviation from true virtue (*aven, avon*). Comparison of several related terms further clarifies the meaning: sin—failure before a declared standard; rebellion—deliberate revolt; straying—ignorant wandering; godlessness—willful ignorance; guilt—inner conviction of chargeable offense. The Greek (NT) terms for iniquity suggest injustice and unlawful activity (*adikia, anomia*). The following concepts also are related: trespass, or transgression—a specific violation; wickedness—a state of failure; impiety—a blatant offense against God.

Today the concept of iniquity has been severely undermined by vacillating values and humanistic philosophy. Certain theological camps have minimized the extent and influence of man's depravity and sinfulness. A weakened view of iniquity leads at once to a weakened view of the Savior, and a false gospel results.

Iniquity does indeed inflict deep stains. But they are not indelible. The blood of Christ is able to cleanse us (Titus 2:14).

See SIN, DECALOGUE.

For Further Reading: *Unger's Bible Dictionary*, 526; *IDB*, 4:361-76. WAYNE G. MCCOWN

INITIAL SANCTIFICATION. In Wesleyan circles, sanctification is described both as initial and as entire, to make clear that sanctification *begins* in regeneration and may be completed in a second work of grace, following regeneration. Thus initial sanctification is cleansing from *acquired* depravity (the guilt and pollution associated with the acts of sin), whereas entire sanctification is cleansing from *inherited* depravity (indwelling or inbred sin). John Wesley developed the doctrinal basis for sanctification, both initial and entire. "When we are born again, then our sanctification, our inward and outward holiness, begins" (*Works*, 6:74).

Initial but incomplete sanctification is implied in such passages as 2 Cor. 7:1 and Eph. 4:13. One of the clearest examples is in 1 Cor. 6:9-11. The Corinthians who were once stained by sin have been "washed . . . sanctified . . . justified." "Here indeed are both real and relative changes" (*GMS*, 458).

See ACQUIRED DEPRAVITY, NEW BIRTH, SANCTIFICATION, ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION, FIRST WORK OF GRACE.

For Further Reading: Harvey, *A Handbook of Theological Terms*, 214 ff; Wiley, *CT*, 2:423 ff, 474-76; Grider, *Entire Sanctification*, 137 ff. A. ELWOOD SANNER

INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE. The doctrine of biblical inspiration affirms the unique and controlling involvement of the Holy Spirit in the

production of the Bible. The activity of the Spirit is such that the Bible can properly be called the Word of God. This inspiration is unique in the sense that, as the term is used theologically, it applies to the Bible in a way and to a degree not true of any other collection of writings. The doctrine is violated when the assumption is made that the inspiration which produced the Bible is no different from the inspiration which prompts great hymns or great sermons.

Jesus and the NT writers saw in the Scriptures an immediate impulse of the Spirit so pervasive that they could ascribe the words to the Holy Spirit as well as to the human authors. In a general way this is implied by the formula, "It is written," used approximately 74 times, always as the final court of appeal (e.g., 1 Pet. 1:16). The Scriptures are not only called "holy" (Rom. 1:2; 2 Tim. 3:15), but universally treated as holy with a deference amounting to complete faith and submission. The belief of Jesus and the apostles that "the scripture cannot be broken" (John 10:35) and that the prophetic elements must be fulfilled (e.g., Mark 14:49; Luke 24:44) are further testimony to the divine origin and hence the inviolable authority of the OT.

But the direct ascribing of the words of the OT to the Holy Spirit, noted above, is unmistakable. Jesus said that David "in the Spirit" called the coming Messiah "Lord" (Matt. 22:43, NASB). Our Lord responded to Satan in the wilderness by quoting Deut. 8:3: "Man shall . . . live . . . on every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:4, NASB). That Jesus equated these words not just with some original oral pronouncement by God but with their preservation in the Bible is clear from "It is written" and subsequent frequent references to the OT.

It is equally clear that Jesus did not confine the Word of God to specific instances of "Thus saith the Lord" which were recorded in the Bible, but to the Scriptures themselves. There is no "God said" prefacing Gen. 2:24—"For this cause a man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave to his wife" (NASB); on the surface this is the writing of Moses. But Jesus ascribed Moses' word here to God: "Haven't you read . . . that . . . the Creator 'made them male and female,' and said, 'For this reason . . . ?'" (Matt. 19:4-5, NIV). Moses was the penman, but the words were God's—hence the authority.

This was Zacharias' understanding too. God's action in raising up Christ was the fulfillment of what "He spoke by the mouth of His holy prophets from of old" (Luke 1:70, NASB). This view of Scripture is echoed by Peter: "Brothers, the Scrip-

ture had to be fulfilled which the Holy Spirit spoke long ago through the mouth of David" (Acts 1:16, NIV). If this view of Scripture was overly primitive and simplistic, the Holy Spirit did not correct them! For on the Day of Pentecost Peter speaks in the same manner: "This is what was spoken by the prophet Joel: 'In the last days, God says, . . .'" (Acts 2:16-17, NIV; 28:25). Paul's conception of Scripture was exactly the same: "The gospel he promised beforehand through his prophets in the Holy Scriptures regarding his Son" (Rom. 1:2-3, NIV; cf. Heb. 3:7; 4:3-4; 9:8; 10:15). It is apparent that the Early Church accepted without question the OT Scriptures as literally the Word of God. In its words God is speaking; since this is true, the words are valid for the Church.

The most direct affirmation of an apostolic doctrine of inspiration is in 2 Tim. 3:16—"All Scripture is God-breathed" (NIV). "All Scripture" would to first-century readers mean the canon of the OT, corresponding to the 39 books with which we are familiar. The KJV phrase "given by inspiration of God" is better rendered "God-breathed," since it translates a single word, *theopneustos*: *theo*, "God," and *pneustos*, "breathe" (from *pneō*, "to breathe"). Inspiration is in-breathing. That the Third Person of the Trinity is the active Agent in this inspiring is affirmed by Peter: "For prophecy never had its origin in the will of man, but men spoke from God as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit" (2 Pet. 1:21, NIV). This is the *written* word, not merely the spoken, as the context shows. As Bishop Westcott observes: "The book is thus rightly said to be inspired no less than the Prophet" (quoted by Thomas, *The Holy Spirit of God*, 155).

The Bible does not explain how the Spirit "carried along" the speaking and writing prophets. The Church has almost been unanimous—at least in modern times—in rejecting the theory of dictation, i.e., that the human writers were completely passive instruments. The evidences of very human individuality in style and method, including active research (Luke 1:1-4), are too overwhelming to permit any theory which reduces the writers to mere puppets. They doubtless were aware of divine aid and impulse, and as a consequence often sensed that they were writing beyond their understanding (1 Pet. 1:10-12); yet they were equally aware of intense intellectual activity which resulted in stylistic peculiarities which would have been theirs without inspiration. As Thomas says: "No theory of inspiration can satisfy the conditions which allows

the human to exclude the Divine at any point, or the Divine to supersede the human" (*ibid.*, 156).

A so-called dynamic theory has often been understood to imply that the Holy Spirit impressed the mind with thoughts but left writers entirely uninfluenced in their choice of words. In this case we are compelled to speak of inspired men, but can hardly speak of an inspired Bible. If in no sense did the inspiration extend to the words, then it did not reach the concrete volume which we hold in our hands and read. How do we know that the words accurately express the Spirit-given thoughts? Or even perhaps distort them? The *thoughts* died with the writers.

On the other hand the theory of *verbal* inspiration has been often misunderstood to imply simple dictation. But the best adherents of verbal inspiration (e.g., Carl F. H. Henry, Clark Pinnock, R. Laird Harris) unanimously disavow an implied dictation. By verbal inspiration is meant that the influencing and superintending of the Spirit was sufficiently dynamic and dominant to assure that what the Spirit wanted said was said, without distortion or error. The degree of Spirit impression could have ranged all the way from occasional dictation, to heightened insight, to general overruling in the selection of materials.

Stylistic differences, in and of themselves, do not necessarily constitute a stumbling block to belief in verbal inspiration, as long as we steer clear of the idea of dictation. The words are freely chosen by the writer and are peculiar to him; but they express accurately and adequately the truth God intended. To extract this truth, these are the words we must deal with, and no others. If we believe the Holy Spirit led in the writer's free choice of words, then belief in verbal inspiration means that we do not try to correct the words or wish they had been different. To say, for example, "I wish Paul hadn't said that," is to do violence to a proper concept of inspiration.

Wiley defines inspiration as "the actuating energy of the Holy Spirit by which holy men were qualified to receive religious truth and to communicate it to others without error" (CT, 1:168). The fact of inspiration is uniform throughout the 66 books; the relative importance of the parts is not uniform, for they differ in level of *revelation*. Wiley sees that inspiration permits degrees of divine activity: *superintendence*, *elevation*, and *suggestion*, but he refuses to regard them as "degrees of inspiration," since to hold such a view is to "weaken the authority of the Bible as a whole" (*ibid.*, 170). He continues:

The error springs from a failure to distinguish between revelation as the varying quantity, and

inspiration as the constant, the one furnishing the material by "suggestion" when otherwise not available, the other guiding the writer at every point, thus securing at once the infallible truth of his material and its proper selection and distribution. For this reason we conclude that the Scriptures were given by plenary inspiration, embracing throughout the elements of superintendence, elevation and suggestion, in that manner and to that degree that the Bible becomes the infallible Word of God, the authoritative Rule of Faith and Practice in the Church (*ibid.*).

The Church gradually came to perceive in the documents of the NT the same unique inspiration which had been universally ascribed to the OT. The documents themselves are replete with evidences of awareness of divine authority, and 2 Pet. 3:15-18 places Paul's Epistles on a par with "the other Scriptures" (NIV), so divinely authoritative that to distort and twist them is to cause spiritual destruction.

See BIBLE, BIBLICAL AUTHORITY, BIBLICAL INERRANCY, BIBLICAL REALISM, PROPOSITIONAL THEOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Wiley, CT, 1:166-84; Thomas, *The Holy Spirit of God*, 147-63; Pache, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Scriptures*; Taylor, *Biblical Authority and Christian Faith*; Henry, *Revelation and the Bible*, 105-52.
RICHARD S. TAYLOR

INSTITUTIONS OF CHRISTIANITY. The institutions of Christianity are the social structures most essential to building the kingdom of God on earth. They are the family, the state, and the church.

The family. The Bible says, "God setteth the solitary in families" (Ps. 68:6). It is His good arrangement for continuing and nurturing the race. For Christ's followers the Bible establishes Christian family standards (Eph. 5:22-6:4). In this family the child first learns the meaning of love, he first hears about God, he learns to cooperate with others and to respect authority. Without Christian family reinforcement, the progress of the Kingdom on earth falters.

The state. This is God's institution to provide social order. The Bible instructs us to give respect and support to every agency that works for order and justice. "Let every person be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God" (Rom. 13:1, RSV; cf. 1 Tim. 2:2). Not all governments are equally good, but even a poor government is better than anarchy. The state that promotes order and equity is given divine approval; it deserves wholehearted Christian support.

The church. Only the church is unique to Christianity. The family and the state are acknowledged by other religions and cultures;

however, it is Christianity, through its Scriptures, which provides adequate information concerning the divine origin even of these institutions. From Scripture we understand their nature and purpose—and what constitutes a Christian attitude and relationship to them.

The church is the organization in which God's people relate to each other. Its roots are found in the OT people of God, but it came into its present form as the Body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:12-30). It is the embodiment and instrument of our Lord who said, "I will build my church" (Matt. 16:18).

The universal Church is composed of all spiritually regenerate persons. The term "church" is also used for a local body of believers. One is included in Christ's Church by becoming a Christian, but he finds adequate fellowship and ministry only as he lives and serves Christ through some local congregation. In the church we identify ourselves with the purposes of Jesus Christ who came "to seek and to save that which was lost" (Luke 19:10). We join in His ministry: "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly" (John 10:10).

These Christian institutions are not only basic to Christianity but also to society and civilization. It is not surprising, therefore, if they should be the objects of satanic attack in every generation, and also the objects of the antiauthoritarian hostility of the carnal heart of man.

Paradoxically the sinfulness of man may take the form, not of opposition to these institutions per se, but of perverting them to selfish ends. Christians must ever be on guard against allowing legitimate and necessary institutions to become masters instead of servants.

See STATE (THE), FAMILY, CHURCH.

For Further Reading: Purkiser, ed., *Exploring Our Christian Faith*, 393-408; Wiley, CT, 3:103-37.

A. F. HARPER

INTEGRITY. From the Latin word *integer*, meaning "wholeness," integrity involves moral uprightness and steadfastness, especially as it is revealed in situations that test one's commitments to truth, honesty, purposes, responsibilities, and the fulfilling of trust.

As God's people we have entered into covenant with God in response to His covenant with us. We have confessed our commitment to Jesus Christ as Lord. Integrity is our profession of that commitment in the world, our acting out of our life in God in concrete events.

To live with integrity is to attain a maturity which is a "measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. 4:13). No longer tossed about by

human deceptions and illusions, one who is thus mature is marked by settled beliefs, sound moral character, and perfect love, well tested in life's alternating fortunes (cf. Ps. 15:1-5, NASB).

See FAITH, FIDELITY, TRUTH, CHARACTER, HONESTY, LIE (LIARS).
NANCY A. HARDESTY

INTEGRITY THERAPY. This theory reflects a growing dissatisfaction with psychology's failure to recognize and deal with the problem of guilt. Stemming directly from the work of O. Hobart Mowrer, research psychologist and professor at the University of Illinois, and the influence of Anton T. Boisen, teacher and mental hospital chaplain, this approach recognizes that every person has a conscience, the violation of which gives rise to feelings of guilt. Like reality therapy, this technique rejects deterministic theory, holding that each individual is answerable for himself and responsible for making his own decisions.

The theory is reflected in two books by Mowrer, *The Crisis in Psychiatry and Religion* and *The New Group Therapy*. It centers in two major areas: guilt and integrity. Disillusioned by the Freudian approach toward resolving guilt, Mowrer came to see that guilt must be resolved through confession. Integrity therapy is concerned with developing individuals into responsible persons by means of openness, confession, and open action. Each individual is a responsible person with a value system.

Integrity therapy is not really a Christian therapy, although it uses much Christian terminology, such as *guilt*, *sin*, *confession*, and *restitution*. The reason that the technique, as represented by Mowrer, is not Christian is that the emphasis is horizontal, not vertical; humanistic, not redemptive. However, John W. Drakeford, in his book *Integrity Therapy*, has placed the theory in a Christian framework. With biblical safeguards, the technique becomes useful to Christian ministers. Drakeford concludes, "Mowrer's theories have been called an 'unfinished symphony' because they leave out the forgiveness which comes from God through Christ. If we are to put this doctrine back into its context, we will have to make the New Testament emphasis on the place of a changed life and behavior pattern in which the individual, experiencing forgiveness through faith, steps up to new heights of behavior and service to his fellowman" (145).

See REALITY THERAPY, ROGERIAN COUNSELING, PASTORAL COUNSELING, GUILT, CONFESSION (CONFESIONAL).

For Further Reading: Drakeford, *Integrity Therapy*; Hamilton, *The Ministry of Pastoral Counseling*; Mowrer,

The Crisis in Psychiatry and Religion; The New Group Therapy.
NORMAN N. BONNER

INTELLECTUALISM. This is the view that, in God, His intellect is supreme, so that it dictates what the will decides. An intellectualist is a person who believes that God's will is subservient to His intellect, so that God always wills to do what His intellect suggests to Him is the proper course of action. Thomas Aquinas (1225-74) was perhaps the most outstanding intellectualist of all the Christian era. In contrast, *voluntarism* is the view that God's will is what is supreme, and not His intellect. Augustine (354-430) was one of the outstanding voluntarists. An intellectualist, then, would say that whatever is right, God wills—whereas a voluntarist would say that whatever God wills is the right thing.

Intellectualism, in the extreme, would result in some form of rationalism, in which God would only be thought of as willing things that are suitable to His intellect and to ours. Voluntarism, in the extreme, has resulted in the doctrine of unconditional predestination—for, in this doctrine, God wills, sovereignly, before individuals are born, what their eternal destiny is to be. And, although this does not seem to our intellects to be fair, it is acceptable because God may will whatever He pleases, whether or not it suits what our intellects suggest to be correct or fair. Probably, on this issue, the correct teaching is somewhere between the extremes of both intellectualism and voluntarism. Arminianism locates somewhere between the two extremes.

See DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY, DIVINE DECREES, ATTRIBUTES (DIVINE), MORAL ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

INTENTION. The term *intention* is often used in Roman Catholic theology to designate a priest's purpose in the administration of the sacraments. Right *intention* along with proper *matter* and correct *form* makes a sacrament valid, according to Roman Catholic theologians.

The Council of Trent (1545-63) said, "If any [one] saith, that, in ministers, when they effect and confer the sacraments, there is not required the intention of at least doing what the [Roman Catholic] Church does, let him be anathema" (Canon 11:7). This canon, in effect, declared Protestant sacraments as invalid because Protestant ministers did not intend to fulfill all of the Catholic tenets in that matter.

The doctrine of intention helped to shield the Catholic sacraments from charges of magic by an official acknowledgment that they were invalid if

they were administered casually, in a drama or mockery, or by an unbelieving priest who did not intend to do "what the Church does." On the other hand, the doctrine increased the divergence between the Catholic and Protestant views on the sacraments. It strengthened the former's views that validity depends on priests; in the Protestant view validity depends on the faith of recipients.

Today this doctrine is of primary interest to Roman Catholics and Anglo-Catholics.

See SACRAMENTS, SACRAMENTARIANISM.

For Further Reading: ODCC, 696-97.

W. CURRY MAVIS

INTERCESSION. Intercession, in both secular and religious thought, implies a mediator, or go-between, who seeks to reconcile the differences between two estranged persons or groups. Intercession is the act of the mediator in seeking to resolve the estrangement. The need for someone to intercede for another may appear on any level of life: political, social, business, marital, etc.; but for the most part it is a vital *religious concept* that reaches far back in Scripture and is most often connected with prayer. Abraham is seen interceding with the Lord for his nephew Lot and the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah in Gen. 18:22 ff. The priest was seen as the intercessor between God and the people of Israel. Moses interceded for Israel in the incident of the golden calf. The prophets of the OT are said to have interceded with God in behalf of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

The supreme example of intercession is that of our Lord, who as the merciful and faithful High Priest offered himself without spot to God (Heb. 9:14) in order to make reconciliation for the sins of the people, and thus to become the Mediator of a new covenant (12:24). In doing this, He took upon himself the role of the Suffering Servant and bore "the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors" (Isa. 53:12). Paul tells us that because of this, God has highly exalted Him and given Him a name which is above every name (Phil. 2:9).

The resurrected Christ is now seated on the right hand of the Father (Heb. 8:1), and there in His mediatorial office He makes intercession for His followers. The people of God may rest assured that they have an Advocate with the Father, one who is unceasingly concerned about their perseverance and eternal triumph. The fact that He occupies His mediatorial throne also insures the salvation of the penitent suppliant, for "he is able also to save them to the uttermost that

come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to to make intercession for them" (Heb. 7:25).

Christ is actually continuing in heaven what He started on earth, for in the Gospels we often see Him speaking, acting, and praying on behalf of others. John 17 is a most beautiful example of intercessory prayer, and Christ taught His disciples to follow His example. The NT abounds with instances of the people of God interceding for each other or for unbelievers, so that today intercession is an important element of any well-ordered prayer.

The Holy Spirit is also spoken of as making intercession for the saints according to the will of God (Rom. 8:27).

See INTERCESSION (PROBLEM OF), PRAYER, ADVOCATE.

For Further Reading: Buttrick, *Prayer*, 104-6, 110-12; Pope, *A Compendium of Christian Theology*, 3:236 ff; Wiley, CT, 2:214, 299; ZPEB, 3:294. C. PAUL GRAY

INTERCESSION, PROBLEM OF. Why intercession is necessary and how it works is a knotty problem. On the human level intercession provides an essential link in communication and sometimes a basis for negotiation. Between God and man the intercessor represents the estranged sinner by proxy, until such time as the sinner pleads for himself. It could be that the goodwill of the intercessor, as a temporary substitute for the sinner, whose own will is still recalcitrant, can provide the holy God with a moral basis for continued divine action on the sinner's behalf. Yet such an arrangement would have to be viewed as a derivative of Christ's once-for-all mediatorial action, as the perfect moral basis for clemency.

The force of any intercession depends on the person of the intercessor. God is pleased to accept the prayers of an Abraham or a Moses who has earned the right to intercede by acquiring a personal relationship with God, and thus an authority, which God honors. By His own obedience and by His vicarious death Christ acquired this intercessory right in perfect measure. Christians who pray for others are entering into that right reflectively.

Yet the idea of intercession must never be construed to be an attempt to wheedle a deserved boon or release from a reluctant deity. This distortion forgets that God as the aggrieved party is the One who himself has provided in His Son the Intercessor. Intercession must therefore be viewed (1) as a one-on-one implementation of the Atonement, and (2) as an appeal to the bridge already established between God's holiness and man's sin. Intercession thus claims in

behalf of another the merit of Christ's blood, not for the granting of a deserved blessing but undeserved mercy. Justice would close the door; God is pleased to accept intercession, in Christ's name, as grounds for keeping it open.

See INTERCESSION, PRAYER, MEDIATION (MEDIATOR).

For Further Reading: Hallesby, *Prayer*.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

INTERMEDIATE STATE. For Christianity the idea of an intermediate state is derived from Jewish thought. Along with many other ancient peoples the Hebrews believed that the soul of man survived the death of the body. But of equal importance to the idea of an intermediate state is the peculiar Hebrew doctrine that for man to be truly man, he cannot be fragmented into body, mind, or soul (spirit). Therefore, the body and the soul of a man cannot forever be separated. These views gave rise to the idea of a resurrection at the end of the age when the soul would be reunited with the body, and thus each man would pass into the "age to come" as an integrated whole. The period between the death of the body and the resurrection has been called by theologians the *intermediate state*. The idea is the product of Scripture and reason.

In the OT, the dwelling place of disembodied spirits is a place called *sheol*—the nether world—which, at times, seems to be one vast domain, but at other times seems to be divided into two compartments: Paradise, a place of bliss for the righteous; Gehenna (or Hades), a place of torment where dwell the wicked.

During the intertestamental period the idea of an intermediate state continued to develop.

In both the LXX and the NT the Hebrew term *sheol* is translated *hadēs* in the Greek, and becomes "hell" in the KJV. The meaning of Hades in the Greek language originally paralleled that of *Sheol*, but it has finally come to mean the abode of the wicked dead.

Neither the OT or the NT tells us all that we would like to know about what happens after death, and varying opinions have sprung up concerning the intermediate state of both the righteous and the wicked. Some in the church take the position that the soul sleeps from the time of death to the resurrection. Others insist that if men do not accept Christ in this life, they will have a second chance after death. Still others define the intermediate state as "purgatory."

The traditional Protestant position rejects the idea of soul sleep, the second chance theory, and the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory. It does hold, however, that at death the righteous

go immediately into the presence of the Lord (2 Cor. 5:8), or Abraham's bosom (Luke 16:23), and that the words of Jesus to the dying thief (23:43) indicate that to be in the presence of the Lord is to be in Paradise. Thus the righteous dead are with Christ and are happy and at rest. Yet Paradise is not the final state of believers, for after the resurrection and the final Judgment (Rev. 20:7-12), the righteous enter into the joys of a new heaven and a new earth (21:1 ff). As to the fate of the wicked, at death they are banished from the presence of the Lord in Hades and are in a state of conscious suffering and unrest. However, Hades is not their final state, for they too will be resurrected (20:12), but only to be consigned to a place of everlasting shame and contempt at the last Judgment (vv. 11-15).

See HADES, PARADISE, SPIRIT, RESURRECTION OF THE BODY, IMMORTALITY.

For Further Reading: Brunner, *Eternal Hope*; Macquarrie, *Principles of Christian Theology*; Pope, *Christian Theology*, vol. 3; Wiley, *CT*, vol. 3. C. PAUL GRAY

INTERPRETATION, BIBLICAL. See HERMENEUTICS.

ISLAM. Islam is the faith of more than 500 million persons in the Middle and Far East. The youngest of the world's major religions, it was founded in A.D. 622 in Arabia by Mohammed. Islam means "submission." A Muslim is one who submits to the word of Allah, the One God.

Mohammed professed to be called by Allah in A.D. 610 to recite the divine message. What he received he wrote in the *Qu'ran* (Koran). Islam believes that the author of the Koran is God. The beautiful Arabic style of the literature, they affirm, could only be from God, not the illiterate prophet. Mohammed began to proclaim his vision, and in A.D. 630 gained control of Mecca, the center of Muslim faith.

Islam has spawned many sectarian groups, but there is a common body of doctrine. The articles of faith are:

1. *Belief in Allah*—He is One, standing alone and self-subsistent. Omniscient and omnipotent, he guides men by his revelation.
2. *Belief in Angels*—The Koran speaks of angels who carry out Allah's commands. The angels support the prophets. Gabriel is the chief angel.
3. *Belief in Prophets*—There are prophets both major and minor. Adam, Noah, Moses, and Jesus are major prophets, but Mohammed is the greatest of the prophets. Prophets are human. They are worthy of respect but not worship.
4. *Belief in Scripture*—Islam calls men to be-

lieve in all scripture (Jewish, Christian, and Muslim; there is no reference to Zoroastrian or Hindu Scriptures). The Koran is God's final revelation. Muslims also take tradition (*Hadith*) with great seriousness, but it is not comparable to scripture.

5. *Belief in the Last Day*—It is a day of resurrection and judgment and provides the greatest incentive for the Muslim to perfect himself.

Islam possesses not only articles of faith but a code of law (*Shari'a*) which regulates conduct. These are the "Five Pillars" of Islam:

1. *The worship of God*—The Muslim repeats the confession: "There is no God but Allah, and Mohammed is the prophet of Allah."

2. *Prayer*—Five times a day at specified times following a precise formula; e.g., at dawn he kneels twice, at midday four times.

3. *The fast of Ramadan*—During the ninth month the faithful fast and abstain from sexual relations from dawn to sunset. When one is able to distinguish between a white thread and a black at dawn, it is time for the fast to begin.

4. *Payment of a religious tax*—This is a responsibility of every Muslim. It is used for the benefit of the poor, for education, and even defense.

5. *Pilgrimage*—Once in a lifetime every Muslim is expected to go to Mecca, especially during the sacred month Dhu-al-Hijja. At Mecca all pilgrims are attired with a white seamless robe.

Of the five major sects that have existed within Islam, notice should be given particularly to:

1. *The Sunnis*—These are the traditionalists who follow a moderate rationalism. In interpreting the law of Islam, the community has responsibility. In effect this means the scholars trained in law consider a case and reach a decision or a consensus (the *ijma*).

2. *The Shi'ites*—They rejected the principle of consensus and place the authority for final interpretation in the hands of the *Imam*, the divinely appointed spiritual leader of Muslims, usually descended from Ali, Mohammed's son-in-law. The Shi'ites debate fiercely over the question of descent. Iran is largely Shi'ite and believes that the 12th Imam, Mohammed al-Muntazar, who disappeared in A.D. 878, is the Imam from whom their leadership is descended.

3. *The Sufis*—These are the mystics who developed a monastic life-style and sought union with God. They moved toward pantheism, stretching the limits of Muslim orthodoxy.

See NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS, JUDAISM, CHRISTIANITY.

For Further Reading: Cragg, *The House of Islam*; Par-rinder, *A Dictionary of Non-Christian Religions*.

LEON O. HYNSON

ISRAEL. This word has been used as the name of a man, of a people, and of nations.

"Israel" occurs first as the new name of Jacob who persisted one night along the Jabbok until he received a blessing (Gen. 32:22-32, esp. v. 28). This incident and two Bethel experiences (28:10-17; 35:9-15) show that Israel was called by God for the same purpose as Abraham had been. His descendants, "sons of Israel," were to become a company of nations and of kings (35:11; cf. 17:6), the possessors of the land in which Bethel was located (35:12; cf. 17:8 and 28:13), and those through whom blessing (or salvation) would come to the nations of the earth (28:14; cf. 12:3).

"Israel," as a shortened form of "sons of Israel," became the name of a people known from several references outside the Bible but most widely from the many hundreds of OT references. They were the people whom God delivered from Egyptian bondage and with whom He made a covenant at Sinai (Exod. 24:1-8) to be His "own possession," a "kingdom of priests," and a "holy nation" (19:5-6, NASB, RSV; cf. Titus 2:14; 1 Pet. 2:9). This covenant, along with the promise to Abraham and Jacob, was Israel's call to be the witness in the world to God, who loves and delivers enslaved people.

During the reigns of Saul, David, and Solomon (see 1 Samuel 1—1 Kings 10) "Israel" was the name of a nation, applicable in the main to all the tribes under one king. "Israel" was also the name of the Northern Kingdom following the division early in the reign of Rehoboam in contrast to Judah, the Southern Kingdom (1 Kings 12, esp. v. 16; see also 14:19, 29). Israel, the people or the nation which came under scattering judgment, never fully became the means corporately whereby redemption blessing came to the world, for this blessing came individually through Jesus, the Descendant of Israel.

From the time of the Exile onward, "Israel" was replaced by the term "Jew" with little or none of

its former national significance. However, it has regained this significance with the establishment of modern Israel in the Holy Land in May, 1948.

A major recent concern in numerous publications has been with modern Israel's biblical or "theological" right exclusively to possess the Holy Land, as well as with any present redemptive role of Israel. Political sympathies and differences in interpreting the Bible will continue to result in disagreement over these questions.

See DISPENSATIONALISM, DISPERSION, JUDAISM, CHURCH, MISSION (MISSIONS, MISSIOLOGY).

For Further Reading: Bright, *A History of Israel*, 105-373; IDB, E-J:750-70; ZPEB, 335-72.

HARVEY E. FINLEY

I-THOU. "I-Thou" refers to a concept given classical form by the contemporary Jewish philosopher and theologian Martin Buber, in his book, *I and Thou*. "Thou," in Buber's thought, has a special reference to man's relation to God. Here a kind of mystical oneness is found in which the particular things of the world (the It) are not disregarded but are seen in their temporal relation. The contrast between these two ways of thinking are expressed in Buber's own words as follows:

The world of *It* is set in the context of space and time. The world of *Thou* is not set in the context of either of these. Its context is in the Centre, where the extended lines of relations meet—in the eternal Thou.

Buber does not mean that what happens in this attitude is an experience; nor does he mean that it is a "content" received. Rather man receives a Presence and a power in which something happens, a meaning is assured, a meaning which relates to this life and this world.

The writings of many contemporary theologians, both Catholic and Protestant, reflect Buber's insight. Among Protestants are Emil Brunner, Karl Barth, Reinhold Niebuhr, H. Richard Niebuhr, and Paul Tillich. Catholics include Ferdinand Ebner, Gabriel Marcel, Erich Przywara, and Ernst Michel.

See EXPERIENCE, FELLOWSHIP, PERSONALITY OF GOD.
ALVIN HAROLD KAUFFMAN

J

JEALOUSY. This is a frame of mind which lays claim to undivided devotion, implying no tolerance toward any rivalry. It often involves deep and strong feelings. The word may convey a good or an evil attitude.

God tells His people that they must not worship idols. He gives as the reason, "I, the Lord your God, am a jealous God" (Exod. 20:5, NASB, NIV). God is jealous and accordingly demands what is His due, exclusive allegiance.

Jealousy is a good and wholesome trait when what is demanded is what is due. The Spirit's sanctifying influence generates sensitivity to what is right and good—there will be desire to give and to receive what is morally owed. The cleansed heart will be keenly sensible of the exclusive nature of some relationships. This aspect of the marriage relationship needs constant emphasis. Christian husbands and wives should jealously guard marital fidelity.

Carnal jealousy is indicated when inappropriate demands are made and ill feelings arise because those demands are not met. Jealousy, a neutral impulse, may be set in a wrong direction by a carnal heart, going beyond legitimate demands to seek that which is not proper. That attitude was demonstrated in Joseph's brothers. They were "jealous of him" (Gen. 37:11, RSV). That disposition of mind may also be described as "envy" (as the KJV translates *qana* in that text). Envy properly defines carnal jealousy. While jealousy may at times be righteous, envy never is.

A study of the OT words from which we get "jealous" and "zealous" suggests that those words have some common ground in meaning. Elijah says that he has been "zealous for the Lord" (1 Kings 19:10, NASB, NIV; the KJV and RSV translate *qana* as "jealous"). What is indicated here is deep and strong feeling resulting from sympathetic identification with God's will and purpose. The apostle Paul reflects that attitude where he says, "I am jealous over you with godly jealousy" (2 Cor. 11:2).

See ENVY, CARNAL CHRISTIANS, HARDNESS OF HEART, HATE (HATRED).

For Further Reading: Scharbert, "Jealousy (zeal)," *Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology*. ALDEN AIKENS

JEHOVAH, YAHWEH. Yahweh is the personal name, the covenant name for the God of Israel. He is called by this name more than by all other titles combined. It is a name which not only identifies the Person but also reveals His character.

The sacred name was first written by four consonants, YHWH, technically called the tetragrammaton. Considered to be too sacred to be pronounced at all, in its place was read *Adonai*, "Lord." The combination in writing the consonants YHWH and the vowels *a, o, a* of *Adonai* created the hybrid word Jehovah. This practice dates from the 16th century and thus appears in many English Bible translations. Some translations (e.g., KJV, RSV, NASB, NIV) use capital and small capital letters for the word—LORD—to designate the title.

The Hellenistic Jews, accustomed to using Greek, substituted *Kurios* (Lord) for the title *Adonai*. Hence the title *Kurios* appears 5,321 times in the Septuagint (LXX).

The meaning of the sacred name for the Israelites is clear. For them it meant "He who is" or "He who will be" (Exod. 3:10 ff). "When God himself speaks, He uses the first person, and the name becomes 'I am' or 'I will be.' . . . It is almost equivalent to 'He who has life in Himself' (cf. John 5:26)" (HDB, 2:299).

The Israelites perceived in Yahweh a thorough and absolute uniqueness. There is no other like or equal to Him. Hence their unswerving (when faithful to the covenant) monotheism. He alone is God. For them He alone creates, reveals himself, and imposes His will upon man and history. He has the power and authority to dispose over all things. He alone saves and judges. To Him alone belongs the Kingdom, and it is He alone who could and did provide a remnant to assure the fulfilling of His covenant with Abraham.

Yahweh is the One who has revealed himself, not only His name but His personal character, His covenant, through His mighty deeds. Of all His mighty deeds none is greater than His self-revelation through His Son Jesus Christ.

See LORD, NAME, GOD, REVELATION (SPECIAL), THEOPHANY.

For Further Reading: *HDB*; Wiley, CT, 1:244-49; *GMS*, 60-63.
JOSEPH H. MAYFIELD

JERUSALEM. Jerusalem became the earthly capital of Israel during the reign of David and continued as such for over 400 years. During that time, the Israelites increasingly regarded Jerusalem as the Holy City, as Mount Zion, the place where God dwelt with His people.

The Temple was built and rebuilt in Jerusalem, and here the Israelites offered sacrifices for their sins, praised God, and prayed. They understood that the Lord, the great King, reigned from Mount Zion (Ps. 48:2-3). Some even believed that the city was immune from destruction, and threatened to stone Jeremiah when he spoke against the city (Jer. 26:6-15). But the Lord did allow the city and its Temple to be torn down, due to the sins of the people. However, the city was not forsaken; it was rebuilt, and an eschatological significance, begun in the kingdom period and the Exile, was attached to it (Ps. 46:4-6; Lam. 2:15; Ezek. 5:5). The Messiah was to reign from Zion, and all nations would come to it to learn truth (Zech. 2:7-13; 3:8-10; 8:20-22; 9:9-11; 14:12-21).

The Messiah did come to Jerusalem, but He was not welcomed by its leaders. The crisis came when Jesus was put to death and arose from the grave outside the city walls. His death and resurrection and the Pentecost event gave the city a greater redemptive importance, an importance that survived its second destruction at the hands of the Romans (A.D. 70).

There was, however, a paradox in this new importance. The earthly city represented sin and slavery, but the new heavenly city represented freedom (Gal. 4:25-26). In the Book of Revelation, we read of a New Jerusalem that comes from God. It has no temple, for God and the Lamb take its place. This is the eternal city, the home of the saints (Revelation 21—22).

See ISRAEL, CHURCH, KINGDOM OF GOD.

For Further Reading: Barclay, *The City of the Great King*, 604-21; "Jerusalem," *Encyclopedia Judaica*, 9:1549-93; Oliphant, *Jerusalem*, 430-521; De Young, *Jerusalem in the New Testament*.

GEORGE HERBERT LIVINGSTON

JESUS. See CHRIST.

JOHN THE BAPTIST. He was the last and greatest of the prophets, an ascetic, and designated by the Holy Spirit as the forerunner of Christ.

After 400 years during which no prophet had spoken to Israel, "The word of God came to

John" (Luke 3:2, NIV). As a child of promise he was to be "filled with the Holy Spirit even from birth" (1:15, NIV). This designated him as a prophet who by the Holy Spirit would speak God's message to the people "in the spirit and power of Elijah" (v. 17, NIV). As a prophet he had the distinction of being the consummation of the prophetic order leading to the coming of Jesus Christ. Because of his unique position between the old order and the coming of the Kingdom, Jesus declared him to be the greatest of the prophets while at the same time making it clear that "he who is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he" (Matt. 11:11, NIV).

God's word to John was to call people to repentance and to announce the coming One and His kingdom and to give promise of a twofold baptism with the Holy Spirit and fire (Matt. 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33). The coming One he designated as the One who "has surpassed me because he was before me" (John 1:30), the One "who will baptize with the Holy Spirit" (v. 33) and "the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world!" (v. 29, all NIV).

John's baptism with water was closely tied to repentance and forgiveness. He came "preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins" (Mark 1:4, NIV). John did not and could not forgive sins. "But John's baptism was the expression of the repentance that results in the forgiveness of sins" (Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, 40).

The message of John centered in repentance—a radical change of mind and heart. Using Isa. 40:3-5 as a text, he warned of "the coming wrath." He called for "fruit in keeping with repentance" and judgment in the figure of ax and fire (Luke 3:3-9, NIV). To inquiring crowds, tax collectors, and soldiers he gave specific instruction of the moral implications of true repentance (vv. 10-14).

John's baptism included Jesus, but for a different reason than any other. Jesus' total identification with man's need included His participation in the symbol of man's need for forgiveness and cleansing, which in the new order would be made possible through the redemptive life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. So John could say to Him, "I need to be baptized by you" (Matt. 3:14, NIV).

See BAPTISM, WATER, FORGIVENESS, CLEANSING, BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT.

For Further Reading: *HDNT*, 1:861 ff; *ISBE*, 3:1708 ff.
JOSEPH H. MAYFIELD

JOY. Joy is an exhilarating emotion of pleasure. It need not be exuberant to be deep and real.

The experience may come with an increase of some good that we desire: wealth or education. It may be found in sensory experiences, in beauty, in mental activity, in moral achievement, and in religious devotion. It may occur with the discovery of a higher value, as when we find that kindness brings more satisfaction than selfishness.

The Bible affirms man's inherent privilege to enjoy nature, music, and social activities. But these natural joys are purified and intensified by a right relationship with God.

The NT recognizes rejoicing as one of God's gifts. Jesus' birth was the source of "great joy" (Luke 2:10). Joy is also one of the fruits of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22). Jesus explained the goal of His ministry: "That my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full" (John 15:11).

Joy is deeply linked with the gospel. Liberation from sin, recovery from lostness, and reconciliation with God move the spirit to praise. When life is enriched by God's blessings, we are glad. When we make progress toward goals for the spirit, we rejoice.

The joy of the Christian is sometimes overshadowed by temporal affliction, but never destroyed. When we walk with God, "weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning" (Ps. 30:5).

Because joy is an emotion, its intensity varies; at times it may even be temporarily absent (1 Pet. 1:6). But in Christ we have dependable sources of renewal. Paul urges: "Rejoice in the Lord always; and again I say, Rejoice" (Phil. 4:4). The prophet sings, "God is my salvation; I will trust . . . Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation" (Isa. 12:2-3).

See EMOTION (EMOTIONALISM), HAPPINESS, FRUIT OF THE SPIRIT.

For Further Reading: *Baker's DCE*, 356-57; Wiley, *CT*, 3:55-58; Taylor, *Miracle of Joy*. A. F. HARPER

JUDAISM. Judaism is the complex of Jewish beliefs and customs. It is based upon the teachings of the Torah (Pentateuch) as interpreted continuously by prophets, teachers, and rabbis down to the present time. The term does not appear in most English translations of the Bible. However, it is used in the RSV on two occasions: Gal. 1:13-14; Acts 13:43.

While beliefs and practices have differed considerably among various Jewish sects and parties, Jews have held consistently to the belief in only one God, Yahweh. Indeed, if Judaism can be said to have a creed, it is expressed in Deut. 6:4:

"Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord." Jews have considered themselves to be God's special people through a covenant relationship with Him.

Jews have accepted the whole OT as authoritative, but the Law of Moses, the Torah, is regarded as God's perfect and final revelation to them. Important, however, is the Talmud which provides commentary and interpretation of the OT. Out of these sources numerous practices have developed quite universally followed by the Jews. They include aversion toward idolatry, an insistence upon moral conduct, the following of certain dietary rules, circumcision, and sabbath-keeping.

Judaism holds that God is related to the world through creation which He has declared to be "very good" (Gen. 1:31). It, therefore, discredits extreme forms of asceticism and teaches rather that man's duty is to live life fully in this world intended for his habitation (Isa. 45:18). Judaism teaches that God is to send to earth a Messiah who will set up the kingdom of God in which the Torah will be perfectly enforced. Judaism says that by creation individuals are endowed with inclinations both toward good and toward evil, but with the capacity to choose which way each will go. Sin, defined as rebellion against God, is considered by Judaism to be common to the race; but through repentance individual sinners may find forgiveness.

Presently Jews are quite generally recognized as either Orthodox, Conservative, or Reformed. Orthodox Jews remain faithful to Talmudic observances, use Hebrew for public prayers, and consider the Messiah to be a real person. Conservative Jews may believe in the essentials of Judaism, but they adapt them to the modern situation. Reformed Jews, while revering their Jewish heritage, do not necessarily hold to the revelational validity of Judaism, give Prophets priority over the Torah, and practice communal good works by social action as a pragmatic Messianism.

There is also a small but growing group of Messianic Jews who accept Christ as the Messiah, consider the NT as a part of God's Word, but retain their Jewish identity, pray in Hebrew, and follow many other Jewish traditions.

See LEGALISM, ISRAEL, DISPENSATIONALISM, JUDAISTIC CONTROVERSY.

For Further Reading: *IDB*, suppl. vol.; Fallon, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Religion*, vol. 2, Jacob J. Petuckowski, *Encyclopedia International*, vol. 10.

ARMOR D. PEISKER

JUDAISTIC CONTROVERSY. This was the conflict in the Early Church over the question of the relation of Gentile converts to the Mosaic law. While believing Jews, especially Pharisees, accepted Jesus as the promised Messiah, they saw Him as within and as continuing the legal system of Moses. They failed to see that the Mosaic regime was preparatory and prophetic, to be displaced by Christ, not reinforced and augmented. If they had ever heard Jesus' sayings about the peril of patching an old garment with new cloth, or putting new wine in old wineskins (Matt. 9:16-17), they either had forgotten or failed to understand.

These sincere but misguided conservatives are called Judaizers because they supposed that to be saved, Gentiles must become Jews, and that this hinged, not simply on their faith in Christ, but upon their receiving circumcision.

The controversy raged over a period of years. It first came to a head in Antioch, where was thriving the first Gentile Church. Luke explains: "And some men came down from Judea and began teaching the brethren, 'Unless you are circumcised according to the custom of Moses, you cannot be saved'" (Acts 15:1, NASB). The vigorous opposition of Paul and Barnabas precipitated the first general church conference, in Jerusalem, at which Peter sided with Paul, and James, the half brother of Jesus, delivered a decision repudiating the Judaizers and vindicating the freedom party.

But the Judaizers were undeterred in their subversive campaign. Apparently they followed Paul for years, infiltrating the churches and agitating Gentile converts. Their insidious work prompted the writing of Galatians, and to a large extent Romans also. Galatians, says Robertson, is a "flaming torch in the Judaizing controversy. This Epistle was the battle cry of Martin Luther in the Reformation" (*Word Pictures*, 4:273).

Paul especially perceived the radical nature of the issues and the necessity of a no-holds-barred fight. While Peter argued that since God was already saving uncircumcised Gentiles, conformity to Judaism was obviously not necessary, Paul saw that the two systems, Moses and Christ, law and grace, circumcision and experience, ceremonialism and faith, were mutually exclusive, as the ground of salvation. To cling to Moses was to do despite to Christ; hence, "if you receive circumcision, Christ will be of no benefit to you" (Gal. 5:2, NASB). To trust in circumcision is to cling to the shadow and miss what circumcision pointed to—the circumcision of the heart (Rom. 2:25-29; Phil. 3:3; Col. 2:11). The watchword of evangeli-

cal religion is Gal. 6:15: "For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation" (NASB).

Paul's victory against the Judaizers was crucial to the preservation of an authentic Christianity. Today Judaizing tendencies are still with us, but in more subtle forms. The peril of trusting in rites rather than Christ is perennial.

See SACRAMENTARIANISM, CIRCUMCISION, LAW AND GRACE, MOSAIC LAW.

For Further Reading: Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, 354-56; Robertson, *Word Pictures in the NT*, 4:272 ff; GMS, 413-17. RICHARD S. TAYLOR

JUDGE, JUDGMENT. God is the Judge of all the earth (Gen 18:25; Heb. 12:23). He alone judges perfectly because He knows perfectly (1 Cor. 4:4-5; Heb. 4:12-13). He judges in righteousness (Gen. 18:25; Jer. 11:20; Rev. 16:7) and in truth (Rom. 2:2; Rev. 19:2). Human judges are to reflect divine judgment, else they judge falsely (Deut. 1:16-17; Prov. 29:7, 14).

Judgment, in the OT, is the activity of God in preserving His covenant by establishing a right order in society—by delivering His people and punishing His enemies (Deut. 32:36-43; Isa. 30:18-19; Ps. 7:6-11). Human champions raised up to deliver Israel are judges (Judg. 2:16-19), and juridical functions are secondary in their careers. The prophets emphasized the moral factor in their preaching of judgment: A disobedient Israel would be punished in the day of Yahweh as surely as the heathen (Amos 5:18-24; Joel 1:13-15). Daniel completes the OT vision of judgment, with the Son of Man reigning in everlasting righteousness and the wicked forever damned (Dan. 7:13; 12:1-3).

In the NT the day of Yahweh becomes "the day of the Lord" (2 Pet. 3:10). Final judgment is committed to Jesus Christ, whose total human experience qualifies Him to judge us all (Acts 17:31; John 5:22). This final judgment has cosmic significance, affecting the physical universe as well as its human inhabitants (2 Pet. 3:7-13). All will appear before this final Judge (Rev. 20:12; Rom. 14:10), whose coming in glory will effect the ultimate vindication of His followers and the ultimate destruction of His foes (2 Thess. 1:5-10).

This final acquittal of believers is brought forward into the present age as *justification by faith*. The death of Christ was judgment upon sin and Satan (John 12:31), and His resurrection launched the new age in which forgiveness and eternal life are present possibilities (John 5:24; Rom. 4:24-25). The Cross was a righteous judg-

ment, so that God is "just, and the justifier" of all who trust in Christ (Rom. 3:21-26).

As there is a present justification for believers, so there is a present punishment for sinners. Unbelievers are already *condemned* (John 3:17-21) and the unrighteous already suffer *wrath* (Rom. 1:18-28).

Present judgment does not preclude *future* judgment (John 5:25-29; 2 Cor. 5:10; Heb. 9:26-28), which occurs at "the end of this world" (Matt. 13:40-43).

We are justified by faith, but genuine faith works by love (Gal. 5:6; Jas. 2:14-26). Therefore, judgment is *according to works*—our words and deeds—as these are fruits of faith or unbelief. True faith in Christ evidences itself in obedience to His teachings and emulation of His compassion (Matt. 7:21-27; 12:7; 25:31-46; 2 Cor. 5:10; Rev. 20:12). God mercifully chastens His erring people that they might live holy lives and avoid condemnation (1 Cor. 11:31-32; Heb. 12:5-17). To despise this discipline is to be condemned with the world.

The final judgment is determined irrevocably at death, for then the believer is at peace with Christ (Luke 23:43; 2 Cor. 5:8; Phil. 1:21-23), and the impenitent wicked are in torment in hell (Luke 16:22-24).

As God is Judge of all, we are forbidden to judge one another (Matt. 7:1-2; Rom. 2:1; 14:4, 10). While judgment as *condemnation* is forbidden, judgment as *discrimination* is enjoined (Matt. 7:6, 15-20; Phil. 1:9-10), and the church is responsible for the discipline of its ministers and members (1 Cor. 5:1-6:6; Titus 3:10-11).

See ESCHATOLOGY, JUSTICE, DEATH, PROBATION, DISCRIMINATION, DISCERNMENT, REPROBATION.

For Further Reading: *A Companion to the Bible*, 209-15; *ISBE*, 3:1771-78; Aulen, *The Faith of the Christian Church*, 145-55. W. E. MCCUMBER

JUST, JUSTIFY. See JUSTIFICATION.

JUSTICE. In its earliest appearance in ethical and legal thought the term *justice* was used as the most adequate term for acceptable and adequate conduct. In attempting to determine and explain the nature of man, the Greek philosopher Plato established four cardinal excellences or virtues: wisdom, courage, self-control (usually translated as temperance), and justice. In spite of Plato's emphasis on human reason and wisdom, justice is particularly important because of its comprehensive character; the excellence of the harmonious functioning of all aspects of human nature is called justice.

The Hebrew Bible is equally emphatic in insisting upon "justice" or "righteousness" (these terms are largely interchangeable in translation; Exod. 23:1-8; Lev. 19:13-15; Deut. 16:18-20; Ps. 82:2-4; Isa. 1:17; 56:1; et al.). By adhering to God's standards of righteousness/justice, a people's character is finally approved or disapproved. Thus the "justification" of a people is determined.

Following Aristotle, classical philosophy tended to make distinctions which gave to justice the more limited character of a particular virtue. And in Christianity love became the dominant motif rather than justice. Christ spoke of divine justice as an impartiality which permitted the divine love to be expressed. And the Incarnation and Cross were/are supreme examples of God's love.

However, justice is still dominant in matters of conduct and salvation. Through Christ, God can be regarded as just even as He justifies the unjust (Rom. 3:26). Love must be paralleled by justice in order to avoid sentimentality, spinelessness, and general emptiness.

In the Middle Ages the cardinal virtues (including justice) were included in a general philosophical/theological system which also comprised love as included among the theological virtues. So important are these concepts both historically and theoretically that Frankena holds that all moral obligation can be basically reduced to justice and benevolence or love.

The call to justice is a call for some standard of rights and/or duties, and it confers a cardinal virtue on those who meet the standard. This standard also requires a fair distribution of honors, wealth, and other goods in accord with some divine or other principle. When just distribution is violated, justice requires the correction of such violation.

Justice thus becomes the acceptance of the dignity of all human beings along with the requirement that that dignity be respected by every other human being.

See JUDGE (JUDGMENT), CIVIL RIGHTS, LAW, LAW AND GRACE, REWARDS.

For Further Reading: *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*, 8:341 ff; Tillich, *Love, Power, and Justice*; ER, 409. R. DUANE THOMPSON

JUSTIFICATION. This concept, though expressed in a limited way in both the OT and the non-Pauline writings of the NT, is essentially Pauline. The substantive "justification" (*dikaïōsis*) occurs only in Rom. 4:25 and 5:18 (see also 5:16), but the verb "to justify" (*dikaioō*) appears 27 times in Paul's Epistles, especially in the passages in

which he is opposing the Jewish teaching of achieving righteousness by faithful performance of the duties prescribed by the Mosaic Law. Justification in the Jewish tradition is not a grace *per se* but a merit of man, "something that God owes to man and to which man, in the strictest sense, has a claim." Also, eschatologically understood, justification as a divine act refers to the final judgment of God on that which a man has achieved ethically in his lifetime (cf. Rom. 2:13; 1 Cor. 4:4).

Paul, on the other hand, gives major attention to man's present existence, though he does not overlook the future meaning of this term. He employs the Greek verb *dikaioō* to carry the basic meaning of his teaching on this point. This predicate derives from the adjective *dikaïos*, which means "just" or "righteous." Early Greek writers used this term with reference to persons who faithfully followed *dikē*, that is, custom, rule, or right. In the religious realm, a "righteous" person was the one who regularly performed the duties owed to the gods. In biblical understanding the "righteous" or "just" person is that one who is approved by God or acceptable to God. *Dikaïōsis* (justification) signifies the act in process of completion, and *dikaïōma*, also rendered "justification," signifies the act as already completed. *Dikaïōsunē*, regularly translated "righteousness," is the state or quality of life of one who is justified or declared righteous (Rom. 8:10; 1 Cor. 1:30).

In the history of the church a difference of opinion evolved with respect to the proper translation of *dikaioō*, whether it should be translated "to make righteous" or "to declare righteous." According to some scholars, in its primitive usage the verb carries the former meaning, but in later usage, especially in the LXX, it bears the latter meaning.

When Paul writes in Rom. 5:1 that "we have been justified through faith" (NIV), does he mean, "We have been declared righteous," or "We have been made righteous," or both? Also, when he asserts that the result of the one righteous act of Christ "was justification that brings life for all men" (v. 18, NIV), was he meaning that Christ's obedience provided God the basis for "pronouncing man righteous" or for "making him righteous," or both? Is the act of justification merely forensic or ethical or both? Does it result in imputed righteousness or imparted righteousness? Does God merely view the sinner as righteous through Christ, the sinner having accepted the saving work of Christ by faith, or does He

transform the sinner, really making him righteous by His justifying act?

These lines were drawn sharply during the Reformation, particularly because the Reformers felt it necessary to make clear the pervasive nature of sin and to declare that salvation rested upon grace alone. In his earlier teaching, Luther described justification as a "being righteous" and a "becoming righteous." In his later teaching an imputative view prevailed. Calvin wrote: "We simply explain justification to be an acceptance, by which God receives us into His favor and esteems us as righteous persons, and we say it consists in the remission of sins and the imputation of the righteousness of Christ" (*Institutes*, bk. 3, chap. 11). Calvin's followers pressed his thinking on this subject to the point of asserting that the active obedience of Christ is so imputed to the elect as to render them legally as righteous as if they had themselves rendered perfect obedience to the law of God.

In the Tridentine Decrees of A.D. 1547, the Roman church defined its position in opposition to the Reformers. It stated that "justification is not the mere remission of sins, but also the sanctification and renovation of the inward man through the voluntary reception of grace and gifts of grace, whereby an unjust man becomes just, the enemy a friend, so that he may be an heir according to the hope of eternal life." The Holy Spirit imparts to each person a measure of righteousness. A contemporary writer expresses the same view: "Since, for Paul, justification and the reception of righteousness are one and the same thing, it follows that the concept of justification also must have a moral content which can be recognized as an essential component of his idea of righteousness" (Bläser, "Justification," *Sacramentum Mundi*, 3:454).

Wesleyanism, following the thought of Arminianism, sees justification as a forensic or judicial act in which God declares the sinner free from the guilt and penalty of sin, and therefore is righteous, but one must not take this to mean that the sinner is actually made just and righteous. A relative change takes place in justification, that is to say, a new relationship with God is established. Once the sinner was under condemnation; now he is pardoned, his sins are forgiven, and he is accepted by God. Viewed negatively, justification is the forgiving of the sins of the penitent believer, an act of the sovereign grace of God; viewed positively, it is the acceptance of the believer as righteous, a judicial act of remitting the penalty due the sinner. Wesleyans, in taking this position, make a sharp dis-

inction between justification and sanctification. This latter term refers to the inward moral change, or impartation of righteousness, which is concomitant to justification. Justification logically underlies sanctification. In effect, justification takes place in the mind of God and sanctification in the moral nature of man.

1. The ground for justification is faith in the redemptive activity of God in Christ. This excludes the view of good works as providing the basis for justification. While the meritorious ground is the Cross, the "conditioning cause" is faith, but as Vincent Taylor observes, it is the interfacing of both the atoning work of Christ and faith that brings one into right relations with God. This means that any righteousness created by the act of justification is real because of the ethical or moral dimension of faith. Moreover, faith is more than trust in God's Word, or assent to theological propositions, but essentially reliance upon God and commitment to Him as the Redeemer. Thus, the righteousness is real and not imagined since one is forgiven and now stands in freedom before God.

2. Justification is not only an act but also a state into which one is brought as a consequence of the divine declaration. This state is maintained by faith and is characterized by righteousness, which is the gift of the new relationship.

The Greek word *logizomai*, meaning "to count, account, or reckon," has spawned the concept of imputed righteousness (cf. Rom. 4:3-5, 9, 22; Gal. 3:6; see also Gen. 15:6). It cannot be taken to mean that one person's acts are accounted as the acts of another. In this context, as Wiley says, "a man's sin or righteousness is imputed to him when he is actually the doer of the sinful or righteous acts. . . . To impute sin or righteousness is to take account of it, either to condemn or acquit, and hence to punish or to exempt from punishment." If through faith a person is accounted righteous, it must be because he is righteous and not because another is righteous.

Calvin taught that imputation in a strict sense means that the obedience of Christ is accepted for us as if it were our own. This is fictional. Wesley, however, taught an accommodated view of imputation which includes the truth of imparted life or righteousness. The righteousness of Christ is imputed to us in its effects, that is, in its merits. We are justified by faith in the merits of Christ. Vincent Taylor writes: "The righteousness springs from faith as it is related to its object; the object gives to it its character as the condition of righteousness."

This is another way of delineating between the objective and subjective aspects of justification. While God's justifying word is objective in that it has been sounded forth in the cross of Christ and is an act of grace on His part toward individual persons, it is also subjective in that it brings about a real change. Jeremias writes: "God's acquittal is not only forensic, it is not an 'as if', not a mere word, but it is God's word that works and creates life. God's word is always an effective word." Justification therefore is both a declaration and a renovation.

3. Justification is an instantaneous act resulting from the immediate response of God to the faith of the sinner in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Justification, therefore, is that gracious and judicial act of God by which He grants the sinner full pardon of all guilt, releases him from the penalty of sins committed, and accepts him as righteous and makes him a new creature with initial righteousness, on the basis of the sinner's trustful and obedient response to the redeeming work of Christ on the Cross.

See NEW BIRTH, FAITH, IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS, IMPARTED RIGHTEOUSNESS, IN CHRIST.

For Further Reading: Brown, *NIDNTT*, 3:352-73; Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings*; Jeremias, *The Central Message of the NT*, 51-70; Blaser, "Justification," *Sacramentum Mundi*, 3:449-55; Taylor, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation*, 48-61; Wiley, *CT*, 2:379-401.

WILLARD H. TAYLOR

K

KABBALA. Kabbala or Cabala (lit. "tradition") is a term belonging to Jewish mysticism. It designates its major medieval variety which crystalized in the 13th century. Cabalistic speculation with its

mystic symbolism sought to understand the nature of God and how man relates to Him. God's relationship to man was through 10 intermediary emanations (*sefirot*). Along with the Jewish tradi-

tion its sources included Neo-Platonism and Gnosticism. The dynamic influence of Kabbala persists in the Hasidic movement in modern Judaism.

See JUDAISM, GNOSTICISM.

For Further Reading: *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, 3:456-79; Sholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 119-350.

FRANK G. CARVER

KAIROS. See CHRONOS.

KENOSIS. The word *kenosis* means "an emptying." It comes from the Greek word *kenōō* ("I empty") and appears in Phil. 2:7 where it is used of Christ's self-humiliation to become man.

While the divine Son might have given up temporarily His function of sustaining and providentially caring for the universe, it is unthinkable to assume that He could have given up any attribute of Deity. Divine attributes belong only to God. To have any of them is to be God, and to be without any of them is to be less than God. Yet by many statements and deeds throughout His ministry Jesus showed himself to be both God and man.

In John 17:5 the Lord reveals that He had emptied himself of His glory (not an attribute) to become man. That was because: (1) otherwise, no earthling could have endured His splendor to come to Him (1 Tim. 6:14-16); (2) with such overwhelming evidence of Deity, the free exercise of volition to choose Him would have been impossible; (3) having such glory, no enemy would have dared resist Him and seek His death; (4) He could not have lived the life common to man nor demonstrate that God supplies grace to meet mankind's common trials; and (5) He could not have died to redeem sinners.

Jesus Christ was not without divine attributes; but He did limit himself in the use of them in order to accomplish His mission. So successful was He in it that many, even of those who had known Him from childhood, thought Him to be a mere man.

Paul spoke of Christ's self-emptying to encourage his readers to imitate their Lord. "Let this mind be in you," he wrote (Phil. 2:5). Paul practiced what he preached (3:4-15).

See CHRIST, CHRISTOLOGY, MIND OF CHRIST, HUMILIATION OF CHRIST.

For Further Reading: Wiley and Culbertson, *Introduction to Christian Theology*, 207-9; Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 701-6.

W. RALPH THOMPSON

KERYGMA. *Kerygma* is a Greek word meaning "that which is cried by the herald," "the com-

mand," "the communication." In the LXX it is the summons to celebrate the Passover (2 Chron. 30:5) or the message of God to the Ninevites (Jonah 3:2; cf. Matt. 12:41; Luke 11:32). In most NT passages it signifies "the proclamation of the redeeming purpose of God in Christ" (Rom. 16:25; 1 Cor. 1:21; 2:4; 15:14; 2 Tim. 4:17; Titus 1:3).

The herald or crier (*kērux*) was "a public servant of the supreme power" (Cremer, 355). He summoned the assembly (*ekklesia*), conveyed messages, etc. In the NT, he is employed by God to proclaim salvation (1 Tim. 2:7; 2 Tim. 1:11) or righteousness (2 Pet. 2:5).

The verb *kērussō* means to proclaim, preach, or discharge a herald's office. It is used 60 times in the NT, once of the public reading of the law of Moses (Acts 15:21) but generally of the declaration of the gospel of Christ. The verb has as its object: gospel (*evangelion*), gospel of the Kingdom (Matt. 4:23), gospel of God (Mark 1:14), Christ (Acts 8:5), Jesus (9:20), kingdom of God (20:25), Christ crucified (1 Cor. 1:23), or Christ Jesus (2 Cor. 1:19, all NASB). *Kerygma* lays more stress on the publicity of the proclamation. *Gospel* emphasizes the nature of the good news of salvation.

Cremer relates proclamation (*kerygma*) and gospel (*evangelion*, good news) to *akoē*, hearing, and *rhēma*, word (82). The proclaimed gospel is what is heard, what has gone abroad, news, tradition. The *akoē* is the message heard, the communication received. The *rhēma* is the word containing the message. So reference is made to the "word of hearing" (Heb. 4:2, NASB marg.). This "word of hearing" that was received from Paul was indeed the word of God, faithfully proclaimed by the apostle and received by the hearers (1 Thess. 2:13).

There is a difference between the *kerygma* (the gospel proclamation) and *didachē* (teaching, i.e., the doctrinal and practical implications for life situations). The proclaimed gospel of redemption in Christ Jesus is the central core of the *paradosis*—the divinely given tradition or trust handed down from Christ through the apostles and faithful hearers (2 Thess. 2:15; 2 Tim. 2:2). God manifested His saving word through oral and written *kerygma* (Titus 1:3; 1 Cor. 1:21; 2 Thess. 2:15). The *kerygma* produced the Church. The Church did not produce the *kerygma*.

See DIDACHE, GOSPEL, EVANGELISM, PREACHING.

For Further Reading: Cremer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek*; Girdlestone, *Synonyms of the Old Testament*; Ridderbos, *The Authority of the New Testament Scriptures*; Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development*.

WILBER T. DAYTON

KESWICK, KESWICKIANISM. This term designates the teaching on the victorious, Spirit-filled life propagated in the main by an annual convention for the promotion of "practical holiness" held at Keswick, England. Keswick teaching, like that of the American holiness movement which originally inspired the convention's beginnings in 1875, emphasizes a "second blessing" or "second crisis" in Christian experience subsequent to justification in which the Holy Spirit completely fills the wholly consecrated Christian. This Spirit baptism enables the believer to live a consistent Christian life.

However, at the point of the nature of the Holy Spirit's operation in the heart in relation to original sin, a continuing tension has existed between Keswick and Wesleyan teachers from the earliest history of the convention. The former have maintained that in the Spirit-filled life, the Holy Spirit counteracts the nature of sin which continues to remain in the heart of the believer; the latter believes that the nature of sin is cleansed from the heart by the Spirit's application of the finished work of Christ.

This point of difference between the two movements arises out of the fact that from the first Keswick Convention the movement was directed largely by evangelical Anglican leaders. Their theology commonly was based on the teachings of John Calvin, who taught that the conflict in the believer between the flesh and the Spirit could not be finally resolved before the point of death. The American holiness movement, following the teachings of John Wesley, believed that the heart could be entirely sanctified and freed from inbred sin by faith in the full redemption wrought by Christ. Both believe that the Spirit-filled life is a life characterized by victory over sin and power for service.

The first Keswick Convention sprang from holiness evangelism in England by Rev. William E. Boardman, Presbyterian author of *The Higher Christian Life* (1859), and Quaker lay evangelists Robert Pearsall Smith and his wife, Hannah Whitall Smith, author of *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life* (1870). In 1873 to 1875 a series of breakfast meetings was sponsored by Mr. and Mrs. Cowper Temple (later Lord and Lady Mount-Temple), to introduce the American holiness evangelists to their British friends. Subsequently, larger holiness conventions were held in England at Oxford (1874) and Brighton (1875). In these meetings future Keswick leaders such as Revs. Evan Hopkins and T. D. Harford-Battersby, both Anglicans, and Robert Wilson, Quaker, testified to a new intensity of Christian experience.

Out of their enthusiasm for their newfound sense of peace and joy, Battersby and Wilson arranged for a convention for the promotion of holiness to be held at the former's vicarage at Keswick in the north of England. The Smiths, who were to be the speakers, did not attend because of personal tragedy in the ministry of Pearsall Smith which threatened the whole revival for a time (see J. C. Pollock, *The Keswick Story*, 34-37).

The success of the first meeting, however, assured its future; it continues to the present. The early patterns of the convention, many of which have become characteristic of Keswick, indicate their American holiness camp meeting lineage. Spontaneity of spirit, a minimum of prearrangement of program, direct appeal to Spirit leadership, extemporaneous addresses—all centered in promoting the victorious life of Christian holiness—were common to both.

By the turn of the century, Keswick speakers and evangelists such as F. B. Meyer, Andrew Murray, Otto Stockmayer, and R. A. Torrey were spreading the Keswick victorious life teaching. A number of small Keswick Conventions were subsequently established and continue to be held annually around the world. As a result, much of Calvinistic evangelicalism in England, Europe, the United States, and Canada continues to be infused with higher-life teaching.

Keswick has often been charged with fostering an inner Christian quietism at the cost of outreach and social concern. Such accusations must be countered by the active inner-city mission movement in Germany led by people committed to Keswick teaching and the widespread foreign mission efforts inspired by such early participants as Hudson Taylor, founder of the China Inland Mission, and Amy Carmichael, founder of Dohnavur Fellowship, India.

See WESLEYANISM, HOLINESS, COUNTERACTION, ERADICATION, HIGHER LIFE, HOLINESS MOVEMENT.

For Further Reading: For the Wesleyan-holiness view of Keswick teaching, see Hills, *Scriptural Holiness and Keswick Teaching Compared* (1910); For Keswick history and teaching, see Barabas, *So Great Salvation* (1957); Pollock, *The Keswick Story* (1964); Sloan, *These Sixty Years* (1935); For the American holiness movement origins of Keswick, see Dieter, "The Holiness Revival in Nineteenth Century Europe," *WTJ*, Spring, 1974, 15-27; and *The Holiness Revival of the Nineteenth Century*.

MELVIN EASTERDAY DIETER

KEYS OF THE KINGDOM. The "keys" of the Kingdom have a twofold significance in the NT. First, they symbolize Christ's authority delegated first to Peter (Matt. 16:13-20) and then to the 11 disci-

ples also (John 20:19-23), to open or close the doors of God's spiritual kingdom to the souls of men. "The power of the keys is authority in the dispensing of the word of grace and judgment" (Jeremias, Kittel, 3:752).

Christ's commission to Peter and the Eleven was not without its OT antecedent (Isa. 22:22). As Eliakim was divinely invested with the key of responsible stewardship over the house of David to "open" and "close" its doors, so Peter, as representative of Christ's disciples, was given responsibility for the keys of God's kingdom to "open" or "close" those doors to the souls of men through the *proclamation of and witness to, or withholding of*, the saving gospel of Jesus Christ (Matt. 28:18-20). Evangelistically this was first to the Jews and then to the Gentiles (Acts 1:8; 2:38-39; 26:16-18; 2 Cor. 5:19-20).

Second, the "keys" signify Christ's delegated authority for ecclesiastical discipline, expressed as "binding" and "loosing" in John 20:19-23, which points back to Matt. 18:15-20. That this disciplinary authority is to be exercised with prayer and under divine approval is evident from the context, which indicates brother-to-brother relationships, and involves the Church, Christ himself, the Holy Spirit, and God the Father in the procedure of judgment (cf. Acts 5:1-11; 8:9-24; 13:8-11; 15:19-29; Gal. 2:11-12; 1 Corinthians 5; 2 Cor. 2:5-11; Titus 3:10-11).

This delegated disciplinary authority is limited to expulsion ("binding") and reinstating ("loosing") of believers for certain doctrinal and moral offenses within the Church. It does not extend to the divine prerogative of forgiveness and condemnation of sin against God. That authority belongs exclusively to Christ (Matt. 9:6). Wesley says: "In the primitive church absolution meant no more than to discharge from church censure" (*Notes*, on Matt. 18:18; so Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Luther).

That the keys of the Kingdom remain ultimately in Christ's possession, and that with them He will finally free men from death through the resurrection, is explicitly declared by Him who unlocked His own tomb and came forth a victor over death and the grave (Rev. 1:18; 3:7; cf. Luke 24:5-7; John 11:25; Acts 2:24; 1 Cor. 15:20).

See KINGDOM OF GOD, CHURCH GOVERNMENT, DISCIPLINE, GREAT COMMISSION.

For Further Reading: *ISBE*, 3:1794-97; Kittel, 3:744-53; Vincent, *Word Studies in the New Testament*, 1:91-98.

CHARLES W. CARTER

logical usage, an understanding of the correlative "king" motif is essential. The Israelite concept of "king" and its cognates had its linguistic roots in the Syro-Canaanite understanding of the "God most high" as a king (*melek*) accorded unlimited authority. This authority took two forms: one affirmed that "Yahweh is king" (the essential, or ontological mode: cf. Ps. 93:1; Jer. 10:7); the other that "Yahweh has proved to be king" (the existential, or dynamic mode: cf. Ps. 47:8; 97:1). In the cultic setting of Israel the enthronement psalms in particular declared the experience of the present reality of Yahweh's kingship, connecting this theme with His historical acts, such as the Exodus, and future expectation of His eschatological consummation of history (cf. the Messianic theology of Isa. 9:7; 11:1 ff). This stress on covenant kingship in Israel became a primary differentiation of Israel from the divine kingship ideas of their neighbors.

From Israel's initial political stance as a loose confederacy waging holy war, there developed the institution of a monarchy. This was in direct response to the perennial Philistine pressure and at the express command of Yahweh (1 Sam. 9:1-10:16). This predominantly favorable view of the monarchy was vigorously opposed by many in Northern Israel who perceived monarchy as a rejection of theocracy (1 Sam. 8:1-22; 10:17-27). This tension over what was Yahweh's will for His people persisted throughout the monarchic period and beyond, with the "eternal" Davidic kingdom of the South vying for supremacy with the charismatic leadership of the North. The concept of an everlasting Davidic covenant (2 Samuel 7) with the adoption of the king as son of Yahweh (in contrast to other Near Eastern views of the king as divine by nature, e.g., Egypt) led to the enhancement of the eschatological kingship motif, as the reality of *earthly* kingship expectation deteriorated (Isa. 11:1-9; 9:2-7).

Thus, Israel experienced Yahweh's kingship fundamentally in His historical actions toward them, seen in the covenantal provisions and demands of His absolute power and the guidance of His elect people through a tortured history. Despite these sometimes ambivalent historical indicators (e.g., the Exilic period), Israel affirmed that Yahweh was still actively exercising kingship, in a functional and not merely formal sense, and that He would continue to rule variously but emphatically over the whole creation, over Israel and the nations of the world.

This pattern of Yahweh's cosmic, historical, cultic, and eschatological kingship (*mal'kuth*) was discerned in secular, political kingdoms (Jer.

KINGDOM OF GOD. To appreciate the significance of this term in its historic biblical and theo-

49:34); in cosmic ideological terms (Ps. 145:11-13); in the eschatological sense of a universal, immanent kingdom (Isa. 24:23; Zech. 14:9); and finally in an apocalyptic mode (Dan. 7:13). The hallmark of this mode was the tension between narrow nationalism and transcending eschatology.

Within later Judaism the national, Messianic eschatology of kingship became prevalent among the masses (cf. *Psalms of Solomon*, the Qumran sectarian War Scroll), and rabbinic thought affirmed the kingship of God in the world by its unswerving loyalty to the one true God and precise observation of His Torah. Whereas in the Qumran literature heaven was a special realm where God's kingship was acknowledged in deed and truth, in rabbinic terms one could take on "the yoke of the kingship of heaven" and thus assist in bringing in the kingdom by penance, study of the Torah, and good deeds.

Alongside these Jewish contributions to the developed concept of kingship which formed the Palestinian religious and social setting of Jesus' ministry was the Graeco-Roman understanding of kingship. Though the king (*basileus*) of Mycenaean times was merely a subordinate prince under the divine ruler (*anax*), by Homer's time the king was generally a hereditary ruler who could trace his power and lineage back to Zeus. Subsequently the term *basileus* was replaced by *tyrannos*. Though initially a neutral concept, *tyrannos* took on a negative connotation in the political upheavals of sixth-century (B.C.) Greece, and *basileus* became the term for a wise, just ruler. Further intimations of divine kingship were infused into the word by the accomplishments of Alexander the Great. The geographical extent of influence and the power of the emperor's office summed up in a kingship terminology reached a climax in the Roman emperor cult begun with Augustus. It was against such a political backdrop of the kingship of Caesar that Christians were challenged to affirm the Kingship of Christ by declaring, "Jesus is Lord."

The kingdom of God motif in the NT affirms the continuity of its OT roots. God alone truly wields Kingship, over against the "kings of the earth" (Matt. 17:25). The positive evaluation of the Davidic monarchy and its Messianic overtones is impressive (2 Samuel 7; Acts 13:22), though the only other king applauded is Melchizedek (Gen. 14:18; Heb. 7:1 ff), the type of Christ, the High Priest, the Son of David.

John the Baptist becomes the turning point of "kingdom" understanding, appearing as he does

on the fulcrum of prophetic prediction and eschatological fulfillment (see Luke 7:28), with an appeal for repentance and baptism which can reasonably be explained only from a Messianic, eschatological understanding of the kingdom of God. With his focus on the judgment of God immediately pending, and the advent of a stronger man (Matt. 3:7-10), he invites comparison with Jesus and His message. Indeed, it is suggested (Luke 16:16) that history can be divided into two phases: the Law and the Prophets prior to John, and the presence of the kingdom of God after John (cf. Matt. 11:11 ff and 5:17).

The differences between John and Jesus, however, are crucial. The former threatens judgment, demands repentance and its fruits, promises contingent escape from Messianic judgment, and advises preparation for the future cataclysm. He is the continuation of the prophetic line (cf. Mal. 3:1) and a living symbol of the imminent dawn of salvation. The latter offers himself as the implicit revelation of God's kingdom of love, grace, forgiveness, and salvation, and the eschatological reality of the kingdom of God made present in His own person and claims (cf. Matthew 5-7). In Jesus' gospel of the Kingdom, all previous hopes of salvation find their culmination and fulfillment in the kingdom of God.

This new age of salvation depicts the kingdom of God present as the dynamic of divine activity. It is the sovereign rule of God here and now challenging and demanding our response. It is societal in nature, for the Kingdom is composed of redeemed people who function often under pressure and opposition. It is salvific, in that the summons to repentance is present alongside the offer of mercy in Jesus' words and works (Isa. 52:7; Mark 1:15). It is purely religious in character, a kingdom which transcends nationalistic boundaries (cf. Matt. 4:1-11) in being directed to all mankind. It is the *eschaton* functioning in the present situation, for the primary thrust of Jesus' teaching is not the imperative but the indicative. In Jesus' life and death the present and future kingdom of God stand side by side: in Him who heals miraculously, exorcises demons, and preaches to the poor (Isa. 61:1); in Him who triumphantly enters Jerusalem as a new Kingdom bearer and cleanses the Temple for a new reign of God (see Isa. 62:11; Zech. 9:9; John 5:15).

The kingdom of God, therefore, is actually present in Jesus' ministry, portraying a new pattern for living, Christocentrically affirmed, and related to a king who functions as a Father (Matt. 6:9 ff). It is a truly eschatological gospel that Jesus preaches, one of power and authority, which em-

phasizes constantly the crisis importance and urgency of the present moment (*kairos*), thereby imposing radical demands on His hearers. This kingdom of God springs from divine power and grace in the present because of what the covenant God has accomplished in the past and guarantees to effect in the future (see Luke 12:32; 22:18). The true nature of the world can only be understood in the light of God's kingdom, but the kingdom of God is neither the extension nor the projection of anything in this world. Thus Jesus teaches and preaches in the *parabolic* mode concerning the value of the Kingdom, conditions for membership in it, its productivity and growth, and the final Judgment.

Outside the Synoptics the kingdom of God terminology tends to be replaced by Christological affirmations (cf. Acts 2:36; 8:12; 2 Tim. 4:18). The implicit Christology of the Synoptics is made explicit in the rest of the NT as the kingdom of God present in the person of Jesus now is seen in the person of the risen Lord.

Particularly in Acts God's kingdom is operative in a new way: Jesus as exalted Lord exercises a real rule, indicative of the new age of the Spirit (Acts 2:36; con. 1:6). Where the Kingdom teaching of Paul preserves the "here-not yet" polarity by a Christocentric, ethical motivation, Acts moves towards incorporating God's kingdom into the *ecclesia* framework of the Early Church. In John's writings the eschatological Kingdom community has become a present fellowship reality, a concept reflected in the General Epistles. By the time of Revelation, of course, the eschatological kingdom of God is identical with the kingdom of Christ (Rev. 11:15), which in turn is equated with the community of saints on earth, where history is merely the battlefield for the ultimate cosmic struggle.

The "here-not yet" teaching of Paul is especially significant. In the Epistles traditionally credited to him, there are 13 references to the Kingdom as such. Three of them assume the kingdom of God to be spiritual in nature and a present reality—e.g., "For the kingdom of God is not food and drink but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Rom. 14:17, RSV; cf. 1 Cor. 4:20; Col. 1:13). The balance are either probably or obviously eschatological in orientation; e.g., "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Cor. 15:50; cf. 6:9-10; 15:24; Gal. 5:21; Eph. 5:5; Col. 4:11; 1 Thess. 2:12; 2 Thess. 1:5; 2 Tim. 4:1, 18).

The history of theological interpretation of "the kingdom of God" reflects not only the disputes over specific biblical passages (e.g., Matt.

11:12; 13:23; Mark 1:15; 4:11; 10:15; 12:34; Luke 7:28; 17:20), but also the apparent ambivalencies or surface paradoxes in the words of Jesus. Is "building the kingdom" consistent with the "kingdom of God"? Is the Kingdom prophetic or apocalyptic in character? Is it transcendent or immanent?

From the imminent *parousia* teaching of Tertullian, the enthusiasm of Montanism, the spiritualization of Origen and the Eastern wing of Christendom, the reification of the kingdom of God in the West (cf. Charlemagne, the Crusades, the social gospel, Pietism), and the assaults of world conflict, the kingdom of God motif has emerged into the 20th century, where the interpretations of the kingdom of God fall roughly into the following camps: futuristic/apocalyptic/consistent eschatology (see J. Weiss, A. Schweitzer); prophetic eschatology (see W. Rauschenbusch, L. Harold DeWolf); realized eschatology (see C. H. Dodd); proleptic/existential eschatology (see R. Bultmann and demythologization); and dual dimension eschatology—Kingdom both present and future (see G. E. Ladd, Oscar Cullmann, W. Kümmel). Each viewpoint attempts to reconcile the nature of the Kingdom as future, present, or in process of realization, and to do justice to the symbols used while appropriating the message to historical reality. The kingdom of God, however, remains ultimately a mystery still to be revealed.

See CHURCH, ESCHATOLOGY, LAST DAYS (THE), NEW HEAVENS AND NEW EARTH, NEW COVENANT, KINGLY OFFICES OF CHRIST, DISPENSATION OF THE SPIRIT.

For Further Reading: Bright, *The Kingdom of God*; Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*; Harkness, *Understanding the Kingdom of God*; Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*; Ladd, *The Presence of the Future*; Lundstrom, *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus*; Schnackenburg, *God's Rule and God's Kingdom*; Vos, *The Pauline Eschatology*; GMS, 38-340, 612-23. JOHN S. LOWN

KINGLY OFFICES OF CHRIST. Christian theologians have for many generations described Christ's work by means of the three offices of Prophet, Priest, and King. He is the One who perfectly combines all three functions (cf. Wiley, CT, 2:213-15). That Jesus should have fulfilled a kingly role is only a natural consequence of His identity as the Messiah, God's Anointed One. However, the manner whereby that identity was manifested in His life and work involved a more accurate interpretation of the OT hope than the popular Messianic expectation of first-century Judaism.

That reinterpretation is introduced by the Synoptic Gospels from the very beginning of Jesus'

public ministry. The episode of Jesus' baptism by John, and the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus with the accompanying voice from heaven, is Jesus' inauguration into the role of Messiah. Its significance is explained by the words of the heavenly voice. Those words identify Jesus by joining the OT concept of the kingly Messiah with the figure of the Servant of the Lord. The voice from heaven combines words from Ps. 2:7 and Isa. 42:1. This means that the kingly authority of Jesus, His identity as the Anointed One, will be exercised, lived out, as He fulfills the role of the Servant Messiah. Jesus will be the crucified Messiah. That King Jesus reigns from the Cross is accentuated by the Gospel of John. There the hour of Christ's glorification is the moment when He is lifted up on the Cross.

The major theme of Jesus' public ministry was the proclamation that the kingdom of God had come near. But He did more than speak words about the reign of God. He acted in ways which demonstrated to the eyes of faith that the Kingdom was present in His very person. He exercised the kingly authority of God when He healed the sick, cast out demons, forgave sins, and reinterpreted the ethical demand of God (cf. Matt. 11:2-6; Luke 4:16-27).

The ultimate demonstration of Jesus' kingly office was His resurrection. It was because God vindicated Jesus by resurrecting Him that the first disciples were able to confess, "Jesus is Lord" (cf. Acts 2:32-36; Phil. 2:5-11).

See CHRIST, ESTATES OF CHRIST, KINGDOM OF GOD.

For Further Reading: Barclay, *Jesus as They Saw Him*, 38-42, 93-159, 240-44; Bright, *The Kingdom of God*, 187-274; Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, 57-80, 135-58, 237-53, 408-22. HAL A. CAUTHRON

KNOWLEDGE. This area is regarded as so important in philosophy that one of its major branches of study is epistemology or theory of knowledge.

One of man's most important abilities is to be aware, to know, to have knowledge. This grasp of the mind may be almost totally missing, as when there is innocence in the case of the infant or mature person who has the capacity but not yet the experience; or as in the case of ignorance when a person possibly should or could know something but does not. Misinformation is a condition in which something is known, but it is not adequate or is distorted so that there is significant failure to apprehend the situation.

Rising to the level of opinion is progress beyond the preceding stages, because here through a number of ways or through a fairly secure method the person knows something. The level

of truth occurs, however, when the method of knowing is fully adequate to the objects being known.

Some of the avenues by which one knows (from philosophic and theological methods) are perception (as in sensory experience), scientific method, custom, tradition, authority, intuition, coherence, and revelation.

While some Christians may occasionally or even frequently speak of the absolute character of their knowledge, others may prefer to speak of assurance. Some stress revelation as found in the Scriptures as the source of sure knowledge. Some believe that the basis of religious knowledge is a reasoned and systematic interpretation of the Bible. For others, the key certainty is a personal assurance of acceptance with God, a knowledge that the God of the Bible is the true God who is the Savior of all mankind and especially of that specific individual. For such persons only the experiential knowledge of the heart is sure, while knowledge of the truth in the form of concepts is relative. The Christian seeks to know truth both propositionally and experientially.

The apostle Paul said, "I know whom I have believed" (2 Tim. 1:12). The person who believes God and His Word is being delivered from the frenetic seeking which fails to turn up genuine knowledge (3:7), for he drinks from a well of truth which deeply satisfies (John 4:7-15).

See EPISTEMOLOGY, WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT.

For Further Reading: *Concise Encyclopedia of Western Philosophy and Philosophers*; Weinberg and Yandell, *Theory of Knowledge*; Barrett, *A Christian Perspective of Knowing*. R. DUANE THOMPSON

KOINONIA. *Koinōnia*, usually translated "fellowship," is the Greek word that identifies the depth fellowship of the NT Christian community. As the fellowship of the Holy Spirit (2 Cor. 13:14), the Church is to be the caring, sharing community.

One aspect of koinonia is that of Christians sharing in their common relationship with God. Being joint partakers of grace (Phil. 1:7) is the result of the vertical koinonia made possible by the work of Christ and the Holy Spirit (John 16:5-15). John Stott summarizes the Christian's mutual participation in God's grace: "Begotten by the will and word of the same Father, redeemed by the blood of the same Son, indwelt by the presence of the same Spirit—that is our koinonia, the common salvation we . . . share" (*One People*, 76).

The vertical koinonia is the basis for the horizontal koinonia experienced among the saints.

Because God loved them, believers are to love; loving one another is to be the trademark of the Church (John 13:35). Christians are to forgive, serve, encourage, instruct, admonish, and weep with one another. Two examples of the new quality of group life are the Jerusalem church in the Book of Acts (John Wesley thought highly of that common life), and the relief offering Paul gathered in his third missionary journey for the saints in Jerusalem. In total, the goal of *koinonia* is that the Body of Christ might attain "the full measure of perfection found in Christ" (Eph. 4:13, NIV).

A further aspect of *koinonia* is the common task of sharing the gospel message. Jesus called His disciples to be fishers of men, collaborators in spreading the faith. Paul speaks highly of those who worked with him in proclaiming the Good News. All believers are to work together in the fulfilling of the Great Commission.

See FELLOWSHIP, LOVE, UNITY, BODY LIFE.

For Further Reading: Stott, *One People*, 69-90; Snyder, *The Problem of Wineskins*, 89-150; Bonhoeffer, *Life Together*.
MARTIN H. SCHRAG

L

LABOR. This is the investment of energy and time in productive, purposeful activity. The purpose is the accomplishment of a task or the rendering of a service.

The Genesis record indicates that before the Fall, God instructs, "Have dominion . . . over every living thing" (1:28). Of Adam God says, "I will make an help meet for him" (2:18). Ruling over the world involves labor, and for that Adam receives a helper. After the Fall God declares, "In toil shall you eat of it [the ground] all the days of your life" (3:17, NASB). The Fall is not the occasion of labor but rather the reason for the way in which labor is often performed: "in sorrow" (KJV).

The biblical view is that labor is a part of God's gracious and requisite plan for man. The Psalmist praises God for the fact that man "goes forth to his work" (104:23, NASB). The Lord Jesus is known as "the carpenter" (Mark 6:3). The apostle Paul sees work as an essential element in Christian discipline. The Christian cannot accept the thinking of a society in which there is inordinate concern for ease, pleasure, security; and little or no concern for honest and hard work. Paul writes, "If anyone will not work, neither let him eat" (2 Thess. 3:10, NASB). There is no place in the Christian life-style for drones. However, not all labor is manual; it may equally be mental. It may also be clerical, professional, or in the category of services.

The early Methodists, in both Britain and North America, following the example of John Wesley, were oftentimes occupied with the concerns of the laborer. Their serious interest in this

area reflects the view that labor must not be passed over in the total Christian view of stewardship.

The Bible teaches that the exertion of spiritual effort is also labor. Jesus' assignment from the Father is seen as "his work" (John 4:34). The Christian is to appreciate the labor of those who are leaders in the Church (1 Thess. 5:12).

See VOCATION, WORK (WORKS), CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM.

For Further Reading: Hoffner, *Fundamentals of Christian Sociology*, 90-109; Kaiser, *Theology of Work*, 521; Wirt, *The Social Conscience of the Evangelical*, 57-64.
ALDEN AIKENS

LAITY. This term derives from the root word *laos*, the "people," and is virtually synonymous with laymen or laypeople. From some time in the second century the Christian church began to distinguish its general membership from the clergy by the use of this term. In later years it has had a more general usage in distinguishing non-professionals from professionals in a number of areas, as, for example, in law and in medicine.

It is probably true that Christendom has swung constantly between the extremes of clericalism on one side and anticlericalism on the other. Certain it is that the Scriptures articulate both the universal priesthood of believers and the special calling of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers (Eph. 4:7-12).

The distinction between the spiritual privileges, duties, and services of the laity and the clergy are not absolutes. Under certain conditions, any Roman Catholic may offer the sacra-

ment of extreme unction to a dying man. In emergencies there are few things laymen cannot do which clergymen customarily do. And the clergymen must, as did the OT priests, seek forgiveness and grace quite as earnestly as do the laity.

Nevertheless, there are relative distinctions which set the clergy apart. These include the sense of divine call; the recognition of gifts and calling by the church, and even by civil authorities; the advantages of advanced study; the financial support of a congregation; and also special powers officially bestowed on him by his particular church discipline.

Furthermore, the God-called clerics are specifically charged with the responsibility of the "equipping of the saints for the work of service" (Eph. 4:11-12, NASB). Laymen are to be trained in churchmanship, that they may fill their places in the body effectively (Rom. 12:4-8; 1 Cor. 12:14-18). The fact that laymen may be especially Spirit-gifted is the counterpart of their training, not a substitute for it.

The present generation of the Church is vividly conscious of the need for and privilege of lay service in the evangelization of the world.

See GREAT COMMISSION, MINISTER (MINISTRY), EVANGELISM, CLERGY, DISCIPLINE.

For Further Reading: *Baker's Dictionary of Practical Theology*, 322-25, 414 ff. JOHN E. RILEY

LAMB, SACRIFICIAL. The lamb, a young male sheep, was the main animal of sacrifice among the Jews. From the time of the Exodus the lamb became the central symbol and dominant sacrifice in religious observances.

Israel's birthday, the Exodus, was marked by the killing of a lamb and using its blood to sprinkle the doorposts to exempt the Hebrews from the angel of death which took the lives of the firstborn of the Egyptians (Exodus 12). The lamb, slaughtered, roasted, and eaten in haste, occupied the center of attention in the observance of the Passover.

Sacrificial regulations for most observances called for the sacrifice of lambs. Lambs were sacrificed for morning and evening burnt offerings (Exod. 29:38-42); on the first day of each (lunar) month (Num. 28:11); for all seven days of the Passover (vv. 16-19); for the Feast of Weeks (vv. 26-27); on the Day of Atonement (29:7-8); for the Feast of Tabernacles (vv. 12-13, all NIV).

In various OT passages the lamb conveyed such ideas as *deliverance* (Exod. 29:38-42); *vicarious suffering* (Lev. 9:3; 23:12); *innocence* (Isa. 53:7); *helplessness* (Ps. 119:176; Hos. 4:16); *gen-*

teness (Jer. 11:19). The climax of the lamb as a sacrifice in the OT is found in Isaiah 53. "All the qualities of innocence, purity, and meekness, and possibly also a sense of efficaciousness, derived from the actual sacrificial system, are summoned with the deepest poignancy in the figurative use of the lamb as applied to the Suffering Servant" (IDB, 3:59).

In the NT the term "lamb" is used only figuratively. The Seventy are sent forth as "lambs in the midst of wolves" (Luke 10:3, RSV). Jesus tells Peter to "feed my lambs" (John 21:15). Most NT references point to the person and work of Jesus Christ (John 1:29, 36; Acts 8:32; 1 Pet. 1:19).

The Early Church community used the innocence and purity of the OT sacrificial lamb in interpreting the life and mission of Jesus Christ.

See SACRIFICE, PASSOVER, ATONEMENT, LAMB OF GOD.

For Further Reading: Nicoll, *The Lamb of God*, 21-36; ZPEB, 859-60. DONALD S. METZ

LAMB OF GOD. The introduction of John the Evangelist to Christ took place when John the Baptist said: "Behold the Lamb of God!" (John 1:36). John the Baptist, the son of a priest, knew full well the import of the title "Lamb of God." This spontaneous tribute to Jesus assigns a title to Him which has become woven into the language of redemption and devotion. The title "Lamb of God" carries several meanings.

The Idea of Innocence and Gentleness. The innocence of Christ means that He was absolutely free from any taint of evil. His innocence was not the innocence of ignorance nor the innocence of freedom from temptation. His innocence was the innocence of spiritual struggle and victory. The gentleness of Jesus was the gentleness of one who suffered, not by the constraint of weakness, but by the stronger constraint of love. The innocence and gentleness of Jesus are that of vicarious suffering.

The Paschal Lamb. It was the blood of the Passover lamb which saved the Israelites in Egypt from destruction and death. John pointed to the one true Sacrifice who could deliver from both physical and spiritual death. While in the institution of the Passover the blood of the paschal lamb was not primarily related to redemption from sin, yet the redemptive idea became part of the Jewish tradition. The reference in 1 Pet. 1:19 relates to the paschal lamb rather than to the Lamb of Isa. 53:7.

The Sin Offering. John the Baptist was familiar with Jewish ritual. This ritual required that every morning and every evening a lamb was sacri-

ficed in the Temple for the sins of the people (Exod. 29:38-42). The daily sacrifice was made as long as the Temple stood. The Baptist declared that Jesus was the permanent Sacrifice who would deliver not only Jews but the entire world from sin.

The Suffering Messiah. John's use of the title "Lamb of God" appears as a reference to Isaiah 53 and Jeremiah 11. "Both these great prophets had the vision of one who by His sufferings and His sacrifice, meekly and lovingly borne, would redeem His people" (Barclay, *The Gospel of John*, 1:64). Isaiah's passage is directly applied to Christ in Acts 8:32. Other phrases from the same prophecy (Isaiah 53) are treated as having a Messianic reference in Matt. 8:17; 1 Pet. 2:22; and Heb. 9:28.

Symbol of a Conqueror. During the time between the OT and the NT gigantic struggles were fought to free Israel. During these struggles the lamb, and particularly the horned lamb, became a symbol of a great conqueror. John the Revelator pictured the Lamb as triumphant (Rev. 17:4; 5:13; 7:17).

See SACRIFICE, PASSOVER, ATONEMENT, SIN OFFERING.

For Further Reading: Bernard, *The Gospel According to John*, 1:43-45; Barclay, *The Gospel of John*, 1:63-66; Westcott, *Gospel According to John*, 19-21.

DONALD S. METZ

LANGUAGE, THEOLOGICAL. See THEOLOGICAL LANGUAGE.

LASCIVIOUSNESS. This word is found six times in the NT (KJV), where it translates the Greek word *aselgeia* (Mark 7:22; 2 Cor. 12:21; Gal. 5:19; Eph. 4:19; 1 Pet. 4:3; Jude 4). *Aselgeia* is also translated (KJV) "wantonness" (Rom. 13:13; 2 Pet. 2:18), "filthy" (v. 7), and "pernicious ways" (v. 2).

J. B. Lightfoot says that in the NT the prominent idea of *aselgeia* is "sensuality" (*Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians*, 210-11). This is rather obvious from its context in most cases. For instance, in Rom. 13:13 it follows a Greek word meaning "sexual immorality" (NIV). In 2 Cor. 12:21 and Gal. 5:19 it follows *porneia*, from which we get *pornography*. In all these cases *aselgeia* may be translated "debauchery" (NIV). This sin marked the pagan society of that day but has no place in the Christian life.

See SIN, SEX (SEXUALITY), FORNICATION, CONCUPISCENCE.

For Further Reading: Kittel, 1:490.

RALPH EARLE

LAST DAYS, THE. This is a Messianic expression denoting the time when God's kingdom is established in the world. "It shall come to pass in the latter days that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established as the highest of the mountains, and shall be raised above the hills; and all the nations shall flow to it, and many peoples shall come, and say: 'Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord'" (Isa. 2:2-3, RSV). This envisages what we call the end of history which will see the rule of God established in all the earth and the earth transformed by being redeemed from the curse of fallenness.

The phrase is found several times in the NT, but from a very different perspective. Hebrews designates the last days as the days of the Messiah. "In many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets; but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son, whom he appointed the heir of all things, through whom also he created the world" (Heb. 1:1-2, RSV). Some readers have been offended by the translation of the RSV, "by a Son." The simple fact is that the Greek had an idiom which is absent from the NT and cannot be translated. English has both a definite and an indefinite article. Greek has only the definite article. However, its nonuse does not mean one of many, as is suggested; rather, it suggests the quality of that with which it is used. Thus, Heb. 1:1-2 means, God has in these last days spoken to us by one whose nature is that of the Son of God.

The phrase occurs also in the Book of Acts in a Messianic setting. On the Day of Pentecost, Peter quotes at some length from Joel the prophet about the eschatological outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Peter adds this phrase which is not found in Joel, "And in the last days it shall be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh" (Acts 2:17, RSV). By placing this event in history, Peter affirms that in some unexpected way, the Messianic age has come into history. The consummation at "the day of the Lord" remains in the future, but in the coming of the Holy Spirit, the new age, the Messianic age, has begun.

A somewhat different form of the expression but the same theology is to be found in 1 Pet. 1:20. "He [Christ] was destined before the foundation of the world but was made manifest at the end [Greek: last] of the times for your sake" (RSV).

However, despite the fact that Messiah has come and we have entered upon the last day, this does not mean that this age will see the complete triumph of Messiah. The last days are the days of

Christ's reign and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, but evil and wicked men are still to be found. These last days are the days in which God has completed His revelation by no longer speaking in various ways and in many places, but has given His full revelation in His Son, Jesus the Messiah, who in Heb. 1:8 is designated God, who has suffered and died and now is enthroned at the right hand of God where He will reign until all His enemies are subdued.

See ESCHATOLOGY, MILLENNIUM, NEW HEAVENS AND NEW EARTH, PROBATION.

For Further Reading: Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament; Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*; Biederwolf, *The Millennium Bible*; Hughes, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*; GMS, 612-76.

GEORGE ELTON LADD

LATITUDINARIANISM. This is an "attitude of latitude" regarding doctrinal beliefs and political matters. This type of thinking was started by a group of 17th-century English divines who desired to find a common ground between the Anglicans, the Presbyterians, and the Dissenters. They professed to stress life as more important than belief, and attached greater importance to practical piety than they did to forms of reasoning. Because they tried to find a middle ground in doctrinal beliefs, they were often referred to as Indifferents; at other times as Syncretists.

The Latitudinarians kept their creedal statements simple and brief, in order to provide a broad base for cooperation. While this is appealing to the undogmatic temper of mind, it has often degenerated into casual tolerance of fatal error.

See DOGMA (DOGMATICS), BELIEF.

For Further Reading: Qualben, *A History of the Christian Church*, 362; Baker's DT, 317; ER, 431.

MENDELL L. TAYLOR

LAW. As employed almost 200 times in Scripture, "law" signifies the revealed will of God with respect to human conduct. God has declared to man what is right and wrong. The law spoken of here is a divine standard.

Underlying the biblical notion of law is God's covenant relation with His people. The law revealed in Scripture reflects the character of the God whom we serve. Because the Lord is holy and faithful, His commandments are righteous and true.

The basic OT term is *torah*, which in Hebrew generally signifies guidance or direction. This guidance is the divine teaching as to how the covenant is to be lived. The common Greek word *nomos* is used in the NT primarily in reference to

the OT *torah*. Unfortunately, *nomos* is understood legalistically by many people, and the central redemptive purpose of *torah* is missed.

The Ten Commandments given to Moses (Exod. 20:1-17; Deut. 5:1-21) enunciate the broad principles of God's moral law. They specify authoritatively, without qualification, what the covenant conditions are. God's people are called to obedience in accord with these directives.

The NT affirms the continuing validity of the Decalogue. Jesus reiterates its commands, highlighting the primacy of love to God and neighbor (see Mark 12:28-31), and focusing on the spirit of the law as over against merely the letter (see Matt. 5:17-48). Similarly, Paul (Rom. 13:8-10; Gal. 5:13-14) and Jas. (1:25; 2:8, 12).

Nowhere in the NT is there a recognition of the Jewish oral tradition as law. Rather, its rules and regulations are labeled manmade (see Mark 7:6-13).

Moreover, the NT does not require of Christians the observance of the cultic statutes commanded by God in OT times: the regulations governing the sanctuary, offerings, and priesthood; circumcision, feasts and festivals, and other ceremonial laws. These were types and shadows of better things to come (Heb. 10:1); they have been fulfilled in Jesus Christ. He is our Passover Lamb; He is our High Priest; He is the End of the law with respect to righteousness (Rom. 10:4).

Similarly, the social legislation of the OT is not obligatory on Christian society: regulations governing property and slaves, the army and warfare, personal offenses and civil crimes. This legislation was designed for a particular culture at a given period of history. Underlying it, however, are timeless principles applicable to all generations.

But God's moral law is eternal, for it is a reflection of His character. It cannot be changed. Man, in the flesh, cannot fulfill its demands. Thus, the law functions to show up his sinfulness for what it is, disobedience against God (Rom. 7:7, 13). He finds himself condemned as unrighteous, a transgressor of God's law at this point or that (vv. 9-11; Jas. 2:9-11). The answer to his dilemma is Christ. The law is a "tutor" to lead man to Christ, that man might be made righteous through faith in Him (Gal. 3:24). That is the only hope of salvation.

And now, in Christ Jesus, one is freed from the condemnation of the law, but brought under a new law, "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1-2). The NT is replete with exhortations, directions, and counsels respecting

the conduct of this new life. The Christian endeavors, in the Spirit, to live in a manner that accords with God's will. The goal is conformity to the image of God as reflected in the face of Jesus Christ (Eph. 4:13). The people of God are called to reflect His holiness in their behavior (1 Pet. 1:14-16). Thus they search the law of God to discern more of God's character and His will for their lives (cf. Mark 12:28-34; John 13:34; 15:12; Rom. 13:1-10; 1 Cor. 9:21; Gal. 5:14; 6:2; 1 Tim. 6:11-14; Jas. 2:8; 1 John 3:23).

See LAW AND GRACE, RIGHT (RIGHTEOUSNESS), FREEDOM, OBEDIENCE, BIBLICAL AUTHORITY.

For Further Reading: Kittel, 4:1022-91; *IDB*, 3:77-102.
WAYNE G. MCCOWN

LAW AND GRACE. Rather than being antithetical, the moral law (Gr., *nomos*) of the OT, epitomized in the Decalogue, and saving faith through Christ in the NT, are complementary. Christ declared His redemptive mission was to fulfill, or complete, the law (Matt. 5:17-18; cf. 3:15; Rom. 10:4).

For one thing, the Decalogue codifies God's righteousness and will revealed to Moses which was also present to some extent in fallen man's moral constitution, and in objective nature (Rom. 1:18-21; 2:14-15; Psalm 19). Furthermore, the Decalogue was a moral norm for man, the first four commandments to direct his relationship with God, and the last six his relationship with society. Moreover, rather than being an end in itself (which is always legalism), the law was designed as a directive ("a child-conductor," NASB marg.) to bring man to Christ for justification (Gal. 3:23-26). There was no salvation in the law *per se*, but through faith in the Redeemer to whom it pointed salvation was always available (Heb. 11:13-16).

Christian *grace* (Gr., *charis*) is the freely given, unmerited favor and love of God manifest in His Son for man's salvation (John 3:16). Grace is the heart of the NT and the most distinctive feature of the Christian gospel. The entire message of the Bible is summarized by John thus: "For the law was given through Moses; grace and truth were realized through Jesus Christ" (John 1:17, NASB; cf. v. 14).

Grace is love in action. James designates it the "royal law" (Jas. 2:8). Jesus Christ is God's grace toward undeserving man demonstrated on the Cross (Rom. 8:1-4). Grace transfers the Decalogue from cold, hard tablets of stone to warm, living hearts of flesh throbbing with outflowing love for God and man (Heb. 8:10-13; 10:16-18). Grace reconciles unworthy sinners to God and

endows them with life everlasting and the riches of His kingdom (2 Cor. 8:9).

The biblical concept of being "under the law" is a looking to the law as a means of salvation, and being subject to the law as an external control on behavior. The biblical idea of being "under grace" is a view of grace as God's way of salvation, through Christ, and as the secret of inner moral power. Being "under grace" and "not under law" (Rom. 6:14; Gal. 4:21; 5:18; 6:7-8) does not mean that grace cancels law, but that grace, rather than the Mosaic law-system, is the only way the moral claims of the law can be fulfilled (Rom. 8:1-4).

See LAW, DECALOGUE, WORK (WORKS), ANTI-NOMIANISM, LEGALISM, LOVE AND LAW.

For Further Reading: Davis, "Law," *IDB*, K-Q:77-102; Mitton, "Grace," *IDB*, E-J:463-68; Eaton, "Grace," *ISBE*, 2:1290-92; McCaig and Rule, "Law," *ISBE*, 3:1844-58; Wood, *Pentecostal Grace*. CHARLES W. CARTER

LAW OF LIBERTY. The new freedom which Christ's atonement provides is called by James the "perfect law of liberty" (Jas. 1:25). Paul speaks of it as "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" which makes us free from "the law of sin and death" (Rom. 8:2).

Because the guilt of sin has been removed in justification, man is freed from the pangs of conscience for sins committed. Because of the indwelling Holy Spirit, man is also freed from (1) the pull of worldly (unchristian) attractions; (2) the weakness or reluctance one feels when God's will involves that which may be distasteful or possibly repugnant; (3) the tendency to be self-assertive and anxious in matters of secondary importance or in circumstances which try one's patience.

This new law of liberty is an inner law working as the believer's spiritual life unfolds in response to the gentle, persuasive presence of the Holy Spirit. This inner law is to be understood as something neither imposed from without (heteronomy) nor originating from within the self (autonomy). Rather the rule of God's Spirit in a renewed self is the very "key" for which the "lock" was made—the original idea of the Creator for man (theonomy).

The fundamental fact, then, is that the new law of liberty frees man from both outward (worldly) and inward (selfish) compulsion and gives him freedom to develop according to the idea for which he was originally created. The keynote of this development is love, for love is the fulfillment of the law (Rom. 13:8).

See LOVE, FREEDOM, LAW AND GRACE, ANTI-NOMIANISM.

For Further Reading: Wiley, *CT*, 3:25 ff; Hordern, *A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology*, 173 ff; Upham, *Principles of the Interior Life*.

ALVIN HAROLD KAUFFMAN

LAY BAPTISM. The Church has been divided over the question of the validity of baptism administered by unordained persons. No clear restrictions are imposed in the NT. Jesus left the rite of baptizing to His disciples, and this before there was any consciousness on their part of special authority. Later, the deacon Philip baptized the Samaritan believers and the Ethiopian official. On the Day of Pentecost the 3,000 converts could have been baptized by many others among the total 120 as well as the Twelve (counting Matthias)—though it can safely be assumed that the baptizing was under the direction of the apostles. In Corinth most of the baptizing was done by Paul's associates (1 Cor. 1:14-17). This slender amount of data would suggest an absence of a view of baptizing which saw it as the sacrosanct preserve of a special ministerial order. Yet, while baptism is not absolutely essential to salvation, its sanctity is such that a denomination which chose to guard the sacrament by definite restrictions and prescribed procedures, in the interests of faith and order, would be in harmony with the apostolic tone of the NT—provided it did not impose ritualistic details as conditions of salvation.

See BAPTISM, BAPTISMAL REGENERATION, SACRAMENTARIANISM.

For Further Reading: Baker's *DT*; Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 631.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

LAYING ON OF HANDS. The practice of laying on of hands, or the imposition of hands, arose about 4,000 years ago, at least, as it was practiced first in families and later in religious bodies. It has had numerous meanings in the course of history, and it remains an important rite in Christianity with distinct purposes.

Jacob placed his hands upon the heads of Joseph's sons so as to convey his blessing to them (Genesis 48). Moses laid his hands on Joshua to commission him to carry on his work and to invest him with some of his God-given authority (Num. 27:18-23). Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon a sacrifice to suggest the peoples' identification with a sacrifice (Exod. 29:10).

The NT suggests further meanings of this practice. Christ used this rite in the performance of some of His miracles (Mark 5:23; 6:5; 7:32). His disciples did likewise after His ascension

(Acts 6:6; 9:12, 17; 28:8). Our Lord also used it to convey His blessing on children (Mark 10:13, 16). The Early Church also employed the rite for the reception of the Holy Spirit by those who believed (Acts 8:14 ff; 19:1 ff). It was used, too, for the conferring of an office or assignment in the Church as the apostles laid their hands on the heads of the first deacons (6:6). Prophets and teachers laid their hands on Barnabas and Saul and sent them out to evangelize (13:3). Paul told Timothy that he had received a *charisma* (gift) from God at the time the hands of elders were laid on him (1 Tim. 4:14; 2 Tim. 1:6). The great apostle said the rite should not be used casually, as he told Timothy not to be hasty in the matter of the laying on of hands (1 Tim. 5:22).

The rite is used in contemporary Protestantism primarily in the ordination of ministers, baptism, and praying for the sick.

See ORDAIN (ORDINATION).

For Further Reading: "Laying on of Hands," *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*.

W. CURRY MAVIS

LEAVEN. Any agent of fermentation added to liquids or dough, leaven receives a religious significance in the OT from the Hebrew Feast of Unleavened Bread. This festival is observed during the seven days following Passover, when only unleavened bread is eaten (Exod. 12:14-20). It was intended as a commemoration of the Israelites' hurried flight from Egypt (vv. 34, 39). Additionally, only the peace offering (Lev. 7:13) and the wave loaves for the Feast of Weeks were to be made of leavened bread (23:17; cf. Exod. 23:18; 34:25; Lev. 2:11).

The NT emphasizes the symbolism of leaven. Jesus uses the imagery of leaven as a positive symbol for the kingdom of God (Matt. 13:33). Negatively, Jesus uses leaven as a symbol of the teaching and the hypocrisy of the Pharisees and others (Matt. 16:6-12; cf. Mark 8:15; Luke 12:1). Paul also speaks of leaven figuratively to describe evil or wickedness (1 Cor. 5:6-8; Gal. 5:9).

HAL A. CAUTHRON

LEGAL SIN, ETHICAL SIN. The first of these terms refers to the broad definition of sin as held by Calvinists, as consisting of any thought, deed, or omission which, whether or not one knows that it falls short, occasions his becoming legally blameworthy—simply because, in any way whatever, it falls short of an absolute standard. In other words, sin is defined solely in relation to law, without taking into account important human factors, such as intelligence and intention.

This way of viewing an act of sin is in contrast to the more precise ethical view as espoused within Wesleyanism. Here, sin as an act, in the sense of sin "properly so called" (Wesley), is an act, thought, or deed in which a person wilfully disobeys a known expectation of God.

Scripture seems, in a few instances, to refer to acts as sins which were not wilfully disobedient. Thus Leviticus 4—5 refers to "sins of ignorance," for which, after a person realized he had committed them, sin offering was to be made for their cleansing. In the NT, the weight is on ethical sin, which is blameworthy in a truly moral sense (cf. John 8:11, 34; 9:41; Rom. 6:1-23; 8:1-4; 14:23; Jas. 4:17; 1 John 3:3-10; 5:18).

While it is very necessary to remember that an absolute law exists, to label every unknown or unintentional infraction as sin, without making any distinction between such infractions and wilful deviations, is to violate the essential sin idea, which is a moral offense against God, an offense which must be condemned because it is culpable. *Morality* loses its proper moral dimension, as do *sin* and *holiness*, if the factors of personal responsibility are eliminated.

This is the reason John Wesley, though he freely conceded that the holiest person was ever in need of the Atonement, refused to call unintentional or unknown errors sins. Mistake, he says, "is not sin, if love is the sole principle of action" (*Plain Account*, 53). They are not "in the Scripture sense, sin" (54). Again, "Such transgressions you may call sins, if you please: I do not." He explained further the danger of failing to discriminate in this, and warned: "Let those who do call them so, beware how they confound these defects with sin, properly so called" (*ibid.*).

While it is necessary to distinguish between wilful sins and nonwilful sins or mistakes, it should be kept in mind that the nonwilful blunders are often serious in their consequences. Therefore an attitude of humility and dependence on the atoning Blood is always proper, as well as continuous effort to develop ethical awareness and sensitivity.

See SIN, SIMPLICITY OF MORAL ACTION, MORALITY.

For Further Reading: Purkiser, *Conflicting Concepts of Holiness*, 45-62; Taylor, *A Right Conception of Sin*; GMS, 120-26, 268-77. J. KENNETH GRIDER

LEGALISM. Whereas *legality* is the state or practice of being legal (conforming to law), *legalism* is (1) a dependence on law keeping as the means of salvation, and/or (2) an excessive bondage to the letter of the law which misses its intent and which fails to be motivated by love.

In the Judaism of the postexilic period there was a fanatical observance of both the written law and an added collection of oral traditions. The result was a rigid and external legalism of slavish obedience to commandments, statutes, regulations, rites, and sacrifices.

In the beginning days of the Christian Church, when believers were both Jews and Christians, many continued their former legalism. As the gospel spread to the Gentile world, advocates of legalism, called Judaizers, sought to impose their convictions on the non-Jewish pagan converts. This set the stage for the first doctrinal conflict in the fledgling Church. Although it was *officially* settled at the first Christian council at Jerusalem—with the rejection of legalism—the struggle was continued throughout much of the first century.

With the exception of Jesus, the prime opponent of legalism was the apostle Paul, who had been dramatically delivered from its bondage (cf. Gal. 1:13 ff; Rom. 7:7 ff). He recognized that the observance of the Jewish law—as essential to salvation—was a form of works righteousness that repudiated justification by grace through faith. In his Galatian letter Paul warned that surrender to Jewish legalism was tantamount to the rejection of Christ and His saving cross (Gal. 2:21) and resulted in galling bondage and slavery (4:9; 5:1). Even more significantly, a dependence on the law would make impossible the new life of the Spirit.

The threat of legalism has plagued the Church from the first century to the present. Today the appeal is not to adopt the Jewish law, but to drift into moralism, a "Christian" version of legalism. Law is viewed as the only alternative to a freedom that becomes license. Religion thus becomes *primarily* a matter of following a set of rules and regulations. The believer is entangled in the web of *works* righteousness that very easily becomes a *self-righteousness*. In turn, such self-righteousness often causes one to live by a "legalistic letter" that results in a cutting, critical, and condemning spirit toward other people. This expression of legalism is a tragic contradiction of the love that is the heart of the Christian faith.

The corrective for legalism is not license (Gal. 5:13 ff) but that Spirit-generated love which fulfills the spirit and intent of the law from the heart, in true freedom.

See LAW, LAW AND GRACE, ANTINOMIANISM, LOVE, JUDAISM.

For Further Reading: Fairbairn, *The Revelation of Law in Scripture*; Howard, *Newness of Life*; Barclay, *The Mind of St. Paul*. RICHARD E. HOWARD

LEISURE. Leisure is free time, time which is not necessary for *existence* (to survive biologically), nor for *subsistence* (to survive economically). Technological advances and labor-saving devices have provided man with more leisure than ever before. The way he uses his leisure is an index of his intelligence, culture, character, and religion. There are four major options in a worthwhile use of leisure time; recreation, improvement, worship, and service.

Recreation. "Your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit," writes Paul. "Honor God with your body" (1 Cor. 6:19-20, NIV). As His stewards, we are charged to take care of His property. Recreation is part of this care. "The tension of both mind and body resulting from the pace and complexity of modern industrial life emphasizes the necessity of periods of rest and relaxation as essential factors in the preservation of the body" (Culbertson, *Introduction to Christian Theology*, 352).

Improvement. The determination of the committed Christian is to be "my utmost for His Highest," says Oswald Chambers. This drive for excellence affects every area of life. Leisure provides time for culture, "the development of the person intellectually, aesthetically, and socially, to the full use of his powers, in compatibility with the recognized standards of excellence of his society" (Taylor, *A Return to Christian Culture*, 16).

Worship and Service. Worship is both adoration and communion with the Lord, and an offering of oneself in service to Him. In private devotions, the child of God is renewed spiritually. In the fellowship of the church, he draws strength from the means of grace and finds avenues of service. He uses his leisure to worship and serve.

Leisure is free time only in the sense that one may choose how it is spent. Man can fritter it away or grasp the opportunities it offers "for learning and freedom, for growth and expression, for rest and restoration, for rediscovering life in its entirety" (Lee, *Religion and Leisure in America*, 35). The Christian is called to faithfulness in his stewardship of this valuable resource (1 Cor. 4:2; Eph. 5:15-16).

See TIME, DISCIPLINE, GROW (GROWTH), STEWARDSHIP.

For Further Reading: Thomas, *Christian Ethics and Moral Philosophy*, 210-16; Taylor, *A Return to Christian Culture*, 15-28, 42-51; Wiley, CT, 3:47-64; Lee, *Religion and Leisure in America*.
MAUREEN H. BOX

LENT. In the Christian year, Lent is the 40-day period beginning with Ash Wednesday devoted to preparation for the celebration of redemption on Easter Sunday.

That Lent should consist of 40 days seems to have been established by the end of the fourth century and may reflect the time Moses spent on Sinai or the period of Jesus' fasting in the wilderness of temptation. The 40 days might also simply reflect the normal period of preparation for the catechumens who would be baptized at Easter.

Although fasting was practiced in connection with the preparation for Easter, in the Early Church it amounted to only two or three days. From the fourth century to the ninth, fasting was emphasized and its observance rigidly enforced. From the ninth century to the present, Lenten fasting has been deemphasized by the Roman Catholic church so that since 1966 the obligation to fast is restricted to Ash Wednesday and Good Friday.

Fasting has given place to emphasis upon an abstemious life-style through Lent. Celebration is reserved for Easter and is displaced during Lent by abstaining from festivities, by omitting the Alleluia from the Mass, and by devoting more than usual time to religious exercises.

Lenten fasting is encouraged in the Book of Common Prayer. Lent comprises part of the Lutheran year and is observed variously in other Protestant denominations.

The word *lent* is derived from an Anglo-Saxon word for spring (*lencten*) which might have referred to the "lengthen"-ing of the days.

See FASTING, CHRISTIAN YEAR.

For Further Reading: *Baker's Dictionary of Practical Theology*, 364-413.
DANIEL N. BERG

LIABILITY TO SIN. The Bible is clear that man's present existence is one of probation, and that he remains liable to sin. "My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous" (1 John 2:1).

People are not liable to sin because they are sinners, but because they are human. Susceptibility to sin is a part of the human predicament; it belongs to the endowment of freedom. It is true that no human is born without the "infection" of sin, but neither is this the basis of one's liability to sin. If it were, then Adam and Eve could not have sinned because they were created pure and perfect, with no natural inclination to sin.

The crux for Wesleyans is whether an entirely sanctified believer is placed beyond the power of sinning. Wesleyans do hold that entire sanctification cleanses the believer's heart from the corruption of inbred sin, whereby he is freed from

the bent to sin. However, they do not hold that he is thereby freed from the liability to sin. This susceptibility remains because it is essential to the functioning of free agents in a state of probation. In addition, an entirely sanctified believer must reckon with infirmities of body, mind, and spirit, which increases his liability to falling into sin.

A distinction must be made between sin springing from deliberate purpose, and sin resulting from momentary weakness and unwatchfulness. "In an unguarded moment," Thomas Cook says, "the best Christians may be surprised into some single act of sin; but for this there is merciful provision in our High Priest above" (*New Testament Holiness*, 19).

But liability to sin must never be interpreted as necessity, certainly not as normalcy. "Permanent sonship and continual sinning are contradictions which cannot be combined in the same character. A person can no more remain born of God and continue in sin that he can remain honest and steal, or truthful and tell lies" (Cook, 18).

Wesleyans rejoice that though the liability to sin remains, the Christian need not sin. In the words of Cook: "While inability to sin does not belong to Christian experience, to be able not to sin does" (16).

Yet if one is overtaken in a fault or transgression, one has the sufficient mercy of God for forgiveness and cleansing (1 John 1:9). He also has the resource of a caring body of spiritual persons who, according to Gal. 6:1, have the challenge to exercise the ministry of prayerful restoration.

See SIN, MISTAKES, INFIRMITIES, SINLESS PERFECTION.

For Further Reading: Cook, *New Testament Holiness*; Geiger, ed., *Further Insights into Holiness*, 193 ff; Cox, *John Wesley's Concept of Perfection*.

NEIL E. HIGHTOWER

LIBERALISM. In theology, this is a synonym of modernism. In contrast to conservative, classical Christian teachings, its persuasions are more rational and humanistic than biblical. Emphasizing the function of human reason as what determines the validity of a doctrine, it denies many time-honored Christian teachings that are biblical, but that (in its view) are not scientifically supportable.

Liberalism denies the virgin conception of Christ, His substitutionary atonement, His bodily resurrection, and His second coming. This, in favor of a Jesus who is only human, and not divine. It therefore denies the doctrine of the Trinity. It tends to favor religious education instead of

evangelism; spiritual growth instead of conversion. In the doctrine of God, it tends to emphasize His love instead of His holiness; His infinite kindness instead of His judgment.

On Scripture, liberalism tends to view it as not qualitatively different from other early writings, and not as the sole basis for a belief. Instead of emphasizing God's revelation in Scripture and in the Christ of Scripture, it emphasizes God's revelation in nature. It tends to teach that everyone will be saved, instead of the view that the finally impenitent will suffer in eternal hell.

See ORTHODOXY, EVANGELICAL, FUNDAMENTALISM.

For Further Reading: Fletcher, *The Moderns*; Marty and Peerman, eds., *New Theology* No. 2; *New Theology* No. 3.
J. KENNETH GRIDER

LIBERATION THEOLOGY. The theologies of liberation seek to provide deliverance for oppressed and margined peoples by changing the structures which deny them the privilege of determining their own destinies. This theological category developed in Latin America in the 1960s and was nourished by the new concern for the problems of underdevelopment that arose out of the Latin American Episcopal Conference held in Medellin, Colombia, in 1968, although Protestant roots may be found in Christian student movements of the post-World War II era and even more remote influences in the French Revolution.

Liberation theology is neither new nor limited to the Latin American context, and it has become a worldwide theme which includes women's liberation and black theologies. It has taken on a reactionary character against traditional theology, and strains of Bonhoeffer, Barth, Moltmann, Pannenberg, and other contemporary European and American theologians are easily recognizable. The Latin American proponents readily admit Marxist influence.

Theology must be done (according to this movement) in the present historical situation, and its initial task is to "awaken the critical consciousness which produces an experience of social discontent." This task is "conscientization," the educational method needed to alert the oppressed to their condition and motivate them to hope for and work toward bringing about a change. Liberation intends to free theology from cultural and philosophical narrowness, often defined as capitalism, individualism, democracy, secularism, and pragmatism.

According to liberation theology, the present historical context can only be understood by utilizing the social sciences, and the most adequate

method is the Marxist analysis, which explains the causes of inequality and oppression as well as the necessary steps to correct them.

Theology is not an academic discipline, but rather "praxis," the action which "results from deep motivation," has the goal of bringing about changes, and can be defined as the entire mission of the church. The proper location of theology is "orthopraxis," usually a synonym for "the poor," a designation which may refer to the "weak, destitute, and oppressed," a subhuman condition created by greed and injustice. Simultaneously "the poor" is an attitude of "openness to God, willingness to be used by God, and humility before God." The ambivalent use of terminology may be further illustrated by a definition of salvation which is strangely similar to the last identification of "the poor." "Man is saved if he opens himself to God and to others . . . and this is true for Christians and non-Christians alike" (Gutierrez).

Liberation theology is doctrinally vague. The point of departure is the human condition and not divine revelation. Sin is primarily social and includes all that interferes with liberation. Salvation applies to the whole man and is a kind of universalism. The transcendent God is absent, and the church is not really very important except as a sacrament which symbolizes the reality of the new society.

Liberation theology has developed in nominally Christian situations where true evangelism has never obtained, and where colonization, neocolonialism, and development theologies have been identified with Christendom. Persons who have been educated by Christian institutions and compose the new middle class have often rejected the poor from whose midst they have so recently risen.

At least five factors of the post-1929 period which gave rise to the development of liberation theology are industrialization, the popular social movements, the development of a military class in Latin America, the conservatism and traditionalism of the church, and a theological dualism.

Liberation theology has made some valid contributions to Christian thought. It has served the Church in putting a new and needed emphasis on appropriate Christian social action and recalls to memory the social concerns of John Wesley in 18th-century England and of the early American holiness movement. Salvation can no longer be assumed to be purely individualistic.

Liberation theology is a reminder that Christianity meets the needs of the whole man. The

Church is challenged to reevaluate its theology to be assured that it is not abstract, but rooted in concrete human experience. One of the greatest values is the initiation of serious rereading and reflection on the Scriptures as a reaction to liberation theology.

But there are serious deficiencies in liberation theology. The social, political, and economic contexts have been so emphasized that the even deeper problem of personal sin is quickly passed over, if not ignored. If evangelical theology has been remiss in its neglect of earthly matters, then the liberationists have moved to the opposite extreme.

There is a general lack of biblical exegesis. The most serious deficiency is the tendency toward humanism. Man is an unexplained paradox. He is enslaved and exploited, but not to the extent that he cannot free himself from bondage and create a new world with his own hands. While he is dependent and controlled, he is nevertheless able to take control of his problems. The model for the new humanity is Jesus Christ, but little is said about the power of God in Christ to deliver man from his bondage.

See CHRISTIANITY, CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM, HUMANISM, CHRISTIAN HUMANISM, CHRISTIAN ETHICS, SALVATION, WESLEYANISM, MARXISM, WOMEN'S LIBERATION.

For Further Reading: Kuhn, "Liberation Theology; A Semantic Approach," *WTJ*, 15:1 (Spring, 1980), 40; Torres and Fabella, eds., *The Emergent Gospel*; Gutierrez, *A Theology of Liberation*; Anderson and Stransky, eds., *Mission Trends No. 4: Liberation Theologies in North America and Europe*; Miguez-Benino, *Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situation*; Kantzer and Gundry, eds., *Perspectives on Evangelical Theology*, 117-50.

MARY LOU RIGGLE

LIBERTY. See FREEDOM.

LICENSE. As here understood, license is not a formal permission to do something that is authorized by law, such as a license to marry, to hunt, to practice medicine, etc. Nor does it mean a departure from man-made rules and conventions of a particular society. Rather, it is an "excessive, undisciplined freedom, constituting an abuse of liberty" (*Webster's New World Dictionary*, 1970). It is an assumed right to deviation from basic biblical morality and proprieties.

The word in NT Greek which most closely corresponds to the foregoing definition is *aselgeia*, most often translated "lasciviousness" in the KJV and ASV, as "licentiousness" in the RSV, and as "lewdness" or "debauchery" in the NIV. Other versions characterize such behavior as "indecent," "sensuality," and "lustfulness." (*Aselgeia*

appears in Mark 7:22; Rom. 13:13; 2 Cor. 12:21; Gal. 5:19; Eph. 4:19; 1 Pet. 4:3; 2 Pet. 2:2, 7, 15; and Jude 4. The NIV translates the term as "a license for immorality" in Jude 4.)

Both Jesus and Paul pointed to unregenerate human nature as the basic source of society's licentiousness (Mark 7:20-23; Gal. 5:19-21). And Peter and Jude stressed the shameless conduct of those who wilfully gave themselves over to filthy living (1 Pet. 4:3; 2 Pet. 2:7, 18; Jude 4).

True Christianity eliminates "debauchery and licentiousness" (Rom. 13:13; 2 Cor. 12:21), and is characterized by loving obedience to God's holy commandments (1 John 1:5-7; 2:3-5; 5:3).

From the early Gnostics to the 20th-century "situationists" the Church has had to resist those movements which have been antinomian in spirit and practice. License is a revolt against both unbiblical legalisms and the disciplined liberties of biblical Christianity.

See FREEDOM, ANTINOMIANISM, LAW AND GRACE, RIGHT (RIGHTEOUSNESS), ETHICAL RELATIVISM, VICE.

For Further Reading: DeWolf, *Responsible Freedom*.
DELBERT R. ROSE

LIE, LIARS. To lie is to practice deceit, falsehood, and treachery. The various biblical words which are used to identify lying signify behaviors or persons which appear to be something that in reality they are not. This is clearly illustrated by such terms as "false brother," "false prophet," "false apostle," "false witness," etc. In the Greek NT these are compound terms, and the first element in each of them is the same root word as the word for lying (*pseudos*).

The profound seriousness with which the Bible treats falsehood is epitomized in the ninth injunction of the Decalogue: "You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor" (Exod. 20:16, RSV). In biblical terminology, to lie is not merely to practice intellectual dishonesty. It is rather to engage in the distortion of one's own true self, of one's relations with one's fellows, and of one's standing with God. This is expressed by John: "He who says 'I know him' but disobeys his commandments is a liar, and the truth is not in him" (1 John 2:4, RSV); again, "If any one says, 'I love God,' and hates his brother, he is a liar; for he who does not love his brother whom he has seen, cannot love God whom he has not seen" (4:20, RSV). To be a liar is to build for oneself a world which has no basis in reality. The only destiny that is possible for such a world is for it to collapse into the empty void that it in fact is (Rev. 21:8, 27; 22:15).

The inherent evil of lying is clear enough, as is

God's condemnation of it. However, in the sphere of moral philosophy there are difficult problems to resolve. Is it lying (in God's sight) to withhold information from those who are not entitled to it? to mislead an enemy in order to save a life? Some would say that any attempt to mislead or deceive is a sin, but that the higher priority of life in the hierarchy of values may justify such a sin. Others would say that sin can never be justified, and that any verbal falsehood demanded by the claims of life cannot properly be called a sin, because its origin is love, not a deceitful heart. In the one case lying is equated with verbal inaccuracy; in the second viewpoint lying involves evil intent, generally for selfish advantage.

See TRUTH, VALUES, INTEGRITY.

For Further Reading: "Lie, Hypocrite," *NIDNTT*, 2:467-74.
HAL A. CAUTHRON

LIFE. The various nuances of the English word "life" allow it to translate a number of words in the original languages of the Bible (e.g., Heb.: *hayyim*, *ruach*, *nephesh*, *basar*, and *yamim*; Gr.: *zōē*, *bios*, and *psychē*). To generalize, life conveys the positively evaluated idea of animate existence as opposed to the negatively evaluated inert state or death. Animal life refers to moving creatures (cf. Gen. 7:21-23; Acts 17:28); living water is running as opposed to stagnant (cf. Gen. 26:19; John 4:10, 14; 7:38). Despite the obvious differences in emphasis and detail between the two Testaments and among the various biblical witnesses, the Bible presents a holistic view of life which differs markedly from all nonbiblical views.

Old Testament. As applied to man, life refers to the spontaneous activities, experiences, and concrete existence of an individual, not an energizing force within him/her. Life is more than just functioning, existing, or enduring in time; it is well-being. Individual existence is not self-contained but implies coexistence, cooperation, and community. Only apparently spontaneous, life has its origin and sustenance in Yahweh, the Creator (cf. Isa. 40:28-31), the "living God" (frequently in both OT and NT, e.g., Deut. 5:26; Matt. 26:63; cf. Rom. 4:17). Self-actuated and sustaining life (immortality) belongs to Him alone (Exod. 3:13-15; Ps. 90:1-6; cf. 1 Tim. 6:16; John 8:58). He alone is real; the so-called gods are "dead," impotent because nonexistent (e.g., Isa. 44:9-20).

The gift of life imparts to God's creature "man" the possibility of a relationship with the Creator (cf. Gen. 1:26-27; 2:7) and of reproducing human life (cf. 1:28; 9:1). Life is experienced in its full-

ness only within the worshipping community (Psalm 27) since authentic life is found only in turning to God (e.g., Ps. 63:3; Ezek. 18:32; 33:11; Amos 5:4; Hab. 2:4). It is not intended merely to be enjoyed, but to be actively chosen and pursued (cf. Deut. 30:14, where life refers to successful conquest and possession of the Promised Land) and lived in dependence upon God its Source (8:3). Since life is a divine gift, it has a supreme value, and man is responsible to its Giver for the conduct and disposal of life (cf. Gen. 9:4-7).

There was little thought of life after death during most of the OT period; "immortality" was possible only through the continuation of the nation and/or family. Thus a long and prosperous life blessed with many children was conceived as an obvious evidence of divine favor (cf. e.g., Exod. 20:12; Deut. 5:16; Prov. 3:16; 10:22; Psalms 37:27-29; 127; cf. Jas. 4:13-16). It was only during the Persian and Greco-Roman periods of Israel's history that resurrection faith began to blossom. That there are intimations of a future resurrection in the OT is affirmed by Jesus (Matt. 22:29-32).

New Testament. Hope turned to reality through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, "who abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel" (2 Tim. 1:10, RSV). Throughout the NT it assumes the OT teaching regarding life; its innovation is primarily in clarifying the role of Christ as the Bringer of the new or true life (cf. John 5:26; 11:25; 14:6; 17:3; 1 John 5:20), which is one of several NT modes of referring to salvation. The unregenerate man is dead in sin although physically alive (cf. Luke 15:21-24; Matt. 8:22; Romans 5 and 6; Rev. 3:1); whereas the believer, freed from the oppressive powers of sin, death, and fear, enjoys a new quality of life (cf. Rom. 6:4, 20-23; 8:1-10; John 5:24; 10:10; 1 John 3:14; 4:18; Heb. 2:14-15). Like so-called natural life, this new life is God's gracious gift, but only through the new creation made possible by the reconciling death of Christ (cf. e.g., 2 Cor. 5:14-6:2 and John 6:40, 47).

Salvation life, received by faith (cf. Rom. 1:16-17; 5:6-21; 6:4, 13; 8:6, 10-11), is to be lived for the Lord and others (cf. 14:7-9). The life of the Christian is not his/her own, but the life of Christ (cf. 2 Cor. 4:10; Gal. 2:20-21). It is not to be simply preserved but shared in self-giving love (Matt. 10:39; Mark 8:34-35; Rom. 12:1-2; 1 John 4:14-18). Such is not necessarily expressed in the giving of life in martyrdom (1 Cor. 13:3; Phil. 2:17) but in giving of that which constitutes

life: time, energy, resources, health, etc. (cf. 1 Thess. 2:7-12; 2 Cor. 2:14-17; 4:7-18; 12:15; Col. 1:24-25).

The new life is lived in an old and dying body (Gal. 2:20-21; Phil. 1:21; 2 Cor. 4:7-5:10) which must be yielded to God for sanctification to "bear fruit" for God in the present, and in the future "reap" eternal life, also God's free gift (Rom. 5:12-21; 6:5-23; 1 Cor. 15:12-58; Phil. 3:7-21). Eternal life is primarily life of the heavenly order, not merely of endless duration. The Christian's resurrection is not a compensation for the miseries of life, but a resumption or continuation of the true eternal life begun already on earth. The Christian lives in the tension of the "already-not yet" characteristic of NT eschatological salvation (cf. Col. 3:1-4), which is both a present reality and a future hope.

See ETERNAL LIFE, SPIRITUALITY, REGENERATION, INTERMEDIATE STATE.

For Further Reading: "Soul," *NIDNTT*, 3:676-89; Kittel, 2:832-75; Howard, *Newness of Life*; "Life," *NIDNTT*, 2:474-84; "Life," *IDB*, 3:124-30; *GMS*, 446-47.

GEORGE LYONS

LIFE-STYLE. The term *life-style* has an innocent sound, as if it meant only our individualistic way of doing things. But suddenly we become aware that the world wants to legitimize such deviant behavior as choosing to live on welfare, or to live together without marriage, or to live with the same sex, by the use of this disarming term. All forms of discernment are loudly shouted down as judgmentalism. Contemporary society is being conditioned to be emotionally neutralized by the innocuous, uncondemning term *life-style*. But evangelicals cannot accept this. They must be prepared to oppose certain life-styles and espouse others; to refuse to endorse an open society; to unhesitatingly evaluate and pass judgment on life-styles, in the light of what it means biblically to be a Christian.

One's life-style cannot be equated with one's Christian experience. Experience is a relationship of heart with God; life-style may point to this relationship, or it may (conceivably) obscure it.

Even heart holiness is not an automatic guarantee of a thoroughly consonant life-style. The saying "Get the heart right and the outward will take care of itself" is only a half-truth.

The translation of sanctifying grace into an appropriate life-style depends, most fundamentally, on the illumination of the Holy Spirit. But the Holy Spirit can be aided or hindered in His tutoring by several secondary factors. Basic intelligence is one. Spiritual depth, governing

spiritual sensitivity, is another. Spiritual maturity also is a factor; how far is this Christian up the road? Also, revival will provide an accelerating impulse.

Environment plays a powerful part, since most converts tend to take on the life-style of the religious community to which they belong. Churches (and schools) are pedagogical agents, by example, atmosphere, preaching, instruction, and rules and regulations.

These many strands of influence bear profoundly on the kind of life-style a convert will adopt, how rapidly he or she will adopt it, and how thoroughly. Obviously, therefore, while the Holy Spirit, illuminating the Bible, is primary, the community also has a responsibility of a teaching nature, which it dare not refuse to exercise.

The problem of determining what is a proper holiness life-style is essentially a hermeneutical one. It is necessary, for one thing, to identify the unmistakable biblical standards. But beyond this, it is important to be discerning in applying biblical principles to 20th-century social issues about which the Bible has no explicit word. Tobacco would be a case in point. But the most difficult hermeneutical task is handling wisely the biblical tension between affirmation and denial. The note of affirmation rests on the Creation motif, while the note of denial rests on the Fall. On the one hand this world is a delightful place, and life is rich with pleasures and options—all of which are gifts from the God who pronounced His creation good (Gen. 1:31), and according to the apostle Paul, are to be received with thanksgiving (1 Tim. 4:3-5; 6:17; cf. Jas. 1:17).

Yet struggling with this celebration of life there is in the Bible a somber note of abstinence and repudiation. This is seen in the motifs of separation, other-worldliness, and pilgrim mentality, which are unquestionably very pervasive. "Worldliness" is a phenomenon recognized consistently in the Bible and consistently forbidden to God's people. This mood of denial, of disapproval and prohibition, stems from the fact that sin has polluted God's creation. Every good gift has become contaminated and distorted. Many things innocent in themselves have at different times and to different degrees been pronounced off limits because of the world's virtual monopoly.

The history of the Christian Church has been a history of seesawing between these two poles. Space does not permit a tracing of this struggle. But the struggle is still with us, between the humanism spawned by the Renaissance and the puritanism of the Reformation (at least in some

of its branches). Richard Niebuhr has delineated very ably the conflict, and its attempted resolutions, in his book *Christ and Culture*.

Much of the time the Church and the world have coexisted quite amicably. The latent hostility of the world has not been aroused because its evils have not been challenged. The Church has adopted the prevailing culture to the extent that the Church and the world have seemed more like brothers than aliens. But something happens when revival sweeps through the Church. Suddenly once again the lines become sharply drawn, and practices which have infiltrated the Church are now rejected, much to the discomfiture and disgust of the unconverted.

Revival always reminds the Church that it must not attempt to remove the tension between affirmation and denial, for the same apostle who says, "All things are yours" (1 Cor. 3:21), and reminds us to enjoy God's gifts with thanksgiving, also affirms the incompatibility of the Church and the world, reiterates the biblical injunction to come out from among them, and exhorts us to cleanse ourselves from all contamination of flesh and spirit, "perfecting holiness in the fear of God" (2 Cor. 7:1).

But while we cannot remove the tension—and dare not blunt the demand for separation—we can transcend the tension at the Cross. For Christ redeemed the natural order as well as the souls of men, and released a grace by which we may live normal lives while yet on earth—lives which are normal because holy. The gifts which have been twisted by sin, such as ownership, beauty, invention, and conjugal love, can be given back to us purified and ennobled—because *we* have been purified.

But this transcending of the tension through redemption presupposes the ongoing control of life by the Cross. This is to say, redemption miscarries without the maintenance of sanctified priorities. The gifts of life are not to be given dominance; that would be a reversion to idolatry, the love of the creature. In practical terms, this means that a holiness life-style will not go overboard in its affirmation of life. Hobbies, recreation, possessions, food, sex (within marriage), sports (within limits), art, music, vacations, education, all may be rejoiced in as good gifts; but all will be disciplined, all will be kept on the altar, none will be allowed to dominate; and all, moreover, will be expendable if more important claims demand.

Holiness by its very nature is the secret of living fully and joyfully, yet equally by its very nature will tend to draw the lines conservatively. In

this respect Wesleyans share an affinity with Puritans and Pietists, or any groups which have been born in revival. Several impulses in heart holiness assure such a conservative tendency. One is the capacity for more penetrating ethical perception of potential peril. Another is a supreme devotion to God and His glory, which means a dread of even the appearance of evil which might dishonor Him. Another is a passion for souls which creates a keen awareness of the importance of example and its influence. Another trait endemic to holiness is goodwill—a spirit of cooperation, which is to say, a willingness to conform to the commitments of the group. A final quality is an emancipation from a carnal bondage to human opinion—or the “in” thing.

Paul prayed that the Philippians would have a love that abounded more and more in knowledge and judgment, in order to discern things “that are excellent,” or literally, things that *make a difference* (Phil. 1:9-10). Some things make a big difference. Others make a little difference, but not enough to divide over. Still others make no difference at all. The strength of the holiness movement will depend not only on pure motives but enough sound judgment to know which is which. It takes sense as well as piety to know where to draw the line between affirmation and denial. Yet it must be reiterated that spiritual depth will be conducive to greater caution than nominalism, and holiness people will always tend to see evil where carnal Christians see no evil at all.

See HOLINESS, ETHICS, ETHICAL RELATIVISM, HUMANISM, CHRISTIAN HUMANISM, WORLD (WORLDLINESS), IMITATION OF CHRIST, SPIRITUAL WARFARE, SINNING RELIGION.

For Further Reading: Shoemaker, *Extraordinary Living for Ordinary Men*; Lindsell, *The World, the Flesh, and the Devil*; Taylor, *Return to Christian Culture*; *The Disciplined Life*; Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture*.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

LIGHT. This is a basic descriptive image of God as revealed in Christ. The scriptural word means brightness either as substance, reflection, or as revelation. God is light (1 John 1:5) who came among us as Jesus Christ (John 1:9); and in Him all men may see light (Ps. 36:9). Christ, as Deity in the flesh, is the embodiment of light.

Creation took place as light was introduced into the world (Gen. 1:3). Being is light. Nonbeing is darkness. The initial dispelling of darkness was prophetic of the continuing drama which looks to the ultimate triumph and destruction of darkness by Christ the Light. The word imagery of

light illuminates the old covenant, e.g., the Exodus light (Exod. 13:21), the Tabernacle light (1 Sam. 3:3), the central place of lampstands in Temple worship (2 Chron. 4:7), and the promise of God to illuminate His people (Isa. 60:19-20). Prophetically the Psalmist sought the light of God's face, and Zechariah looked to the day when God's abiding Spirit would dwell as illumination in the cleansed hearts of the redeemed (Zech. 4:6 ff).

The light breaks through in clarity in the person of God the Son (Matt. 5:14-16; John 1:1-18; Heb. 2:6-7). Jesus is the incarnation of God in the present world, and He is announced as the Lamb who is the Light of the new heaven and earth (Rev. 21:22-26).

Light was a religious symbol in ancient non-biblical traditions, e.g., Babylonian. Some pre-Socratic Greek philosophers expressed light as a presupposition of all understanding. The writings of the Christian saints commonly use the imagery of “radiance” and “light” in their efforts to express a manifestation of God.

Light is a fundamental concept theologically since it is descriptive of the nature of God and is definitive of the mission of Christ. It guides the soul responding to the prevenient and saving grace of God and is part of the new atmosphere in which the regenerate person lives (John 8:12). The soul of man was created to be an earthly lamp of God. It may be proper, therefore, to define light as the spiritual understanding which a person receives as he accepts the revelatory Word of God. His continued acceptance (walking in the light) is his salvation.

Since Christ alone is the Light of life, to be indwelt by Christ is to have light, and not to be indwelt by Christ is to live in darkness (John 1:12; 3:19-21). The unconverted sense spiritual light as blind men sense the light of the sun but do not see. In one respect the fire of hell is the residue of refused light.

The one who receives the gift of life in Christ (1 John 5:12) may live and walk in light (1:7) and be a “child” of light (Luke 16:8) and a bearer of light (Matt. 6:22). The redeemed person begins to take on more of a radiance of His light (Eph. 5:8) and to become light in the world (Phil. 2:15).

See DARKNESS, KNOWLEDGE, REVELATION (NATURAL, SPECIAL).

For Further Reading: Kittel, 9:310-58; Pelican, *The Light of the World*; Robertson, *Light in Darkness*.

GORDON WETMORE

LIKENESS. See DIVINE IMAGE.

LIMBO. In Roman Catholic theology *limbo* (from Latin *limbus*, meaning "border") is the middle ground between hell and heaven. To this place are consigned unbaptized infants and unbaptized but righteous heathen, who do not deserve hell but are not entitled to heaven. Such a doctrine is the logical product of an extreme sacramentarianism, which affirms the absolute necessity of baptism for salvation, combined with an attempt to preserve some semblance of justice in the divine order. Limbo is not marked by unhappiness or pain, but neither is it participation in the glories of redemption. Its nearest non-Christian conception might be the Nirvana of Buddhism. The NT teaches only two possible destinies, not three. There would be no need to invent a third place or destiny if baptism were not invested with such determinative power.

See INFANT SALVATION, SACRAMENTARIANISM.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

LIMITED ATONEMENT. See ATONEMENT.

LITURGY, LITURGICS. *Liturgics* is the study of the origin, form, and use of liturgies. The term *liturgy* is derived from the Greek *leitourgia*, used in Hellenistic Greek to describe an act of public service, and used in the Septuagint to denote the services of priests and Levites in the Tabernacle and Temple (e.g., Num. 8:22, 25; 18:4; 2 Chron. 8:14). The NT uses the term of Temple services (Luke 1:23; Heb. 9:21), of Christian worship (Acts 13:2), and of works of love and devotion (2 Cor. 9:12; Phil. 2:30). In Patristic writings *liturgy* expresses the whole service of God and is used particularly of the activities of the pastoral office. Later still the meaning of the term became more confined, descriptive of the Eucharist, and most modern writers on liturgies, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, give major attention to the form and significance of the eucharistic rite.

First-century Jewish worship, both in Temple and synagogue (apart from the former's sacrificial ceremonies), consisted chiefly of Scripture reading, prayers, an optional exhortation, psalm singing (often recitation), the antiphonal declaration of the Shema (consisting of Deut. 6:4-9; 11:13-21; and Num. 15:37-41) and the benedictions. The Apostolic Church modelled its worship on the Jewish pattern, and it consisted of praise, prayer, Scripture reading, exposition, and the Lord's Supper (see 1 Tim. 3:16; 2:1-2; 4:13; Rom. 6:3; 1 Cor. 11:20 ff; etc.).

Subapostolic writings such as *First Clement* (A.D. 95), the *Letters of Ignatius* (A.D. 107), and the *Didache* (approx. A.D. 130) all contain liturgical

forms and allusions. The *Didache* is basically a manual of liturgical directives. Justin Martyr, writing about A.D. 151, gives the fullest account of contemporary Christian worship: lections, sermon, common prayers, the kiss of peace, praise, prayer, and the Lord's Supper (see *Apology*, chaps. 65-67).

All branches of the Christian Church have had, and have, their own distinguishing liturgical forms, ranging from the ornate ceremonialism of Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Episcopal churches to the more simple worship patterns of the small groups in evangelical Protestantism. Prominent among those congregations with least liturgical forms are the Quakers and the Salvation Army, neither of which celebrates baptism or the Lord's Supper. (An excellent summary of worship in the Early Church and through the centuries in Catholic, Reformed, and Episcopal churches is found in W. D. Maxwell's *An Outline of Christian Worship*.)

The many liturgical forms found in Christian worship are not only inevitable but desirable, ministering, as they do, to a wide diversity of human feeling, religious aspiration, and temperamental differences. All liturgical acts, whether in words only, or in words and actions (i.e., ceremonial proper), are intended to have a twofold function. Towards God the liturgical act is an expression of the attitude and aspirations of the worshipper; towards man it is an attempt to unite the congregation in and through that particular form of worship.

As far as an ideal liturgical form can be spoken of, it should combine *objectivity*—the contemplation, adoration, and praise of the Holy Trinity; and *subjectivity*—the experience of the grace, forgiveness, and blessing of God mediated by the Holy Spirit. A liturgical form that overstates the institutional tends to suppress God-given individual expression, while worship that merely gives free rein to individualistic subjectivity tends to eccentricity and an exclusion of institutional devotion. While no one form of liturgical practice will satisfy all worshippers, each form must have both the corporate and the individualistic elements. Ideally, the Spirit should be able to work through the form, not have to go around it. Worship forms should conduct the Spirit's ministrations, not impede them. Yet there is always danger that the best of forms, because of habit and familiarity, can become a sedative instead of a stimulant. Whether a service is formal or informal, it cannot create a spirit of worship when such a spirit is absent from the heart of the worshipper.

See WORSHIP, PUBLIC PRAYER, FORMALISM, SACRAMENTARIANISM, MASS, CHURCH.

For Further Reading: Maxwell, *An Outline of Christian Worship*; Clark, *Liturgy and Worship*; Williamson, *Overseers of the Flock*, 99-112; Stowe, *The Ministry of Shepherding*, 40-56; Jones, *An Historical Approach to Evangelical Worship*; Baker's *Dictionary of Practical Theology*, 364-92.

HERBERT MCGONIGLE

LOGOS. Accommodated from the Greek, *logos* is word, not as a grammatical form but as the content or thought conveyed—the living, spoken word (Cremer, 390). It is used both broadly and specifically of what God had to say to man. It is OT revelation, the gospel of Christ, Christ's own words, and the truth about Christ. And it is the Christ himself, the perfect Expression of God.

The NT emphasis on the spoken, written, and living Word is rooted in the OT. The Hebrew *davar*, "speak," refers to the substance of revelation and is translated by *logos* in the Septuagint. The Ten Commandments, then, are the Ten Words. And the "word of the Lord" is God's communication. *Davar* (*logos*) is quite distinct from words that emphasize form or method of saying. It is even taken as identical with the power of God, as in creation (Ps. 33:6; cf. John 1:3). In a similar way, *wisdom* (*memra*), especially in Proverbs, is personified and related to God. Inter-Testament Jews carried the idea farther (*Sirach* and *Wisdom of Solomon*).

Some try to trace the NT *logos* (especially in John 1:1-14) to Philo's attempt to unite Hebrew prophecy and Greek philosophy. Though similarities of terms are seen and though Philo predicates certain attributes of Christ to his *Logos*, the subject is not the same. The Son of God is missing. Philo has no adequate Mediator (Cremer, 395). The *Logos* of John's Gospel and of the NT in general leads to the OT for its source and meaning.

NT usage of *logos* is different from and opposed to the pagan and semipagan concepts. The truth of God corrects the false ideas and half-truths of the philosophers, of the Philonians, of the Gnostics, and of modern unbelief. The *logos* is God's truth proclaimed (Mark 4:14), whether by Jesus himself or by others (Acts 4:4; 1 Thess. 2:13). It is handed down orally and in writing (2 Thess. 2:15). The eternal *Logos* is also a living person, now incarnated (John 1:1-14). The NT gives consistent witness implicitly and explicitly to the *logos* as the spoken, written, and living Word of God.

See CHRIST, BIBLE, REVELATION (SPECIAL), KERYGMA.

For Further Reading: Turner, "Logos," *ZPEB*, 3:953-58; Cremer, "Logos, lego, etc.," *Biblico-Theological*

Lexicon of New Testament Greek, 390-96; Girdlestone, "Word, Law, Covenant," *Synonyms of the Old Testament*, 204-14.

WILBER T. DAYTON

LONG-SUFFERING. Long-suffering is the demonstration of patience and endurance when one is being provoked or injured.

With Reference to God. In the OT long-suffering literally means slow to anger, a disposition to delay wrath (Exod. 34:6; Num. 14:18; Ps. 86:15). The NT usage also relates long-suffering to wrath (Rom. 2:4-5; 9:22; 1 Pet. 3:20). J. Horst observes that long-suffering does not mean the complete end of God's wrath. "In biblical usage [long-suffering] does not imply renunciation of the grounds of wrath. What it does mean is that alongside this wrath there is a divine restraint which postpones its operation until something takes place in man which justifies the postponement" (Kittel, 4:377). So, in God long-suffering is placing patience or endurance alongside wrath.

In Relation to Man. Paul identifies long-suffering as a Christian character trait by listing it as a fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22). It is further referred to in 2 Cor. 6:6; Eph. 4:2; and 2 Tim. 4:2. In the NT sense, long-suffering literally means "long of mind" or "long of soul," as opposed to shortness of mind or soul. Related to man, long-suffering is patience with others—an even temper under provocation. Yet that which distinguishes it from steely self-control is love. It is patience sustained by compassion and understanding.

See FRUIT OF THE SPIRIT, CHRISTLIKENESS.

For Further Reading: Metz, *Studies in Biblical Holiness*, 191-96; Kittel, 4:377.

JAMES L. PORTER

LORD. The title or name is descriptive of one who owns or controls as a master. He is the one in full control, hence a person of high authority, power, and position.

In biblical literature "lord" is a translation of a variety of Hebrew words referring both directly and indirectly to God and Christ. The Hebrew word for God in His essential being is *Elohim*. The word *Yahweh* (Jehovah), designating His relationship to man, is at once grounded in man's experience and God's Lordship, as in "Thus has *Yahweh* spoken."

The Greek *Kurios* is most frequently translated "Lord" but also has other meanings. Many English translations, e.g., KJV, NASB, NIV, RSV, use capital and small capital letters—LORD—for *Kurios* when it is a translation from the Hebrew *Adonia* (which in turn represents *Yahweh*).

In late Judaism the Lord (*Kurios*) was perceived

as the One who could legally dispose. God's Lordship was seen in His creating and sustaining the universe. It was He their Lord who had brought Israel out of Egyptian bondage. Hence He had a legitimate claim on His covenant people. He was for them the One God who had the power, right, and authority to dispose over all things.

In the NT, Lord (*Kurios*) is the name for God in quotations and reminiscences of the OT where the Septuagint is usually followed. The same word, *Kurios*, which is translated "Lord" to refer to God or Christ ("The LORD said unto my Lord" [Luke 20:42]), has also secular meanings variously translated "master," "lord," "owner," and "sir," as a form of polite address.

Jesus addressed God His Father as "Lord of heaven and earth" (Matt. 11:25). Here Jesus recognized His Father as the uncaused divine will while at the same time evincing that His own voluntary subservience to the divine will was in no way either indicative or productive of a lack of willpower.

This attitude of Jesus to His Father gives insight into the early confession where the title and name, Lord, was ascribed to Jesus. According to Paul, "Every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord" (Phil. 2:11, NASB). His Lordship is the consequence of His humble obedience freely chosen. "He humbled Himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, even death on a cross" (v. 8, NASB).

See JEHOVAH (YAHWEH), CHRIST.

For Further Reading: GMS, 328-32; Kittel, 3:1039-95.

JOSEPH H. MAYFIELD

LORD'S DAY. This is Sunday, the first day of the week, the special Christian day of worship.

The term appears in the NT only in Rev. 1:10 where it provides the temporal setting of the revelation given John on Patmos. Despite its appearance in this apocalyptic context, it is doubtful that the "Lord's day" (*Kyriakē hēmera*) refers to the eschatological "Day of the Lord" (always *hē hēmera [tou] Kyriou*). The term in other early Christian literature (e.g., *Didache* 14.1; Ignatius of Antioch's *Letter to the Magnesians* 9.1; Justin Martyr's *First Apology* 67.7; *Epistle of Barnabas* 15.9; and the *Gospel of Peter* 9.35; 12.50) always refers to Sunday (and exceptionally more specifically to Easter Sunday).

The pagan term "Sunday" is certainly of later origin than the Jewish "first day of the week" (Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, 19; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2), and the equivalent "eighth day" (cf. John 20:26 and later Christian

usage)—and probably later than the specifically Christian designation, the "Lord's day."

The fact that Christians created a new name for only one day of the week suggests its importance, but not necessarily the significance of the specific designation, "Lord's day." The expression may imply that Sunday (1) as a day belongs to the Lord in some special way; (2) was inaugurated and observed on the Lord's authority; (3) weekly anticipates the eschatological Day of the Lord; or, with greater probability (4) serves as a weekly memorial of Jesus' resurrection; and (5) is the special day on which the "Lord's supper" (*Kyriakon deipnon* [1 Cor. 11:20]) was celebrated.

Scripture nowhere specifically commands the transfer of the day of worship from the Jewish Sabbath to the Lord's day. Nevertheless, probably from the very earliest days of the post-Easter Christian community (cf. references above for "first day") but certainly by no later than A.D. 150 (Justin Martyr's *First Apology* 67), the Lord's day was the chief day of worship, the climactic focal point of which was the Eucharist. Thus the decree of the Roman Emperor Constantine in A.D. 321, making Sunday a public holiday, did not change but merely recognized and officially sanctioned a long-standing Christian customary practice.

See SUNDAY, SABBATARIANISM, LAW, WORSHIP.

For Further Reading: Corlett, *The Christian Sabbath*; Jewett, *The Lord's Day: A Theological Guide to the Christian Day of Worship*; Latourette, *A History of Christianity*; Richardson, "Lord's Day," *IDB*, 3:151-54; Rordorf, *Sunday: The History of the Day of Rest and Worship in the Earliest Centuries of the Christian Church*; Wiley, CT, 3:143-50; Beckwith and Scott, *This Is the Day: The Biblical Doctrine of the Christian Sunday in Its Jewish and Early Church Setting*.

GEORGE LYONS

LORD'S PRAYER. The prayer in Matthew 6 and Luke 11 is referred to nowhere in the NT as "The Lord's Prayer," unless one counts the appellation "Abba, Father." The title is most probably a result of Jesus' introductory words, "Pray then like this" (Matt. 6:9, RSV); "When you pray, say" (Luke 11:2, RSV).

In the early centuries of the Church, the Lord's Prayer was a part of the worship service. Cyril tells us that in Jerusalem the prayer was used at the end of the Eucharistic prayers before the Communion. This leads to the conclusion that the privilege of public use of the Lord's Prayer was reserved for the full members of the church. The candidates for believer's baptism learned the Lord's Prayer either shortly before or immediately after baptism. Thereafter they prayed it

daily, for it was an integral part of their identification as Christians.

The prayer is composed of an address, six petitions, and a closing doxology. Although it was not unusual for Jewish prayers to be addressed to God as Father, it is remarkable that in the OT God is addressed as Father only 14 times, all of which were very important. Jesus' instructing His disciples to call God "Father" is the more astounding when we examine the word for "Father" in Jesus' spoken language, Aramaic. The Early Church fathers Chrysostom, Theodor, and Theodoret, who came from Antioch and had Aramaic-speaking nurses, tell us that *abba* was the address of the small child to his father. The Talmud confirms it: "The first words for a child when it learns to eat wheat [i.e., when weaned] are: *abba, imma* = dear father, dear mother." *Abba* was an intimate family word, and Jesus gives His disciples a share in this privilege of addressing God as *Abba*. Encompassing the scope of the Good News, Jesus empowers the disciples to speak to their Heavenly Father literally as the small child speaks to his father, in the same confident and childlike manner.

The first three petitions of this prayer (two, in Luke) have a very similar meaning. To hallow God's name, to pray for the Kingdom, and for the doing of God's will, all reflect the living hope of the Church that God as Sovereign will prevail.

In the remaining three petitions, the verbs move from the passive to the active voice. In the context of the eschatological hope expressed in the first three petitions, it is not unlikely that the request for "daily bread" suggested a share in the Messianic banquet. However, a closer, more practical reference is quite probable. The example of the manna in the OT suggests that the bread for the new day would be sufficient for that day only. It is quite possible that this is a reflection of Jesus' concern for the every-day needs of His disciples and means simply "the day's ration."

The fifth petition, a request for forgiveness of debts/sins, is difficult to interpret in the context of the prayer alone. Yet the tenor of the entirety of Jesus' teaching suggests that any person who is not willing to forgive others, is not ready to be forgiven.

Many explanations of the final petition are strained attempts at exonerating God from leading the believer into sinning. The simple truth is that *peirasmos* primarily means a testing, not enticement to sin. The biblical idea is one of putting men to proof, and such trials are to be expected. The meaning is: "Do not allow us to be overcome in our testing."

The final doxology is a liturgical addition which returns to the eschatological theme of the first three petitions, thus rounding out the prayer; but it is not in the oldest Greek NT manuscript.

It would be well for the contemporary Church to recapture the use of this prayer in its liturgical practice, especially the sense of privilege at being allowed to pray, "Our Father."

See PRAYER, FATHERHOOD OF GOD, ADOPTION.

For Further Reading: IDB, 3:154-58; "The Lord's Prayer in Modern Research," *Expository Times*, vol. 71, no. 5 (Feb., 1960): 141-46. W. STEPHEN GUNTER

LORD'S SUPPER. See HOLY COMMUNION.

LOST, LOST SOUL. In the present tense a lost soul refers to an unregenerate person who is deprived of the presence of God. In an eternal perspective a lost soul is one who has been judged sinful and sentenced to eternal punishment.

Biblical Terms. Both OT and NT terms, *abad* and *apollumi* (or *apolluō*), literally mean "To destroy, kill, or lose oneself." The implication is strong. Being "lost" is the result of one's own actions. The NT word *apolluō* is the basis for Apollyon (Rev. 9:11, Thayer), a name for Satan, meaning Destroyer. Hence, Satan is the destroyer, and a "lost soul" has taken action to permit himself to be destroyed by Satan. Figuratively, the biblical use of "lost" depicts the struggle between life and death for a soul. The prodigal son (Luke 15:11 ff) and Lazarus in Abraham's bosom (16:19 ff) are examples of the figurative conflict which is related to lostness in the NT.

As Spiritual Death. The lost soul experiences a spiritual death during this life. Spiritual death is a loss of God's presence, the separation of the sinner from God. Spiritual death is caused by the withdrawal of the Holy Spirit, as David indicated by his prayer of repentance, "Do not cast me away from Thy presence, and do not take Thy Holy Spirit from Me" (Ps. 51:11, NASB). The lost soul not only experiences the loss of God in spiritual death, but the lost soul also experiences the loss of the present pleasures of spiritual life: love, joy, and peace.

As Eternal Death. The ultimate experience of the lost soul is eternal death, i.e., to be lost eternally. At the final Judgment the willful separation of spiritual death is pronounced fixed and unalterable. Jesus declared that the lost soul would depart into an everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels, and that

the lost soul would experience this as an eternal punishment (Matt. 25:41, 46).

Universal. The state of being lost is universal: "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all" (Isa. 53:6). Paul restated the universal lostness of mankind: "They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one" (Rom. 3:12; cf. Ps. 14:3).

Remedy. The Bible also states the remedy for the lost soul. "Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it" (Mark 8:34-35).

See SALVATION, REDEEMER (REDEMPTION), ETERNAL PUNISHMENT, SOUL WINNING, EVANGELISM.

For Further Reading: Anderson, *Our Holy Faith*, 144-78. JAMES L. PORTER

LOVE. Both Hebrew and Greek have a rich vocabulary regularly translated into English by the word "love." In the OT, these words range from a root primarily denoting passionate love but also family affection and friendship, a root denoting tender mercies, to a root denoting steadfast loyalty. Though not as diverse as the range in classical Greek, the NT usage includes the dominant *agapao* and its cognates, *phileo* and its cognates, and the rarely used *stergō* and its cognates. Each of these words also has a theological usage. *Eros* never occurs in the NT.

The exceedingly rich theological usage of "love" has its basis in the character of God: according to the Scriptures, God is love (1 John 4:8, 16). Unlike the human expression of love, God's love does not need an object to exist, since it is His very essence. "God is eternally love prior to, and independently of, his love for us" (Cranfield, *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, 135). This essential character is the only sufficient explanation for God's love to man.

Without doubt, it is God's love for man which is the major theme of the OT and NT alike. His love for Israel is seen in her election, His covenant graciously given to Israel, and His mighty, redeeming acts on her behalf. But His love is supremely demonstrated in the life and death of Jesus. Paul, noting the gracious nature of God's offer of reconciliation to man, writes: "God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8, RSV). On the Cross, the God whose holiness exposes the

utter sinfulness and unworthiness of man, from His being of love himself provided all that was necessary to end the alienation and estrangement that man's self-love had caused. Only when one grasps the graciousness of God's love for us can we gain a proper perspective of our love for God and our fellowman.

Man's love for God is a reflection of God's love for us in that the origin is in the response to His love rather than an emanation from our own being. The human condition of sinfulness precludes the possibility of pure love springing from our being, since sin has so infected man that his attitudes and actions are selfish, not loving. Even the highest human love has the character of enlightened self-interest insofar as it is a human motivation. The love which does exist in the world alienated from God is evidence of the prevenient grace of God, even if it is not seen as such by the world. In sum, love is dependent upon God's grace and is impossible apart from it. "We love," says 1 John 4:19, "because he first loved us" (RSV). Consciousness of this utter dependence upon God's grace is the state of the redeemed and becomes more acute as the Christian grows. With the presence of the Holy Spirit, love becomes the basis of the Christian existence. It is this fact which makes obedience to the commands of Jesus into a joyous response to God's love, not an onerous burden.

The inescapable corollary of one's love to God is love for one's neighbor. Jesus and the NT writers alike insist that love for God must find its expression not only in personal piety but in loving action for others (1 John 3:18). "Hate, disobedience, mere profession in words without deeds, pride in one's 'experience', all point to a fundamental hypocrisy" (Johnston, *IDB*, 3:176). True, this love is costly and is often imprudent. It is never to be a thinly disguised self-interest; rather, it is to be "an uncalculating loving kindness" (*ibid.*, 170).

Our love for God and neighbor is the only fitting response to the love of God given to us. But we cannot love in such a fashion without a heart made clean (Mark 7:21), a point with clear ethical overtones. Love, then, is inextricably bound up with Christian holiness, for the truly loving individual is the one who is totally and single-mindedly devoted to the holy God. The loving individual is the one whose highest goal is the complete obedience of the disciple, whose every action springs from the love of God spread abroad in his heart, and whose life is controlled and guided by the Holy Spirit. No wonder Wes-

ley used the biblical phrase "perfect love" so often in describing the holy life.

See AGAPĒ, GREAT COMMANDMENTS, PERFECT LOVE, HEART PURITY, FRUIT OF THE SPIRIT.

For Further Reading: Cranfield, *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*; Johnston, "Love in the NT," *IDB*; Lewis, *The Four Loves*; Wiener, "Love," *Dictionary of Biblical Theology*; Nygren, *Agape and Eros*; Wesley, *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection*. KENT BROWER

LOVE AND LAW. The summary of Paul's discussion of law and love in Rom. 13:8-10 by "It [Love] is the only law you need" in TLB, not only goes beyond what Paul says, but betrays a grave misunderstanding, which leads straight to situational ethics, if not to antinomianism. What Paul is saying is that love alone can fulfill the moral law from the heart—fulfilling the law's spirit and intention, not just the letter—because it is in the very nature of love to desire to do good and not harm. What Paul is not saying is that therefore all laws are superfluous, since love is wise enough always to infallibly know what will be harmful. This would be a non sequitur. The impulse to seek another's welfare is not in itself knowledge as to what constitutes that welfare, or how it is to be secured. Love does not automatically provide information nor assure sound judgment. The guidance of law is needed to inform the mind in order that love may be directed into modes of self-expression which God has already declared to be proper for the achievement of love's objective. What love will not do—as long as love for persons is governed by love for God—is to despise law or set it aside.

See LAW, LAW AND GRACE, LOVE, NEW MORALITY, ANTI-NOMIANISM, LAW OF LIBERTY, FREEDOM.

For Further Reading: GMS, 532-41; Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, 509 ff. RICHARD S. TAYLOR

LOVE FEAST. The Gospels make reference to Jesus' participation in fellowship at a meal on several occasions. Luke and John especially highlight the theme of table fellowship in their accounts of the appearances of the resurrected Jesus. The memory of such moments was most likely the motivation for the Early Church's practice of regularly sharing a common meal. The desire to celebrate their religious fellowship, and their commitment to care for the poor among them, prompted the Jerusalem Church to eat their meals together (cf. Acts 2:42-47; 4:32-35; 6:1-6). Most probably their common meals included the observance of the Lord's Supper. This latter practice seems to have been carried on in at least one of Paul's Gentile congregations (cf. 1 Cor. 11:17-34). The observance of the love feast

was widespread until the time of Augustine. The Eastern Orthodox church persisted in the practice, which was taken up by the Moravians, from whom John Wesley borrowed it for his Methodists.

See CHURCH, KOINONIA, FEET WASHING, EUCHARIST.

For Further Reading: *Baker's DT*, 333-35; *IDB*, 1:53-54; Wesley, *Works*, 8:258-59. HAL A. CAUTHRON

LUST. See DESIRE.

LUTHERANISM. Lutheran was originally a nickname used derisively of the followers of Martin Luther. It later came to distinguish these from Protestants of the Reformed branch which was led by John Calvin, and Protestants of the "radical reformation" or Anabaptists. Lutheran, in time, lost its derisive tone, and Lutheranism became the proper designation for the structural spiritual heritage of Martin Luther.

The doctrinal basis for Lutheranism is broadly the pivotal doctrines of Protestantism: justification by faith, the universal priesthood of believers, and the authority of Scripture. More particularly, Lutherans are informed and influenced in their doctrine by a series of traditional documents. These include Luther's *Longer and Short Catechisms*, both produced in 1529; the *Augsburg Confession*, written by Philip Melanchthon (1530-31); *The Schmalkald Articles*, written by Luther for a general council in 1537; and the *Formula of Concord*, published in 1577 in the interests of Lutheran unity.

Lutherans recognize two sacraments. The Lord's Supper involves the "real presence" of Christ but does so without philosophical speculation about a physical change in the bread and wine. The Lord's Supper and baptism are means or channels of grace and thus not just memorials or signs. Baptism is for infants and adults alike and marks the reception of the grace of regeneration through the Holy Spirit.

Worship is liturgical and centers on the altar. Lutherans observe festivals and seasons of the historic church year. In some Lutheran churches certain Catholic forms of worship have been retained but in a simplified form and with an altered understanding of their significance. Medieval traditions of art and beauty were not rejected by Lutheran worshippers as they sometimes were in Reformed Protestantism. In fact, where Luther's influence spread, the place of religious music in worship was firmly established, and European Lutheran churches are often resplendent with works of art.

The local congregation is the basic unit of gov-

ernment in the Lutheran church. While the church rejects the hierarchy of episcopacy (although bishops are not unknown in European Lutheranism), it also rejects the looseness of denominational bonds as in congregationalism. Congregations unite in synods, territorial districts, or conferences. General unions are national or international and serve either as legislative or consultative bodies.

Lutheranism began with Martin Luther's attempt to reform the Roman Catholic church. Under the political protection of the elector of Saxony, Luther protested against the usurpation of authority over conscience by the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic church. What had begun as an attempt to reform proceeded to become outright rebellion, taking sometimes a secular form

as in the Peasant Wars and Peasant Rebellion. From Germany, Lutheranism spread throughout Europe and the Baltic States. Its influence came to be especially strong in Scandinavia.

Lutheranism in America is accounted for chiefly by immigration from Scandinavia and Germany. The first permanent Lutheran residents to arrive in the United States came from Holland and landed on Manhattan Island in 1623. Present membership in Lutheran churches is nearly 12 million in more than 17,000 congregations.

See PROTESTANTISM, CONSUBSTANTIATION, JUSTIFICATION, PRIESTHOOD OF BELIEVERS, BIBLICAL AUTHORITY.

For Further Reading: *Our Church and Others* (Concordia); *The Lutheran Catechism*. DANIEL N. BERG

M

MACEDONIANISM. This is another name for Pneumatomachianism, a fourth-century view that the Holy Spirit is not divine and is not to be worshipped. The Council of Nicea had only declared clearly that Christ is divine, and had only vaguely declared belief in the Holy Spirit. That council's vagueness regarding the Holy Spirit's divinity encouraged the Pneumatomachians to believe they were within orthodoxy by denying the Holy Spirit's divinity. But Basil wrote diplomatically in support of the Holy Spirit's divinity; and the Second Ecumenical Council (Constantinople, 381) declared the Holy Spirit's deity, against the view of the Macedonians.

See HOLY SPIRIT, TRINITY (THE HOLY), CHURCH COUNCILS, CREED (CREEDS). J. KENNETH GRIDER

MAGIC. See SORCERY.

MAJESTY. The term is used in English versions of the Bible to depict the greatness of God in reference to His deity and glory which place Him above any creaturely excellence. Because of His Creatorship, the word also attributes to Him the governance of the entire universe.

The term was used in ancient Rome to signify the highest power and dignity, and was therefore attributed to the whole community of citizens—the *populus* in which Roman sovereignty ultimately resided.

Later the term was used to acknowledge the

dignity and greatness of the ruling sovereign of an individual country or state. "Your Majesty" was considered the appropriate salutation for one's king or queen. It expressed the subject's compliment to his ruler.

The earliest use of the term in the English language was to express the greatness and glory of Almighty God. Thus it occurs in the English Bible as a translation for the Hebrew *gaon*, "excellency," and its derivatives (Job 40:10; Ps. 93:1; 96:6; Isa. 2:10, 19, 21; 24:14; 26:10; Ezek. 7:20; and Mic. 5:4).

A second term, *hōd* (indicative of grandeur, imposing form and appearance; consequently beauty, comeliness, excellency, glory, and honor), occurs under the concept of God's majesty (cf. 1 Chron. 29:25; Job 37:22). And a third term, *hādār*, (referring to magnificence, grandeur, ornamentation and decoration, adorning in honor), is also translated "majesty" (cf. Ps. 21:5; 29:4; 45:3-4; 96:6; 104:1; 145:12; Dan. 4:30). In a number of instances we have the combination of terms, such as *hōd* and *hādār*, to emphasize the exaltation and magnificence of Yahweh (cf. Ps. 21:5; 96:6; et al.).

Majesty was the divine name on the high priest's mitre, according to the apocryphal writer (*Wisdom of Solomon*, 18:24).

In the Greek NT the noun, *megalōsunē*, and the adjective, *megalēiotēs*, are used to express the su-

perhuman glory, splendor, and superbness of both God and Jesus (cf. Heb. 1:3; 8:1; 2 Pet. 1:16; Jude 25). The apostle Peter declared himself to have been an eyewitness of Christ's transfiguration radiance (2 Pet. 1:16-17).

Majesty was expressed in God's action, revealing His royal supremacy and stating His magnificence. Since God is the Source of all majesty, kings and men derive their dignity from God. This appealed to many a sovereign as he espoused the dogma of "the divine right of kings," based on Rom. 13:1-7.

Christ's majesty was manifested in His miracles (Luke 9:43), His transfiguration (2 Pet. 1:16), as He revealed God's majesty (1 Tim. 6:15-16), as He fulfilled man's true dignity (Heb. 2:6-9), as He shared the divine name and throne (Phil. 2:9; Heb. 1:3-4), and in His Messianic Kingship (Rev. 5:6-14; 19:11-16) about to be revealed.

See GOD, ATTRIBUTES (DIVINE).

For Further Reading: Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Psalms*; Thayer; Gesenius, *Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon*.

ROSS E. PRICE

MAMMON. The word "mammon" is an Aramaic word used exclusively by Jesus Christ in the NT (Matt. 6:24; Luke 16:9, 11, 13). It is evident that the word had a long-established reputation for expressing the evils of money in particular and of temporal wealth in general. Such possessions are spoken of derogatorily because the suggestion is that they were acquired dishonestly.

Jesus was sensitive to man's proclivity to erroneously seek security in accumulating such possessions and thereby become enslaved to them (Matt. 6:21). This was the problem of the unjust steward as described by Jesus to the Pharisees, who were lovers of money (Luke 16:1-14).

The answer Jesus gives to this enslavement is that the righteous must free themselves by an exclusive dependence upon God (v. 13). Human wisdom seeks the best of both worlds; but in the strongest of terms Jesus declares that it is utterly impossible to trust both God and riches. God accepts nothing less than undivided worship, and this requirement is at the heart of the first commandment.

See COVETOUSNESS, MONEY, VALUES, STEWARDSHIP, MOTIVES.

For Further Reading: Kittel, 4:388-90; Vincent, *Word Studies in the New Testament*, 1:394-95; ISBE, 3:1972 ff.

ROBERT A. MATTHEW

MAN. The technical term for the study of man is *anthropology*. This is a combination of two Greek words, *anthrōpos* and *logos*, meaning *the doctrine*

of man. The scientific use of the term covers the problems arising from a study of primitive man, racial distinctions, the geographical distribution of these races, and the factors which enter into man's development of himself in societal groupings. The *theological* use of the term is our interest in this article. We are concerned with man's metaphysical and moral being. Yet the science of anthropology and the theology of man are not absolutely exclusive investigations.

The Scriptures look upon man as the crowning work of God's creation. The Genesis account of the origin of mankind is the Christian believer's authority and source of information. Theories of materialistic origins for mankind, including *epigenesis* and the supposed resultant evolutionary process, are non-Christian, even in the self-contradictory theory of theistic evolution. Genesis 1 gives the basics about man's origin, and Genesis 2 enlarges and elaborates thereon. The two accounts are not contradictory but are complementary.

The account of the origin of this first individual man is a classic statement of Judeo-Christian anthropology (Gen. 2:7): "Then the Lord God formed man [i.e., his flesh, *basar*] of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath [*ruach*] of life [lit., lives, plural]; and man became a living soul [*nephesh*, psychosomatic somewhat]" (NASB). Thus God's fashioning of the empirical man preceded His inbreathing of the ontological self into man, which inbreathing gave to man both his animal and his spiritual life. Man is therefore a combination of both dust and deity, a time-space creature with eternity at the core of him. He is a psychosomatic entity, a combination of mind and matter (*dichotomy* in essence), with the highest functioning of matter evidenced in the brain and nervous system. Mind, involving man's self-consciousness and reasoning functions, also relates him to things spiritual and divine as well as to things material by way of his body. So much for man's essence.

Functionally man is tripartite in his being (*trichotomy*), and is so specified by the apostle Paul as body (*sōma*), soul (*psychē*), and spirit (*pneuma* [1 Thess. 5:23]). Here the body functions earthward and soul-ward, giving man sensation and world-consciousness. The soul functions body-ward and spirit-ward, giving man his self-consciousness. But the spirit functions soul-ward and God-ward, giving man his God-consciousness and also his own self-grasp in personal self-evaluation and self-estimate.

The Hebrew term *ruach* agrees with the Greek *pneuma*, "breath of lives" (both animal and spiri-

tual) and specifies "life bestowed by the Creator." The Hebrew term *nephesh* agrees with the Greek term *psychē* (psychological entity) and specifies "life constituted in the creature." The Hebrew term *basar* (not used in Gen. 2:7) translates "flesh" and agrees with the Greek term *sōma* (body) to indicate man's material essence as composed of "flesh" and "blood" and "bones." Thus man finds himself as a being that is both *noumenal* and *phenomenal*, a combination of both transcendence and immanence, with an *ontological self* as subject, and an *empirical self* as object. The transcendent self knits together in consciousness and memory the totality of its lived-through events and empirical experiences and functions outward and upward toward God and fellowman. The empirical self functions earthward and fields in sensory experience man's contact relationships with his physical environs. So much for man's functions.

Man was created not only as an individual (*ish*—man) but also as a racial being (*adam*—mankind). All the races of mankind have descended from a common parentage (Gen. 3:20; Acts 17:26). Moreover, the primitive state of man was not one of barbarism, but one of maturity and perfection (cf. Wiley, *CT*, 2:21). Adam (the man) walked in fellowship and holy harmony with God and intuitively read off the nature of each animal, so giving each a name appropriate to its characteristics (Gen. 2:19-20; cf. 1:31).

The Genesis account also tells of God's elaboration of the race into two sexes by the creation of Eve from Adam's *side-chamber* (*tsela*, Gen. 2:18, 22, 24), so that mankind includes both as *one flesh*. Thereafter, the basic unit within the race is a community of father-mother-child in societal relationships. So sex is God's invention, for He made mankind both man and woman (the "man with a womb"), both male (*ish*) and female (*ishah*); but since the Fall, nothing about mankind has been more perverted than sex.

See HUMAN NATURE, DIVINE IMAGE, BODY, SOUL, DICHOTOMY, TRICHOTOMY, SEXUALITY.

For Further Reading: Curtis, *The Christian Faith*, 7-93; Laidlaw, *The Bible Doctrine of Man*; Paul Meehl et al., *What Then Is Man?*; Wiley, *CT*, 2:7-50.

ROSS E. PRICE

MAN OF SIN. The "man of sin" is an eschatological figure described by Paul in 2 Thess. 2:1-12. The most obvious source for Paul's thought here is the OT Book of Daniel (chaps. 7-8; 11-12). These and other OT passages gave rise in later Jewish and Christian circles to a belief that the coming of the Messiah would be preceded by a period of religious apostasy and

persecution, epitomized in a great world ruler. Jesus appropriated the Dan. 11:31 passage regarding the profanation of the Temple and projected its occurrence into the future, near the end of the present age (Matt. 24:15; Mark 13:14). In the Johannine writings the expectation took the form of a future Antichrist figure (1 John 2:18, 22; 4:3; 2 John 7; Revelation 13).

For Paul the man of sin will be more than a preeminently godless individual; in him humanity in its hostile alienation from God will come to a definitive, eschatological revelation. He will be the final counterpart of Christ. Like Christ, he will have his "revelation" (2 Thess. 2:3, 6, 8) and "parousia" (v. 9). His coming will be marked by all manner of powers, signs, and wonders, by which he will deceive an unbelieving humanity (vv. 9-11). He will proclaim himself to be God and demand the worship of the world (v. 4). He will be the culmination of that satanically inspired hostility to God and to Christ which has been operative throughout history (vv. 7, 9).

See TRIBULATION, RAPTURE, SECOND COMING OF CHRIST.

For Further Reading: Morris, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*, 217-36; Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*, 512-28; Vos, *The Pauline Eschatology*, 94-135.

FRED D. LAYMAN

MANHOOD OF CHRIST. See HUMANITY OF CHRIST.

MANICHAISM. Manichaeism, also known as the Religion of Light, was once considered a Christian heresy, but significant recent research shows that it should now be regarded as a complex dualistic religion essentially Gnostic in character.

Founded by Manes, Mani, or Manichaeus (c. A.D. 216-76), this religion was based primarily in Babylonia and Persia, but broad missionary activity of Manichaeus and his followers pushed the religion into India, China, Tibet, the Roman Empire, and Egypt. Manichaeism is still alive in small measure in the 20th century both as a result of the conscious efforts of a few disciples and in bits and pieces of views of generally orthodox Christians.

Manichaeism's principal contention is for an ultimate dualism: light vs. darkness; good vs. evil; spiritual world vs. material world. The world itself is the product of a complicated struggle between light and darkness. And while matter per se is evil, certain activities and material entities are more an expression of darkness/evil than others. For example, morality is negatively regarded as abstention from meat, wine,

and sexual contact. Luminous foods (melons, fruits) must be distinguished from dark foods (wine, meat). The very purpose of procreation is the enslavement of particles of light (and thus involves the shrouding of light in the darkness of matter).

Ambassadors of light are especially Buddha, Zoroaster, and Jesus. But the final seal of all revelation is Mani.

Those who accept Manichaeism dualism will ultimately be liberated into the Kingdom of Light (either immediately if among the elect or through transmigration into an elect). Those who reject this will be reincarnated as beasts and finally end in hell.

During the Middle Ages there was a tendency to apply the term Manichaeism to any heresy. Catholics called the Reformers Manichaeism after this fashion. This led to studies which exposed the extra-Christian sources of this approach. A whole new era of understanding of Manichaeism has arrived through the great discoveries of texts in the 20th century.

See DUALISM, Gnosticism, MEDITATION.

For Further Reading: *Encyclopedia Americana*; Heick, *A History of Christian Thought*, 2:132 ff.

R. DUANE THOMPSON

MARCIONISM. This relates to the teachings of Marcion who, in the middle of the second century of our era, taught a Gnostic-like kind of Christianity which was dualistic, which denigrated the OT, and which preferred the writings of Paul to other writings in what later became Christianity's accepted NT canon. Marcion was excommunicated from the Christian church, and his views did not receive wide acceptance—although Gnosticism as such continued to be a formidable threat in that century.

See Gnosticism, DUALISM.

For Further Reading: Heick, *A History of Christian Thought*, 1:76-78.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

MARIOLATRY. Mariolatry is the worship of the Virgin Mary. Through prayer, prostrations, and other forms of veneration honor is ascribed to Mary that ought to be reserved only for God.

Orthodox groups and Roman Catholics have encouraged the adoration of Mary. Centuries of tradition have been formalized into dogma by Roman Catholic popes concerning her place. On December 8, 1854, Pope Pius IX declared that Mary had been preserved from original sin from the earliest moment of her life (immaculate conception). On November 1, 1950, Pope Pius XII gave formal voice to the long-held view that

Mary was a virgin throughout her lifetime (perpetual virginity). He also affirmed that she had been received into heaven without having tasted death (bodily assumption). Along with her centuries-old title "Mother of God," Mary was officially declared to be "Mother of the Church" by Pope Paul VI, on November 21, 1964.

Shrines have been built to honor Mary. Matchless paintings and beautifully sculptured madonnas have been created to aid the worshipper in directing his prayers to and through her. She is considered to be a mediator between the penitent and Christ. Songs have been sung, poems have been written, candles have been lit in her honor. Mariolatry goes far beyond the proper biblical appreciation for the lowly "handmaid of the Lord" (Luke 1:38).

See IMMACULATE CONCEPTION, MOTHER OF GOD, IDOL (IDOLATRY).

RONALD E. WILSON

MARRIAGE. Marriage is the institution whereby a man and a woman are joined together in the legal relationship of husband and wife. It was established by God when He created the first human pair (Gen. 2:20-24), and is the foundation on which the family and society are built.

While procreation is a purpose of marriage (Gen. 1:27-28; 9:7), that is but one of its functions. Apart from each other man and woman are incomplete. Marriage gives each a sense of belonging and of fulfillment, and is a citadel of mutual love and concern. But these goals can be reached on the highest level only as the man and woman are united in Christ.

God intended marriage to be a lifelong relationship. Vows and/or agreements made in its inception are done before God and therefore are most sacred (Matt. 19:6). A successful marriage requires a mutual, ongoing attitude of unselfish concern. It must be built on the principles of submission and love stated in Eph. 5:21-22, 28-30. As the couple submits to God, He supplies graces that enrich and cement together the marriage relationship.

The biblical principle of submission of the wife to her husband does not contradict another principle stating the equal dignity of the sexes (Gal. 3:28; 1 Cor. 7:4; 11:11-12). The wife's submission, like the submission of Christ to the Father, of citizens to rulers, and of employees to employers, is functional and does not imply inferiority. Because God ordained a hierarchy of responsibility, He also appointed a hierarchy of authority in keeping with the order in which the human genders were created. The dignity of wives is seen also in the fact that the command to submit is

addressed to them personally, not through their husbands (Eph. 5:22).

Marriage is only for this life (Matt. 22:30). But its intimacy, its love, its beauty, its mutual joy and concern make it a fitting symbol of the eternal union between Christ and the Church (Eph. 5:21-32; Rev. 19:7).

See FAMILY, CHILD (CHILDREN), INSTITUTIONS OF CHRISTIANITY, POLYGAMY, SEXUALITY.

For Further Reading: Bailey, *The Mystery of Love and Marriage*; Bowman, *A Christian Interpretation of Marriage*; Granberg, "Marriage," *Baker's DT*.

W. RALPH THOMPSON

MARTYR, MARTYRDOM. One is a martyr who willingly suffers death rather than renounce his religion. The etymology of the word *martyr* ties its meaning and history closely to the Greek word *martus*, meaning witness.

Although the word *martus* does not appear in the Septuagint (LXX), the spirit of the martyr is evident in many parts of the OT from Abel (Gen. 4:10) onward. Judaism held in high esteem those whose suffering and death were within the framework of the Pharisaic ideal of piety. For them suffering and death for the law were considered to be unexcelled works of piety.

In the NT it is Stephen who became known as the first Christian martyr. Paul told it in one simple statement. "When the blood of Stephen thy witness [*martus*] was shed I stood by" (Acts 22:20, NEB). The whole story of Stephen makes it clear that he was not called a witness because he died. Rather he died because he like Abel was a witness, and he engaged in fervent evangelistic activity.

The history of the martyrs in the Christian Church contains some basic elements. There is always evident the conflict with Satan and/or his agents. They all share in the imitation and extension of the sufferings of Christ (cf. Paul, in Rom. 8:17). In some unique if not mysterious way they found His support in the time of persecution and/or death even to the point that they sensed an unusual infilling of power and joy.

These common denominators go back to ideas and ideals set forth in the NT (Matt. 5:11 ff; 10:17 ff; 16:24 ff; Acts 5:41; Rom. 5:3 ff).

To be a valid witness one must stake everything, including his life, on the veracity of the truth he espouses and lives out. Jesus' answer to Pilate's question, "What is truth?" was what He did—the Cross. He had just said, "My task is to bear witness [*martus*] to the truth" (John 18:37, NEB).

See TESTIMONY (WITNESS), CONSECRATE (CONSECRATION).

For Further Reading: Foxe, *Book of Martyrs*; Sangster, *The Pure in Heart*, 62 ff, 107-8.

JOSEPH H. MAYFIELD

MARXISM. Marxism, the ideological basis of Communism, purports to explain everything of importance in history and society. As a social and political movement, it commands the passionate allegiance of millions. As social philosophy, it is also termed *dialectical materialism* and *economic determinism*.

Karl Marx (1818-83), a brilliant, highly educated German radical, produced in 1848, along with Friedrich Engels, the 1,500-word *Communist Manifesto*, which sums up Marxist ideology. Engels, son of a wealthy Englishman, became Marx's lifetime protégé and sponsor. Twice expelled from Germany, Marx lived first in Paris, and from 1849 to his death, in London. His four-volume work, *Das Kapital* (*Capital*), is the sacred scriptures of Marxism.

Marx borrowed Hegel's dialectical explanation of history, applying it, however, not to spiritual, but to material factors. Thus Marxism is materialistic, deterministic, and atheistic. It is congenial to the theory of evolution applied to cultural matters.

Marx theorized that all cultural change is determined by the mode of economic production. The ultimate social malady is economic. Those who own the means of production (the class called the bourgeoisie) take from those who have only labor to sell (the class called the proletariat) the surplus value of their labor, creating class enmity and struggle. This self-produced dialectic is the inevitable source of new social movements. The state, itself the product of economic forces, must protect the capitalist system, a fact which makes violent revolution necessary. After revolution, the temporary "dictatorship of the proletariat" will yield to "economic democracy," a classless society in which the people control the means of production. The state will "wither away." Religion, which is the "opiate of the people," will be eradicated. The final ideal will be: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

Lenin altered "inevitable progress" to "voluntarism." Under Stalin Communism became infallible state teaching accompanied by secret police and the horror of political purges of all dissident ideas and persons. The inevitability of war became dogma. Various revolutions have produced industrial serfdoms and dictatorships of

the Communist Party. The only acknowledged "right" is that which produces desired changes.

There is a popular existential form of Marxism, a philosophy of liberation, based on a theory of human alienation under capitalism, but it is scarcely compatible with the central dogma of Marx.

In spite of the failure of Marxist theories the mythology persists, a tribute to its ambiguous appeal to democratic ideals, and to the proud search for a humanistic salvation.

See CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM, LIBERATION THEOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Shook, in *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*; DeKoster, *Communism and Christian Faith*; Marcuse, *Soviet Marxism: A Critical Analysis*; Solzhenitsyn, *Warning to the West*.

ARNOLD E. AIRHART

MASS. The word *mass* means "sacrifice." In Roman Catholic teaching, the mass is a time when Jesus Christ is resacrificed for the communicant's sins. It is identical to the time when He was sacrificed on the Cross, except that, on Catholic altars, it is an unbloody sacrifice. When Christ is thus resacrificed, Catholics understand this to be a priest's highest office, and the communicant's highest act of worship. They understand that, through the priest, the substance of the bread and wine becomes the actual body and blood of Christ, even though the appearance of the elements does not change.

In the early centuries, Origen and others viewed the eucharistic elements as symbols. Others, such as Cyril of Jerusalem, began to teach vaguely that there is some kind of mystical change in the elements. Gradually, the "mystical change" view won out. This, especially in 851 when Paschasius Radbertus wrote a treatise on the Lord's Supper taking the view later called transubstantiation: that the substance of the elements becomes transformed into Christ's body and blood.

As Protestants view the matter, Christ does not need to be resacrificed. Christ is not physically present in the Lord's Supper but is present spiritually. They also understand that the Supper is a sacramental means of grace for the communicant only; not for others, in purgatory, as Catholics teach.

See CATHOLICISM (ROMAN), HOLY COMMUNION.

For Further Reading: Boettner, *Roman Catholicism*, 168 ff; Lebbe, *The Mass*; Sheppard, *The Mass in the West*.
J. KENNETH GRIDER

MATERIALISM. Materialism is one of the oldest attempts to explain systematically the nature of existence. From early Greek philosophers (Tha-

les, Anaximenes, Heraclitus, Democritus) to Thomas Hobbes in the 17th century and Marx in the 19th, materialism has had an appeal. According to this view, all things, including the functioning of the mind and the flow of history, depend upon matter and physical processes. Materialism is not simply the acknowledgment that matter exists, but the doctrine that matter is all there is. Materialism, as such, has no place for God or any kind of transcendent, spiritual, non-material reality. Mind is epiphenomenal.

The strongest argument for metaphysical materialism arises out of the fact that sense-perception is the basis for all knowledge. Nerves, brain, the physical senses—all are material. However, materialism does not adequately explain how new ideas arise out of sense data. Even our perception of matter is incomplete. Recent study of subatomic particles suggests that energy or radiation may come nearer explaining matter. The first act of God in creation ("Let there be light") supports this view (see also Heb. 11:3, NIV).

Moral materialism has been defined by Abraham Kaplan (*In Pursuit of Wisdom*) as "the pursuit of pleasure, power, or profit." Thus persons may be materialists at heart even though they disavow metaphysical materialism. The Pharisees and Sadducees of Jesus' day were theists yet materialistic. It has ever been a problem for man to live for spiritual values in a material world.

Gnosticism viewed all matter as evil and attempted to produce the spiritual man by imparting a special knowledge. Some Gnostics taught that for one who possessed this knowledge, indulgence of the flesh could not affect the spirit. Others emphasized escape from the material world through asceticism.

However, Christianity rejects both views. It distinguishes between *materialism* and *materiality* (the state or quality of being material). Material things are part of God's "good" creation to be received with thanksgiving (Gen. 1:31; 1 Tim. 4:3-4). The body is God's temple and will be resurrected in the last day. What God created, inhabits, redeems, and purposes to resurrect, is not to be despised or misused (1 Cor. 6:18-19; 2 Cor. 6:16; 1 Corinthians 15). The Christian rejoices in material things as gifts from God (2 Cor. 6:10; 1 Tim. 6:19) not as sin, but as responsibility. He is a steward to manage his Master's resources for his Master's pleasure (Matt. 25:14-30).

The Christian is warned of the peril of materialism—of being ruled by lust for the world (Matt. 6:24; 13:22; 1 John 2:15-17). Not setting his heart on riches (Ps. 62:10; 1 Tim. 6:9; Luke 12:16-21), he is to help the needy (vv. 33-34; Acts 20:35; 1

Tim. 6:17-19). Covetousness is sin (Rom. 1:28-29; Eph. 5:5). Moderation, discipline, and freedom from anxiety are the ideal (Matt. 6:24-34; 1 Cor. 7:31; Phil. 4:5-6).

See MONEY, METAPHYSICS, BEING, REALISM, Gnosticism, BODY, DUALISM.

For Further Reading: Kaplan, *In Pursuit of Wisdom*, 243; Sider, *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger: A Biblical Study*; Webber, *Common Roots*; White, *The Golden Cow*.
G. R. FRENCH

MATURITY. The concept of maturity, like the idea of growth, comes from the Latin *maturus*, "ripe." To be biologically mature is to have completed a natural process of growth and development. All living organisms reach their God-intended maturity unless the process of growth is interrupted and life is altered or destroyed.

A further factor in maturing appears where self-consciousness and purpose enter into the growing process. Human beings are said to be mature when they have attained a reasonable level of stability, wisdom, and competence.

Maturity in a theological sense refers to a high level of spiritual and moral development. The concept is clear in the NT, but the term is seldom used in the KJV; it appears more often in recent English translations.

Natural human maturity comes as a result of two forces, (1) the native, God-given growth patterns of body and mind, and (2) personal study disciplines that improve and expand the mind.

In spiritual growth, however, a third factor comes into play: God gives His Holy Spirit as a purifying, empowering agent. The Holy Spirit is a gift of free grace to all who desire Him: "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" (Luke 11:13).

When the Spirit comes in His fullness, He purifies our hearts by faith (Acts 15:9). Because He comes in response to faith, and because He is God's gift to us, He brings purity in a moment of time.

"Entire sanctification, as understood by holiness people, does not admit of degrees. It is as perfect and complete in its kind as the work of regeneration and justification is perfect and complete in its kind. This does not mean that there is no growth in grace both before and after sanctification. What it does mean is that sanctification, as an act of God, is instantaneous, and is not produced by growth or self-discipline or progressive control of the carnal nature" (Purkiser, *Conflicting Concepts of Holiness*, 30).

Thus we do not grow *into* holiness, but we do grow *in* holiness after entire sanctification. And we move more rapidly toward mature Christian life because we have been empowered by the Holy Spirit. Such growth and maturity are not accomplished by sheer determination and human effort. We make progress in the things of God when we yield ourselves to Him. Paul writes, "If ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live" (Rom. 8:13).

But in our movement toward maturity there is also the determined action of a human spirit now completely committed to the whole will of God. The Bible teaches that in addition to being filled with the Holy Spirit (John 16:13), spiritual maturity is achieved by putting away childish attitudes (1 Cor. 13:11); by improved understanding (14:20); by overcoming temptation (1 John 2:14); by partaking of the deeper truths of the gospel (Heb. 5:14); and by striving toward the ideal of Christlikeness (Eph. 4:3).

Christian maturity, then, is completeness in Christ. It is the whole human personality—body, mind, emotions, and will—dedicated to the will of God. But spiritual maturity is also a consequence of this total commitment. Maturity is never fully reached as long as we are still growing—and it is God's plan that we should grow at least as long as we live on this earth. Our goal is complete Christlikeness. While never fully achieved in this life, we are always moving closer to "reaching maturity, reaching the full measure of development which belongs to the fulness of Christ" (Eph. 4:13, Moffatt).

See GROW (GROWTH), PROGRESSIVE SANCTIFICATION, CHRISTIAN PERFECTION, PURITY AND MATURITY.

For Further Reading: Purkiser, *Conflicting Concepts of Holiness*, 29-44; Wiley, CT, 3:51-67; GMS, 508-26.

A. F. HARPER

MEANS OF GRACE. A broad definition of the *means of grace* is that they are "divinely appointed channels through which the influences of the Holy Spirit are communicated to the souls of men" (Wiley). Such a broad definition would encompass all aspects of Christian life, especially private and corporate worship, including prayer, fellowship, preaching, sacraments, etc.

An examination of how the means of grace have been understood in Christian tradition produces a narrowing of the definition to two main forms: (1) the sacraments and (2) the Word. The place of each as a means of grace is generally established in the Christian world. But a dispute about the primacy of one over the other is a fracture-line in the Protestant/Catholic division.

In Roman Catholic tradition the sacrament takes primacy over the Word as the means of grace. Through the sacrament the virtue of the passion of Christ is mediated to the recipient. A sacrament functions *ex opere operato*, that is, by virtue of a power within the sacrament itself.

The Protestant Reformation insisted upon reversing the primacy of sacrament to Word. Through the hearing of the Word, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, faith is born and thus the benefits of the passion of Christ are mediated. Only inasmuch as a sacrament is joined to the faith of the recipient can it become a means of grace. The Word is primary as the means of grace.

Emphasis upon the Word as the means of grace in Protestantism legitimizes a broader concept of means of grace. The Word is heard in preaching primarily. But it may come to human beings in the home and in the school, through conversation and through literature.

Thus we are led full circle to the broader definition of the means of grace which include prayer, meditation, fellowship, devotional reading, corporate worship, preaching, and the sacraments.

One of the most vigorous accents in the teaching of John Wesley was his insistence on observing all available means of grace. The seeker (for either pardon or perfect love) was instructed to be faithful therein until faith came; those having been justified and sanctified wholly were exhorted to use all regular aids in order to maintain and grow in grace. Wesley refused to be intimidated by those detractors (including the Moravians with their antinomian tendencies) who categorized all such duties as works-righteousness, incompatible with evangelical faith.

See GRACE, WORSHIP, PRAYER, SACRAMENTS, PREACHING.

For Further Reading: Watson, comp., *The Message of the Wesleys*, 157 ff; Wiley, CT, 2:460.

DANIEL N. BERG

MEDIATION, MEDIATOR. The infinite distance which separates God and fallen humanity requires mediation if reconciliation is to be realized. Mediation is, theologically defined, the means by which the distance created by sin is bridged, and God and man are reconciled. The heart of the matter is expressed well in 1 Tim. 2:5-6a: "For there is one God, and one mediator also between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself as a ransom for all" (NASB).

In the Old Testament. The terms *mediation* and

mediator do not appear in the OT, but the concepts are worked out in various ways. The principle is embodied in Israel's prophet, priest, and theocratic king. The prophet was God's representative to men; the priest was man's representative to God; and the theocratic king was the anointed representative of Israel's divine Ruler.

Among human mediators in the OT, however, foremost was Moses (cf. Exod. 32:30-32; Num. 12:6-8; Gal. 3:19-20; Heb. 3:2-5), the instrument through whom the covenant was established at Sinai (cf. Exod. 19:3-8; 24:3-8; Acts 7:37-39). Consequently, Jesus, Mediator of the new covenant, is compared and contrasted with Moses.

The supreme eschatological figure of mediator is the Servant of Yahweh who suffers vicariously as an atonement for the people's sins (Isaiah 53). This figure is perfectly fulfilled in the death of Christ.

In the New Testament. The word "mediator," Greek *mesitēs*, occurs six times in the NT (Gal. 3:19-20—of Moses; 1 Tim. 2:5; Heb. 8:6; 9:15; 12:24—of Christ). Oepke questions whether we are justified in regarding Jesus as "the fulfilment of the mediator concept" in view of so few explicit references (Oepke, "mesitēs," Kittel, 4:624). Such skepticism is ill-founded. If the term is rare, the concept is not. All OT figures of mediation intersect in Christ. Only Christ truly brings God and man together. In this sense there is "one mediator" (1 Tim. 2:5). The OT figures were, at best, shadows of the archetypal realities fulfilled in Christ.

The NT presents both the cosmic and redemptive aspects of Christ's mediation. The principal passages bearing on Christ's cosmic mediation are highly significant for Christology (e.g., 1 Cor. 8:6; Col. 1:15-17; Heb. 1:2-3; John 1:1-5). It is the redemptive aspect of Christ's mediation, however, that is most fully presented (e.g., Matt. 11:27-28; 26:26-28; Mark 8:38; 14:22-24; Luke 9:11-27; 22:19-20; John 14:6; Acts 4:12; Eph. 1:10-21; 2:13-18; Col. 1:20; 1 John 2:1-2). The entire Epistle to the Hebrews focuses on Jesus' work as the redemptive Mediator.

Both the Godward and manward sides of Christ's redemptive mediation are emphasized. Since He is the Word become flesh (cf. John 1:14), "the exact representation of His [God's] nature" (Heb. 1:3), Christ is uniquely qualified to represent God to men. Since Jesus can sympathize with our weaknesses, having been tempted as are we, yet without sinning (4:15), He is uniquely qualified to represent men to God. Jesus' death provides the objective ground for our forgiveness and acceptance with God; His

resurrection and exaltation provide the basis for His ongoing mediatorial intercession.

See ADVOCATE, PRIEST (PRIESTHOOD), CHRIST, ES-TATES OF CHRIST.

For Further Reading: Becker, "mesitēs," *NIDB*, 1:372-76; Blackman, "Mediator, Mediation," *IDB*, 3:320-31; Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*; Murray, "Mediator," *NBD*, 802-4; Oepke, "mesitēs," Kittel, 4:598-624. J. WESLEY ADAMS

MEDITATION. This, generally, is an act in which one thinks carefully in search of or consideration of any truth. Among Christians it is a form of mental prayer or devout reflection involving the memory, the imagination, the emotions, and the intellect, aimed toward spiritual insight and growth. Meditation has always been practiced in the church, and various techniques have been proposed to make it more effective.

As the word *meditation* is used today, it often refers to Transcendental Meditation, a popular movement headed by Maharishi Mahesh Yogi, who left India in 1958 to begin a tour of the West. During a brief training period each meditator is given a secret *mantra* (a Sanskrit word, simply a meaningless sound to the meditator) which is to be repeated during meditation whenever the meditator's mind wanders. The goal of the meditator is unity with the god who is, however, not the personal God of Christianity; and the devotee reaches this by the repetition of his mantra for 20 minutes each morning and evening. He wishes to go beyond all thought to a state of pure awareness. Transcendental Meditation is a version of Hinduism, and advanced meditators find themselves adopting a Hindu philosophy.

Christians are called to a different kind of meditation. They are to meditate on God and His Word day and night so that they will act according to what is in it (Josh. 1:8; Ps. 1:2; 63:6; 119:48). They are also to meditate on God's works (77:12; 143:5). Finally, they are to meditate on true, honest, just, pure, and lovely things which will elevate their thinking (1 Tim. 4:15; Phil. 4:8). Such meditation will be a delight (Ps. 1:2; 104:34). A Christian meditator is *not* to go beyond all thought to lose his individuality in pure being, but to find his identity as a child of God.

See TRANSCENDENTAL MEDITATION, DEVOTE (DEVOTION), PRAYER.

For Further Reading: Haddon and Hamilton, *TM Wants You!* Lewis, *What Everyone Should Know About Transcendental Meditation*; Pipkin, *Christian Meditation*. RONALD L. KOTESKEY

MEEKNESS. Meekness is that poise and selflessness in those who are truly strong which frees them from the compulsion to prove their strength.

Moses, demonstrating massive strength in reserve and unrestricted concern for the people under his care, is an enfleshment of meekness in the OT (Num. 12:3). The perspective which is typified by Moses is in the frame of reference of belief in the God of the covenant who will judge and recompense as well as justify the meek in spirit.

Jesus is the enfleshment of meekness in the NT. He is completely free of motives of self-service. He is confident, sufficient, and thereby free to serve people without using them. He is enough (Matt. 11:29). He is strong enough for any task in the fulfillment of the will of the Father, yet is not compelled to exercise undue force to prove it.

Historically, the concept has been distorted by non-Christian mind-sets which, by their limitations, are incapable of handling strength without subjugating the weak. Consequently, the grand word "meekness" as a Christlike quality (and the eighth of the nine fruits of the Spirit in Gal. 5:22-23), has been changed to denote a weak and passive characteristic.

Meekness resembles humility and gentleness, while it also includes the active qualities of courage and confidence in one's resources. It is the opposite of the pride and self-assertion which results from lack of self-identity as a Christian. It connotes a healing and restorative quality as it deals with other people (Gal. 6:1).

Meekness is in contrast to the characteristics of the carnal nature, since self-centered man cannot deal with others unselfishly. Meekness is confused with weakness by the one who is not cleansed of the spirit of pride and self-elevation.

In Christian terminology, then, meekness is an essential Christian virtue and an evidence of the Spirit-filled and Spirit-directed life. It demonstrates the confidence and resiliency which result from unreserved trust in and an unconditional obedience to God in Christ Jesus.

See SEVEN CARDINAL VIRTUES, HUMILITY, CHRISTLIKENESS, MIND OF CHRIST, GENTLENESS.

For Further Reading: Kittel, 6:645-51; *Nave's Topical Bible*, 830-32. GORDON WETMORE

MELCHIZEDEK. Melchizedek, "righteousness is my king," or "king of righteousness," is mentioned in Gen. 14:18-20; Ps. 110:4; and in Heb. 5:6-11; 6:20-7:28.

In Gen. 14:18-20 Abram, returning from the

defeat of the four kings, is met by Melchizedek, "king of Salem" and "priest of God Most High" (NIV). Melchizedek brought out bread and wine, presumably to refresh Abram. Then he blessed Abram by God Most High, blessed God Most High for giving Abram the victory, and, although a foreigner, received tithes from Abram. Salem is usually thought to be Jerusalem (Ps. 76:2), and Melchizedek, a Canaanite king. "God Most High" was a title for God among Canaanites and Phoenicians. Nevertheless, the Bible identifies the God of Abraham with the God of Melchizedek.

In Ps. 110:4 the Lord, with an oath, proclaims the Davidic king a "priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." Jesus applied Ps. 110:1 to himself (Mark 12:35 ff), and in this He was followed by much of the NT. Only in Hebrews is Ps. 110:4 applied to Jesus.

In Heb. 6:20—7:28, Gen. 14:18-20 is used to aid in the application of Ps. 110:4 to Christ. Melchizedek is superior to Levi, as proven by the fact that Levi's father Abraham paid tithes to Melchizedek and also by the fact that Melchizedek "lives" (Heb. 7:1-10). Therefore Jesus, the "priest . . . after the order of Melchisedec," the priest "after the power of an endless life," replaces the merely typical Aaronic/Levitical priesthood (vv. 11-25). This new Priest is able to save completely (v. 25).

Most interpreters understand v. 3 to mean that Melchizedek's lack of genealogy made him a symbol of the eternal priesthood of Christ. A few interpreters have held that the verse describes Melchizedek as an eternal being, a preincarnate manifestation of Christ or a theophany similar to the appearances of the Angel of the Lord in other parts of Genesis. The sudden appearance and disappearance of Melchizedek in Genesis 14 is not altogether uncongenial to this interpretation.

Philo allegorized Melchizedek as "divine reason" in man. Josephus refers to him as the first priest, the founder of the Temple at Jerusalem. The rabbis sometimes identified him with Shem, to avoid Abram's giving tithes to a foreigner. The Dead Sea Scroll 11QMelch depicts Melchizedek as the angel who in the last days will deliver God's chosen people and bring judgment on the wicked. This scroll has little apparent relationship to Hebrews 7.

See ABRAHAM, HIGH PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.

For Further Reading: Waltke, *ZPEB*, 4:177-78; Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition*; Demarest, *The Evangelical Quarterly* (July, 1977), 141-62.

GARETH LEE COCKERILL

MEMORIAL THEORY. See HOLY COMMUNION.

MERCY. In the deepest sense, mercy is an attribute of God given to His creation. For this reason we find the verb "to be merciful" attributed to God and man in both the OT and NT. Although the word may be translated "have compassion," there is a significant theological difference carried by the term "mercy," especially when referring to God's mercy to man.

The OT's main word for "mercy" denotes a combination of righteousness and love. Many Bible scholars are inclined to translate the word as "steadfast love," implying that God has entered into a covenant with His people. The result of this relationship is a readiness on God's part to relieve the oppressed and pardon the guilty. It is in the context of relief and pardon that God's righteous love becomes mercy. Mercy is compassion in action. Although guilty and deserving no mitigation, God's mercy is extended to man; and when accepted, it results in pardon. Only as man accepts the steadfast love of God revealed in the Cross can he receive mercy and experience pardon from sin.

See SUPPLICATION, JUSTICE, GRACE.

For Further Reading: *HDB*, 644; *IDB*, 3:352-54.

W. STEPHEN GUNTER

MERCY SEAT. From the biblical languages this means "propitiation" or "place or means of atonement." It was an important object of the Tabernacle preeminent and fulfilled by Jesus, Lord and Savior.

In the Pentateuch the mercy seat was a base of fine gold, about four feet long and two and one-half feet wide (Exod. 25:17; 37:6), with a cherub at each end. The cherubim faced each other with outstretched wings, touching each other at the midpoint above (25:18-20; 37:7-9). It fit on top of the ark of the covenant, which was placed beyond the veil inside the holy of holies (Exod. 26:34; 30:6). Within the inner sanctum God spoke to Moses concerning His people Israel (Num. 7:89; cf. Exod. 25:21-22). To the mercy seat the high priest applied atoning blood on the annual Day of Atonement (Lev. 16:2, 13-15).

From archaeology it is known that the Israelites reflected their cultural setting in the use of cherubim. However, they rejected their cultural setting by prohibiting an image of their God, Yahweh, on the cherubim, in keeping with the second commandment. Further, the mercy seat, where God abode in His invisible presence, was sprinkled with atoning blood on the annual

Day of Atonement and therefore was the place and means whereby God in mercy forgave sin among the people of Israel.

In the NT the passing reference to "mercy seat" in the Epistle to the Hebrews (9:5) suggests that it and other older covenant features have been superseded and fulfilled in Jesus Christ.

See MOSAIC LAW, SACRIFICE, ARK OF THE COVENANT, DAY OF ATONEMENT, BLOOD, HOLY OF HOLIES, TEMPLE, VEIL.

For Further Reading: IDB, I:354; Wright, *Biblical Archaeology*, 98-119, 136-40; Wycliffe Bible Encyclopedia, 1104, 1416.

HARVEY E. FINLEY

MERIT. See WORK (WORKS).

MESSIAH. The word "Messiah" is derived from the Hebrew word *meshiach* and means "anointed" or "the anointed"; its Greek form is *Christos*, and its English equivalent is "Christ." "On the early pages of the New Testament, 'Christos' occurs with the definite article, 'the Christ' (e.g., Matt. 16:16; 27:22; John 4:29; 1 John 2:22; 5:1). It was only later that 'Christ' came to function as a name rather than as a title" (GMS, 183).

In the OT, when applied to persons, the term indicates induction into a sacred office. It is "applied exceptionally to prophets, occasionally to the chief priests and most commonly to the king of Israel, 'the Messiah of Yahweh'" (Bruce, *New Testament History*, 122). For example, Saul is designated "the Meshiach of Yahweh," the anointed of the Lord (1 Sam. 24:6). In general usage kings, high priests, the Jewish people as a whole, even non-Jewish Cyrus, the king of Persia (since he was used by God to accomplish the divine purpose) were spoken of as "the anointed of the Lord" (Exod. 29:7; Isa. 45:1; 61:1; Psalms 2; 28:8).

In the centuries following the destruction of Judea (586 B.C.), the Jews found their hopes centering upon an early restoration of their independence and the reestablishing of the monarchy by a descendant of David, whose throne would be "forever" (2 Sam. 7:16; Ps. 89:29). Haggai and Zechariah saw this future king who would be Meshiach Yahweh (Zech. 3:8; 6:12-13; 9:9-16; 12:8; 14:3-4).

Beside this national hope or superimposed upon it was the slowly emerging vision of "the Day of the Lord," a time of moral and spiritual meaning, when sin would be punished, whether Israel's or others', and when universal righteousness and peace would reign over all men, with Jerusalem, "the joy of the whole earth," as the center of it all. This universal dimension in OT

"messiahship," while sometimes obscured by nationalism, is consistent with Jewish monotheism. "It flashes through the darkness in Isaiah in the four Servant songs (42:1-7; 49:1-7; 50:4-11; 52:13-53:12), where is seen the Servant of Yahweh whose mission is the spread of the knowledge of the true God to the ends of the earth . . . not by imposing his will on others but by uncomplaining endurance of contempt, injustice, suffering and death" (Bruce, *New Testament History*, 128). But it comes to its true focal point and fulfillment in the words "the anointed Lord" (*Christos Kyrios*), used so significantly in the angelic announcement to the shepherds in Bethlehem (Luke 2:11).

All Bible scholars recognize the duality, if not multiplicity, of Jewish "messiah" concepts at the time of Christ. Theologically liberal Jewish and Christian theologians are prone to emphasize the nationalistic concepts and to minimize or deny the universal and spiritual mission of Christ. This point of view is expressed by Rabbi Silver and M. S. Eslin in *ER*, 485 ff. An opposite, though much less serious, error is found in some conservative eschatology when historical substance is largely ignored or allegorized into prophetic interpretation.

Sound biblical exegesis exposes the unity of the Bible in progressive revelation, lays bare the realities of God's redemptive work with a wayward Israel, and then lets shine forth the glories of the kingdom of God through our Lord Jesus Christ, the Messiah.

See CHRIST, SON OF MAN, PROMISES (DAVIDIC), DAY OF THE LORD, PROGRESSIVE REVELATION.

For Further Reading: GMS, 183-93, 322-28.

JOHN E. RILEY

METAPHYSICS. The term *metaphysics* refers to that branch of philosophy which deals with the nature of what is called "ultimate reality" or Being as such. *Ontology* is sometimes used as a synonym for *metaphysics*. The term originated curiously from a reference to the place occupied on Aristotle's bookshelf by his volume on "first principles"—that is "after" (*meta*) the "physics" (*physica*)!

Metaphysics, as a subject of human thought, originated with the Greek thinkers of the sixth century B.C. who were concerned about the nature of the stuff out of which everything else is made: the *basic principle* of the universe. In the two and one-half millennia since then, scores, perhaps hundreds, of views have been formulated in answer to this question.

Metaphysics, through the centuries, has

played an important role in Christian theology by providing to theologians a ready-made vehicle for interpreting Christian thought to a non-Christian world—a world which already understands the particular metaphysical view selected.

The employment of metaphysical thought in this task has not been universally accepted by the church. During the patristic period there was opposition to all pagan thought in the writings of Tertullian, who asked, "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?" Clement of Alexandria, however, considered philosophy to be an excellent preparation for the knowledge of God. In the writings of Augustine, bishop of Hippo, it is possible to see the influence of Plotinus, whose metaphysics asserted a single, all-inclusive deity.

During the early Middle Ages, a strong Platonic influence which stressed the role of eternal forms (Ideas) may be seen in the theology of Anselm of Canterbury. In the later Middle Ages, in the theology of Thomas Aquinas, we find great use of the metaphysics of Aristotle—a view which sees the entire universe as seeking to realize Pure Form, the First Cause, the completely transcendent God.

Since the Reformation, metaphysics has not played as dominant a role in Christian theology as before, although liberal Protestantism in the 19th and 20th centuries derived much help from idealistic metaphysics (primacy of "mind" as ultimate reality). The recent decline of metaphysics within philosophical circles has influenced much contemporary theology: the existentialism of Søren Kierkegaard and Paul Tillich, neoorthodoxy, and radical theology.

See NATURAL THEOLOGY, ONTOLOGICAL ARGUMENT, PERSONALISM, ONTOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Since most books on metaphysics contain the author's *particular* metaphysical view, the reader who desires to understand the field in a *general* way would be advised to consult a recent introduction to philosophy and to read the chapters or section which deal with the topic of metaphysics. One such popular book is Titus and Smith, *Living Issues in Philosophy*, 6th ed. (1974). Almost any other such text would do, however. ALVIN HAROLD KAUFFMAN

METEMPSYCHOSIS. See REINCARNATION.

METHODISM. John Wesley writes definitively of the people called Methodists. In November, 1729, four young men of Oxford—John Wesley, Charles Wesley, Mr. Morgan, and Mr. Kirkman—began to spend some evenings each week to read together, chiefly the Greek NT. Others joined them later. "The exact regularity of their lives, as

well as studies, occasioned a young gentleman of Christ Church to say, 'Here is a new set of Methodists sprung up,' alluding to some ancient physicians who were so called (because they taught that almost all diseases might be cured by a specific *method* of diet and exercise). The name was new and quaint; so it took immediately, and the Methodists were known all over the University" (*Works*, 8:339, 348).

These four Methodists were zealous members of the Church of England and also carefully followed the university statutes, "but they observed neither these nor anything else any further than they conceived it was bound upon them by their one book, the Bible." It was their "one desire to be downright Bible-Christians, taking the Bible, as interpreted by the primitive Church and their own, for their whole and sole rule." The charge laid against Methodists was that they were too scrupulous, too strict in following the teachings of the church and the statutes of the university.

John Wesley's mother, Susanna, in a long letter to John explained that in rearing her children, all were "always put into a regular *method* of living, in such things as they were capable of, from their birth, as in dressing and undressing, changing their linen, etc."

So first of all Methodism relates to a methodical practice of piety, in prayer and Bible reading, in visiting the sick, in helping the poor, in regularly attending the sacraments and services of the church.

Methodism in the second place relates to various evangelistic methods in teaching and preaching Christ. In addition to evangelism by sermons, printed tracts, and books, John Wesley introduced itinerant evangelism. On foot and horseback Wesley took the gospel across England, Wales, Scotland, and into Ireland. Some heart-warmed laymen began to share their faith, and Wesley, following his mother's advice, refused to forbid them. In fact, had not John Wesley received and trained laymen to be itinerant soul winners, Methodism would not have captured England. But any method that honored Christ, John Wesley approved: street meetings, house-to-house meetings, field preaching, prison ministries, and others. Methodism is the gospel on the move.

In the third place, Methodism may be known by its synergistic theology. One may observe these types of soteriological theology: (1) that of liturgy and sacrament; (2) that of creed and confession; (3) that of universalism; and (4) that of the divine-human encounter and cooperation. Methodism belongs to the fourth class.

At issue are the mysteries of free will and of sovereign election. No one who reads the Bible will deny that man is responsible for his damnation, if he is lost, or that Christ alone is to be praised, if man is saved. To systematize a theology that accents one mystery at the expense of the other is neither necessary nor wise. Methodist theology includes both emphases, holding them as twin truths in tension, unwilling to reject one or the other, and willing to admit that the salvation of any one person is quite as mysterious, if not so unique, as the incarnation of God in Jesus Christ.

Methodistic doctrine and Methodistic evangelism go together. The "persuasive techniques" of Methodistic evangelism—so strongly condemned by strict Calvinists—are logically the extension of the Methodist doctrine of free will, meaning a freedom to accept or reject the overtures of the gospel. In this respect Methodism is Pauline (2 Cor. 5:11; Phil. 2:12-13). Yet Methodism, when true to its moorings, is not Pelagian, but Augustinian, in its view of sin and human depravity. The ability of the sinner to decide for or against Christ is not traced to natural ability but to prevenient grace, as a universal and unconditional benefit of the Atonement.

See WESLEYANISM, HOLINESS MOVEMENT (THE), ARMINIANISM, AUGUSTINIANISM.

For Further Reading: Wilcox, *Be Ye Holy*; Rose, *A Theology of Christian Experience*; Turner, *The Vision Which Transforms*.
GEORGE E. FAILING

MIGHT. See POWER.

MILLENNIUM. The word (from the Latin *mille*, "a thousand") refers to the idea of a future reign of Christ with His saints on the earth for a period of 1,000 years. Those who embrace the idea are called millennialists or chiliasts (from the Greek *chilias*, "a thousand").

The idea is rooted in the Jewish expectation that the advent of the Messiah and the inauguration of the new age would bring about the final destruction of evil in the world order. God's chosen people would be restored to national integrity and righteousness and would live in holiness upon earth (cf. Daniel 7).

This hope was taken over into Jewish-Christian apocalyptic, with the Church being identified by many as the new Israel, the restored people of the Messianic kingdom. Jesus used the prophetic imagery of the Messianic banquet (Luke 22:16; cf. Isa. 25:6-8; Luke 14:15) and spoke of His apostles as reigning in that day (Matt. 19:28).

However, the most influential passage on millennial thought is Rev. 20:1-7, the only NT mention of a 1,000-year rule of Christ's resurrected saints. This passage is chiefly responsible for the belief that at the end of this age, but before the final bliss of heaven, there will be an intermediate period on earth (a millennial kingdom) in which Christ will reign with His saints.

One's view of the millennium will be determined largely by one's answer to two basic questions. First, what is the relation between the millennium and the second coming of Christ? Different answers to that question are represented by premillennialism, postmillennialism, and to some extent amillennialism. Second, how does one interpret apocalyptic literature in general, and Rev. 20:1-7 in particular, especially the words "a [or the] thousand years"?

In regard to the second question, some choose to interpret the words *literally*, expecting an earthly millennial kingdom of 1,000 years duration either following or preceding Christ's second coming. Others take the words *symbolically*, as expressing the believer's hope for the future and his faith in the ultimate triumph of God and His Christ, arguing that since apocalyptic literature is replete with symbolism, it is inconsistent to make an exception in the interpretation of Rev. 20:1-7.

See ESCHATOLOGY, AMILLENNIALISM, PREMILLENNIALISM, REVELATION (BOOK OF).

For Further Reading: Clouse, ed., *The Meaning of the Millennium*; Erickson, *Contemporary Options in Eschatology*; Lawson, *Comprehensive Handbook of Christian Doctrine*, 236-56; Lohse, "Chilias," Kittel, 9:466-71; Ludwigson, *A Survey of Bible Prophecy*; Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*.
ROB L. STAPLES

MIND. In general current usage, *mind* or *intellect* refers to that part of a person that enables him to know, to think, to will, to act. It is regarded as being distinct from the body.

In the English Bible, "mind" is used to translate several Hebrew and Greek terms. While all of those terms differ somewhat in meaning, they all do include the idea of a person's capacity for rational thought.

Among the important Hebrew words translated "mind" is *lebh*—usually translated "heart." It refers to a person's inmost center of personality which determines his outward acts. It is used especially, it would seem, with reference to recollection (Isa. 65:17) or purpose (Jer. 19:5). *Nephesh*—usually translated "soul"—is also sometimes translated "mind" to designate the deepest part of man, the self, the personal center of feelings, desires, and inclination.

In the NT we are admonished to love God with all the "mind" (Mark 12:30). The Greek term here is *dianoia*, referring to a person's power of reason, perception, imagination—his creativity.

Paul declared, "I myself in my mind am a slave to God's law" (Rom. 7:25, NIV). The Greek word here is *nous*, the seat of a person's reflective consciousness. In a later passage the apostle, using the same term, urges his readers to "be transformed by the renewing of your mind" (12:2, NIV). He seeks thereby to show that the transformed mind is a new, a different mind. It will provide new thought patterns, give a new orientation to life. No longer conformed to the world, the Christian no longer thinks like the world. His viewpoint is changed.

In both of these passages Paul uses "mind" to mean a person's inner self which is able to reflect and purpose. It is the mind, as Paul uses the word, which enables a person to understand the revelation of God and respond to it. We see, then, that in the use of "mind" the apostle Paul stresses action rather than abstract thought.

Paul also speaks of the carnal, sinful mind being hostile toward God (Rom. 8:7). The Greek term for "mind" in this instance is *phronēma*, which refers to the habitual disposition of a person's intellectual faculty, his frame of mind, his bent. Literally it is the mind-set or bent toward the flesh.

We see in the various contexts a variety of inferences expressed by the word "mind." But there is so much overlapping and interpenetration in the meanings that one is brought to see that in spite of the various faculties suggested, the Bible indicates man to be a holistic being. In fact, in a very real sense "mind" is often used in the Bible to mean the whole person, practically the same as soul (Rom. 1:28; 2 Tim. 3:8).

See MAN, HUMAN NATURE, HEART, SOUL, SPIRIT.

For Further Reading: IDB, 3:383-84; Purkiser, ed., *Exploring Our Christian Faith*, 218-20; GMS, 257-62, 334.

ARMOR D. PEISKER

MIND OF CHRIST. This term is based on the KJV rendering of Phil. 2:5—"Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." Its significance is twofold: first, it demands an inquiry into the nature of Christ's mind; and second, it raises the problem of the possibility of that mind being in us, and the means by which this can occur.

It should be noted at the outset that this verse is one of a cluster of passages which stress Christlikeness as the objective of God's grace, and make this inner conformity the central es-

sence of Christian character. Our predestination, declares Rom. 8:29, is to be "conformed to the image of His Son" (NASB). While this conformation must await the resurrection for its full consummation, its essence must and may be experienced now, by crisis and process (Rom. 12:1-2; 2 Cor. 3:18; 1 John 3:2-3). Another example of this cluster of related texts is Gal. 4:19—"My children, with whom I am again in labor until Christ is formed in you" (NASB). The birth pangs once experienced by the apostle in bringing forth these spiritual children are now being experienced the second time. The purpose of this apostolic travail is for Christ himself, in His very character, to be reproduced in them.

The Philippians verse carries a similar import. The exact meaning of the passage only partly turns on *phroneite*, "let this mind," or "be minded," but we must begin here. The verb *phroneō*, "to be minded," is in v. 2, also 3:16; 4:2; and elsewhere. The exact sense in v. 5 is best expressed by "to be in a certain frame of mind" (*Analytical Greek Lexicon*). Earle believes that Lightfoot most aptly renders the clause: "Reflect in your minds the mind of Christ Jesus" (WMNT, 5:33). The substitution of "attitude" for "mind" in NASB and NIV is not an improvement, for it is putting a weak word for a strong one. "Mind-set" would be better, as it would more nearly express the deeply rooted disposition which is intended.

Apart from the word *phroneite*, Paul makes perfectly clear in vv. 6-8 exactly what he means by the mind of Christ. It is a mind or disposition motivated by love for a lost world, a love demonstrated by emptying himself of His heavenly glory, and though truly God, becoming truly man; not only a man but a slave who is obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross. Such a mind is marked by humility, sacrifice, and total unselfishness.

The relevance of this mind to the Philippians is seen in the fact that this exhortation or command is the culmination of vv. 1-4. They will succeed in relating themselves to each other as indicated in those verses if they are governed by the same frame of mind which prompted the Second Person of the Trinity to become our Redeemer. The possibility of Christians actually possessing such a mind-set is a staggering conception. But its difficulty is due primarily to the presence of its opposite, the carnal mind, with its disposition toward pride, self-serving, and self-willfulness. The radical displacement of one mind by another cannot occur simply by resolving, but only by a profound work of divine grace.

See CARNAL MIND, KOINONIA, AGAPÉ, HOLINESS, KENOSIS, MEEKNESS.

For Further Reading: GMS, 464-66; Wesley, Works, 10:364.
RICHARD S. TAYLOR

MINISTER, MINISTRY. "Minister" comes from the same root as *minor*, "less," and etymologically means "servant." "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister" (Matt. 20:26). The term has come to have a wide spread of usages from the humblest servant to the exalted official: ecclesiastical, such as clergy, pastor, or priest; social, such as officer or administrator; political, such as an official representative or executive of a sovereign state up to ambassador or prime minister. In its verb form "minister" may mean to serve, to supply, to provide, to do things helpful, or to administer; each of these meanings may be found in the NT.

Vine provides an excellent NT study of terms for "minister": *diakonos*, a servant, attendant, deacon (Mark 10:43; Rom. 13:4; 1 Cor. 3:5; Eph. 6:21); *leitourgos*, a public servant (Heb. 8:2; 1:7; Rom. 13:6; 15:16; Phil. 2:25); *hupēretēs*, an under rower as distinguished from *naútēs*, a seaman (Luke 4:20; Acts 13:5; 26:16; 1 Cor. 4:1); *doulos*, a bondservant or slave. Vine says, "Speaking broadly, *diakonos* views a servant in relation to his work; *doulos*, in relation to his master; *hupēretēs*, in relation to his superior; *leitourgos*, in relation to his public service" (Vine's ED, 3:72).

The NT Church sets the parameters for the Christian ministry and describes the basic principles, though not the detailed structure, for church life and service.

Although for Protestantism there is a universal priesthood of believers, there were, in the NT, nevertheless, some persons who were called of God and set apart or ordained for special service or ministry. Mark 3:14 and Luke 6:13 tell how the Lord called, chose, and sent out 12 "apostles." Then Luke goes on in 10:1 to record how He ordained 70 and sent them out. In Eph. 4:11-12 Paul enumerates the classes of service in the Church as given by Jesus: "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers . . . for the work of the ministry." Wiley believes that the bishops, elders, and deacons might perform any or all of these offices as needed and as appropriate. Furthermore, he distinguishes the first three as extraordinary and temporary, and the latter two as regular and permanent types of ministry. The elders and bishops are to be responsible for the spiritual care of the churches, while the deacons are to care for the management of its temporal affairs (Wiley, CT, 3:129 ff, cf. 118).

Since NT times, ecclesiastical structure and the forms of Christian ministry have been in constant change. There have been churches from the almost formless house groups (no membership or organization), through the small congregational type, to the huge superchurches, to the massive hierarchy of the Roman Catholics. And there has been "ministry" from the humblest teaching of a few believers to the colorful cathedral ritual and the corporation-type multiple staffs of the largest congregations.

In all the diversities of ministry there are a few fundamental principles to be kept in mind: the nature of the NT ministry; the command of our Lord to "go and make disciples of all nations" (Matt. 28:19, modern versions); the guidance and enablement of the Holy Spirit; the spiritual needs of humanity; and the building of the kingdom of God.

Purkiser offers an outline of the NT ministry by noting some of its figures of speech: messenger, voice, fisherman, shepherd, witness, vessel, servant, laborer, builder, steward, athlete, ambassador, playing coach, prisoner of Jesus Christ, pattern, soldier, husbandman. He then notes some of the broader terms: disciple, apostle, elder, bishop, minister, preacher, prophet, evangelist, man of God, priest (*New Testament Image of the Ministry*, 30 ff).

Perhaps the most significant note in all of this for all Christians, whether clergy or laity, is that each is to be a *doulos*, a love slave to Jesus the Lord.

See CLERGY, CHURCH GOVERNMENT, DISCIPLING, SERVANT, SERVICE.

For Further Reading: Wiley, CT, 3:118 ff, 129 ff; Kittel; TWNT.
JOHN E. RILEY

MIRACLE. A miracle is an event in which God acts to demonstrate His power to assist man in some beneficial way. There are many words in the OT and in the NT for "miracle." One term is *oth*, which is usually translated "sign" (Num. 14:22; Deut. 11:3, RSV). Another Hebrew word for "miracle" is *pala* (Judg. 6:13). It is often used of God's actions in the realm of nature. In the NT the words *sēmeios* (Luke 23:8; John 2:11, 23) and *terata*, "signs and wonders" (cf. RSV) are used to describe the acts of God in unusual ways.

The question of miracles versus natural law has been debated for centuries. Does God ever interrupt the natural process? If He does, what does this mean in our understanding of God in His relationship to man? Some have attempted to explain the unknown in life by holding that a miracle is a phenomenon produced by a natural

law which we do not yet understand. This interpretation of "miracle" eliminates the direct action of God in His world.

Our Western view of nature and God is often at odds with biblical man's view. Biblical man saw God at work in the mundane and in the total structure of the universe. The rain and the heat were gifts of God. Thunder and lightning were evidences of His nearness. The processes of life—in the field, in the birth of cattle, and in the life of man—were in the direct will of the Lord. The Psalmist portrays a God who acts in the realm of nature: "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained" (Ps. 8:3); and the prophet presents a God who is directing and sustaining the creation in a marvelous, miraculous manner: "[He] that bringeth out their host by number: he calleth them all by names by the greatness of his might" (Isa. 40:26). This speaks of God directly involved in the "miracle" not only of creation but of providence.

The OT and NT also portray God as One who enters into the lives of human beings in special ways. This may involve the revelation of God's will through prayer, vision, or divine voice. This experience of the divine can transform, shape, command a person's total outlook on life. This happens often, not only in the study of the Book, but by the direct involvement of God in the experience of man. It can occur when one is in worship or when one is at work in the field or in the town. Amos experienced the "miracle" of God's revelation while pasturing the flock; Isaiah in the context of Temple worship; Hosea in the experience that shaped his view of God at work in restoring broken Israel.

The Bible records instances of miracles of healing. This is particularly true in the case of the ministries of Elijah and Elisha, and of the ministry of Jesus. These miracles appear to be instantaneous and in most cases to result from the faith of the person in the power of God to act. The lame walk, the blind see, the paralyzed move, and in several cases the dead arise. Either these events are phenomena outside the processes of nature or in temporary suspension of nature. The biblical record is clear in its statement that these events did take place and at the express command of God.

What is essential for us to understand is the purpose of God in the sustaining care and nurture of His people in the midst of a well-ordered universe. Faith in a God who loves is essential in the comprehending of miracles. God's purposes were not always completely comprehended by

those who experienced the miraculous; but their faith was strengthened and their allegiance confirmed.

See SUPERNATURAL (SUPERNATURALISM), HEAL (HEALING), CREDENTIALS OF SCRIPTURE, SIGN.

For Further Reading: HDNT, 2:186-89; Wiley, CT, 1:149-56. FRED E. YOUNG

MISSION, MISSIONS, MISSIOLOGY. *The terms for mission.* The central meaning of all the biblical and theological terms for mission is "sending." It is the mission of God (*missio Dei*), who wants all people to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth (1 Tim. 2:4). He sends His Son into the world, the Son sends His disciples into the world, and both Father and Son send the Spirit to empower the Church in its mission of seeking the lost. Ideally, it may also be said that when the Church sends its workers, the Spirit is also sending them (Acts 13:1-4).

The term *mission* is the broadest theological term and includes all that is involved in the salvation activities of the Trinity and the Church in the extension of the kingdom of God on earth (*Verkuyt*). The term *missions* as a singular noun refers commonly to the world missionary enterprise, though it may also relate to the theology and theory of mission. As a count noun that may be pluralized, *mission/missions* denotes the organizations involved in mission. There is a tendency, especially among ecumenicals, to prefer the use of *mission to missions*, though both terms are used concurrently. *Missiology* is the scholarly discipline which studies and delineates the whole field of mission and missions from the biblical, theological, and historical perspectives with additional relevant input from the social sciences.

Mission in Scripture. The revelation of God as the Creator and Redeemer of all mankind first begins to come into clear focus in the covenant promise to Abraham that through him all the people on earth will be blessed (Gen. 12:3). Although this universal motif continues to be developed in the OT, particularly in the Psalms and prophetic books, Israel tended to understand its religion as an ethnic monopoly and failed to fulfill its God-intended mission of being a light to the nations (Isa. 42:6). So God had to create a New Israel, the universal society of the Church, which could serve as His missionary agent in the world. Christ initiated the mission first to the Jews through His own missional activity and in the sending of the Twelve and also the Seventy-two. Between His resurrection and ascension, Jesus made the mission explicitly universal in the

terms of the Great Commission, which sent the whole Church to the whole world with the whole gospel. Acts and the Epistles record how the Early Church faithfully carried out their Lord's command and carried the gospel to the ends of the earth in their known world (Acts 1:8).

One of the mysteries of NT interpretation is that while there were obviously missionaries active in the Early Church, where is the NT term for *missionary*? A clue can be found in the usage of the Greek Church from the beginnings right up to the present in which the word *apostolos* or "apostle" has continually been used for the missionary ministry, including biblical references to James and companions of Paul (Gal. 1:19; Rom. 16:7; 2 Cor. 8:23; Phil. 2:25; Acts 14:4, 14). The Roman Catholic church has retained the term *apostolate* to designate the missionary ministry. Kirsopp Lake states flatly that there are two usages of *apostolos* in the NT, one limiting it to the Twelve in certain contexts, and another used in the sense of a Christian missionary (Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, 5:50-51). There is a growing consensus among scholars to consider that this wider usage of "apostle" is indeed the "missionary" of the NT (Hesselgrave).

The theological meaning of mission. The ultimate goal of missions is to glorify God in the fulfillment of His redemptive purposes for mankind through the extension of the kingdom of God. This evangelistic goal is delineated by the Great Commission as (1) making disciples and (2) incorporating them into churches. The evangelical commitment to biblical evangelism is not to be understood as excluding social concern, including the seeking of social justice for all, but rather as requiring it as a proper corollary to evangelism. The mission of the Church must be pioneered by specialists (missionaries, evangelists, church planters), but it is best completed by a universal commitment to witness by all believers through the use of their spiritual gifts in response to the need for and the call to ministry, whether among tribal peoples or in the inner city of the world's great metropolitan areas.

The only safeguard against the syncretism of the content of the gospel is the proper indigenization and contextualization of the forms of the gospel in responsible, self-sufficient churches. Sending missions must continue while the vast majority of people in the world are without the gospel and have no near neighbors who can share it with them. The base and field of mission must be seen as worldwide, not excluding or neglecting any who are without the gospel, whether across the street or across the world.

See EVANGELISM, GREAT COMMISSION, SOUL WINNING, CHURCH, GOSPEL, APOSTLE, MISSION OF CHRIST.

For Further Reading: Kane, *Understanding Christian Missions*; Verkuyl, *Contemporary Missiology*; Hesselgrave, "The Missionary of Tomorrow—Identity Crisis Extraordinary," *Missiology* (1975), 2:231 ff.

PAUL R. ORJALA

MISSION OF CHRIST. Mission derives from the Latin *missio*, "to send." It is a term of wide and varied use in the Christian Church, including what Webster titles its theological meaning: "The sending of the Son or the Holy Spirit by the Father, or of the Holy Spirit by the Son."

The mission of Christ is found in the protogospel (Gen. 3:15), the Messianic prophecies of the OT, and in the numerous names, titles, and attributes ascribed to Him (Zech. 3:8; Isa. 7:14; 9:6; Hag. 2:7; Num. 24:17). The three major aspects of His office and work are prophet (Deut. 18:18; Isa. 61:1-3), priest (Ps. 110:4; Zech. 6:13), and king (Ps. 2:7; Isa. 11:1-5). Closely related to His priestly mission is the OT picture of the Suffering Servant, with the two strange paradoxes: king/suffering servant, priest/sacrificial lamb (Acts 8:32-35; Heb. 9:11-12).

In the NT, from the "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" of childhood (Luke 2:49) to the "It is finished" of the Cross (John 19:30) and the promise "I will come again" (14:3), Christ's own sense of mission sounded so clearly that it still rings out to us. In the synagogue at Nazareth, He said, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears" (Luke 4:16-21). He affirmed both His purpose and authority in delivering His people from their sins (Mark 2:17; Matt. 9:13; Luke 5:32; Matt. 18:11; Luke 19:10; Mark 2:9; Luke 7:48). He clearly related His saving from sin to His future atoning death (Mark 10:45; Matt. 26:28; John 10:11-18; Acts 5:31).

The glorious redemptive purpose and work of Jesus in saving "his people from their sins" was to the end of bringing them to eternal life in the unending kingdom of God. "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world," He said to Pilate (John 18:37). The glorious purpose of a holy, loving God, before time began, is to be brought to fulfillment in His resurrection from the dead, in the coming of the Holy Spirit, in the love and labors of the Spirit-filled Church, in His return to earth, and in the glorious consummation of all things. And then "every knee [shall] bow . . . and . . . every tongue [shall] confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father" (Phil. 2:11).

The mission of Christ can never be fully understood without an appreciation of the nature

of His personhood: very God of very God, very man of very man, the God-man.

See CHRIST, ESTATES OF CHRIST, REDEEMER (REDEMPTION), MISSION (MISSIONS, MISSIOLOGY), HOLINESS.

For Further Reading: DCT, 217; Wiley, CT, 2:143 ff; Baker's DT, 358; Dufour, *Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, 365.

JOHN E. RILEY

MISTAKES. Mistakes are unintentional errors in judgment or action which are a result of the infirmities of the flesh.

Mistakes are not sins, "properly so-called" (Wesley). Since a mistake is unintentional, it lacks the element of moral blameworthiness which is essential to sin. A mistake may be the result of ignorance, inexperience, or immaturity—handicaps which are not sinful in themselves. Also, mistakes are consistent with the doctrine of perfect love. Because a mistake is unintentional, the motivation behind a mistake may be compatible with love from a pure heart. The motivation of love could hardly be classified as sin.

While mistakes are not sin as properly defined, mistakes may indeed be unintentional violations of law, and hence require both correction and covering. Through Christ God overlooks our mistakes, just as He always is ready to forgive sin when confessed.

In a sermon on Christian perfection John Wesley concluded, "No one, then, is so perfect in this life, as to be free from ignorance. Nor, secondly, from mistakes" (*Works*, 6:3). Wiley concurs: "The depravity of his spiritual nature may be removed by the baptism with the Holy Spirit, but the infirmities of flesh will be removed only in the resurrection and glorification of the body" (CT, 2:140).

See SIN, FAILURE, INFIRMITIES.

For Further Reading: Wesley, *Plain Account of Christian Perfection*; Wiley, CT, 2:140, 506-9.

JAMES L. PORTER

MODALISM. See SABELLIANISM.

MODERATION. See TEMPERANCE.

MODERN REALISM. This is directly opposed to *idealism* (the modern philosophical term for the older realism). Modern realism's main contention is in opposition to any theory that would reduce the phenomenal world to a system of ideas. It shifts from *ontology* to *epistemology*. Its concern is with man's perception of individuals and particulars as he experiences his world of material things. It is a reaction from the belief that the ultimate "stuff" of our universe is essentially of

the nature of mind (spirit) and is basically spiritual and dynamic. It contends (1) that not all entities are mental, conscious, or spiritual; and (2) that entities are knowable without being known. It is the epistemological position which asserts that the object of knowledge is distinct from and independent of the act of awareness. It contends that the object of awareness, when we are aware of it, is precisely what it would be if we were not aware of it.

Of course man, as a creature of time and space physically, develops a kind of *naïve realism* (sometimes called *common sense realism*) which says that things are just as they are given in consciousness through immediate perception. But this makes no allowance for error in perception or hallucinations in perceiving things not actually present in sense but only in imagination.

Two schools of realism arrived on the scene of American philosophy in the early 20th century. The first was known as *neorealism*. It was sometimes called "presentational realism." It subscribed to epistemological monism and made no clear distinctions between seeming and being, insisting that things are just what they seem.

The second was known as *critical realism* and was referred to as "representative realism." It was epistemologically dualistic and made a distinction between the sense data directly present to the mind and the real external object. Thus ideas are representative of the external objects. For this sort of realism perception had two aspects: (1) the sensory and ideational content, and (2) the meaning and outer reference. Knowledge is the insight into the nature of the object that is made possible by the contents which reflect it in consciousness. Thus mental states exist as much as do physical objects. Such realism had preference for the correspondence theory of truth, and our ideas, if valid, must conform to the existential realm of physical nature. Yet there is the possibility of error and things may not be just what they seem.

Both types of American realism were inclined toward evolutionary naturalism, holding that the physical is but another term for being and existence. Thus most modern realists are evolutionary humanists. Mind therefore becomes only a tool of the organism and not the instrument of an ontological self.

Thus in their concern for epistemology they have not been able to escape ontology and the taking of some kind of a metaphysical stance.

See REALISM, SCOTTISH REALISM, REALISM AND NOMINALISM, REALISM IN THEOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Perry, *Philosophy of the Recent*

Past, 197-220; *Present Philosophical Tendencies*, 271-347; Stace, "The Refutation of Realism," *Mind*, 53 (1934).

ROSS E. PRICE

MODERNISM. See LIBERALISM.

MONARCHIANISM. This refers to certain unitarian views of God, originating in the second and third centuries A.D., according to which God is thought of as unified, as a monarch is. The truest, clearest form of Monarchianism was that of Modalism, the view that there is but one God, and that He has manifested himself successively in three modes: as Father, then as Son, then as the Holy Spirit.

See SABELLIANISM.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

MONASTICISM. Monasticism, a term derived from the Greek adjective *monos*, "alone," and the related verb *monadzein*, "to live alone," is used to describe a movement in the church which advocated renunciation of, and withdrawal from, the world as a means of attaining Christian perfection. Followers of this method of attaining perfection are known as *monks*, and their dwelling place is known as a *monastery*. Monks live an ordered life within their community, and the guidelines for living are called *rules*. Monastic rules are governed by three vows which every monk must make before being accepted in the *order* (the technical term for the monastic community). These are the vows of *poverty*, i.e., the monk vows never to have any personal possessions (in some cases, however, the monastery as a whole may own possessions); *chastity*, i.e., abstinence from carnal gratification; and *obedience*, i.e., humility expressed in following the commands of a superior without question.

Origin. Monasticism arose as a lay protest movement at the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth centuries in Egypt. The decline of belief in the immediacy of the Parousia meant that the church had to come to terms with her continued existence in the world. To this was added the increasing acceptance of Christianity as the official religion of the Roman Empire, with the result that the church became increasingly wealthy and worldly. Spiritual and political power were frequently merged, and being a Christian became a formality.

In this situation a young Christian orphan named Antony (c. A.D. 250-355—he lived to the age of 105!) heard the words of Jesus, "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor" (Matt. 19:21); and, desiring no less than Christian perfection, he resolved to

obey the instruction to the letter. He disposed of all his possessions and distributed them to the poor before withdrawing to the desert to commune with God in solitude. Antony's fame as a man of God spread, and so many there were who would be his disciples and follow his example, that he emerged from solitude in A.D. 305 to organize a community of hermits. Monasticism was born.

Types of Monasticism. The motivating force was the desire for personal sanctification through the renunciation of the world. This renunciation expressed itself in a variety of ways. The community of Antony was of the so-called *anchorite* type; that is to say, they lived individually as hermits or, if they lived in community, they practiced absolute silence. This type of discipline is practiced today in the Carthusian Order.

Contemporary with Antony was Pachomius, who also formed a monastic order. Here, however, normal community life was practiced. This is known as *coenobite*, or fellowship monasticism.

In the Middle Ages monastic life in the West was largely dominated by the *Mendicant Friars* who, unlike other monks, were forbidden to own any property either personally or in common, and lived either by working or begging. Also unlike other orders, the mendicants were not restricted to one monastery, but travelled around from town to town.

Monasticism was spread in the East by Basil the Great, and in the West by John Cassian.

Strengths and Weaknesses. The strength of the monastic movement lay in its attempt to keep the goal of personal sanctification before an increasingly worldly church. The words of Jesus which Antony heard, "If thou wilt be perfect," have been the pattern for virtually all monastic orders. Another strength lay in the fact that it was a lay movement. While many priests also became monks, the movement itself was lay in character. A monk aspired to no higher title than "Brother," while the priest was called "Father."

The weaknesses of the monastic movement were that, in the first place, it presented the Christian ideal as something impossible for everyday life and therefore attainable only by those who withdrew from the world. A double standard of Christianity was thereby introduced which divorced the demands of God from normal living. The second weakness of the movement was that in its ideal it was intensely individualistic. Frequently in the history of monasticism, warnings had to be given regarding the monastic rejection of the church and the sacraments. The monk was so concerned with his

own salvation that community life was a matter of little importance to him. The monk proposed to himself no great or systematic work beyond that of saving his own soul. What he did more than this was the accident of the hour.

See CHRISTLIKENESS, SANCTIFICATION, CHURCH, KOINONIA.

For Further Reading: Workman, *The Evolution of the Monastic Ideal*; Chadwick, *John Cassian* (2d ed., 1968); Kirk, *The Vision of God*. THOMAS FINDLAY

MONERGISM. This is the view that salvation is solely and independently the work of God. Thus it is contrasted with *synergism*, which leaves some room for human action in the total saving or redeeming process. *Monergism* was expressed very forcefully by Augustine in his debate with Pelagius. Since then it has been embraced by schools of both Catholics (e.g., Jansenists) and Protestants (e.g., Calvinists). Its best exponents have been in the Reformed tradition. Both Luther and Calvin embraced monergism enthusiastically; the followers of Calvin have preserved it to the present; much contemporary theology has ignored or discarded the concept entirely. Wesley is generally recognized as opposed to monergism, but his position is extremely subtle in that his doctrine of prevenient grace attempted to preserve the stress on divine action in regeneration. It enabled him to assert that any human action related to regeneration was only possible because of prior divine action.

The support for monergism has been manifold. Proponents insist that it alone does justice to the following considerations. It exalts God by giving Him all the glory for man's salvation. It fully preserves justification by faith by ruling out any human cooperation or contribution to regeneration. It takes very seriously the radical corruption of human nature by stressing the complete inability of man to save himself. It makes sense of the experience of salvation by illuminating the resistance of the human will when confronted with the claims of the gospel. It preserves the biblical emphasis on divine initiative and constant divine action in salvation.

Monergism cannot be divorced from the wider set of doctrines in which it is embedded. Thus it finds its natural home in the classical Calvinistic scheme that begins with total depravity, and moves through unconditional election, limited atonement, and irresistible grace to the perseverance of the saints. All of these doctrines develop the implications of monergism by specifying the divine activity that alone results in any individual's salvation.

Two other themes that naturally deserve extended consideration in order to accommodate fully the implications of monergism are the nature of human freedom and the relation between divine action and human action. Of the two the first has received most attention. In this case either free will is rejected entirely (Luther), or it is so interpreted as to be compatible with complete divine determinism (Edwards). Recent work by Lucas has shed light on the relation between divine and human action in salvation.

As noted above, Wesleyan Arminianism is monergistic to the degree that all saving grace is acknowledged as coming from God, and that even man's free cooperation is made possible by prevenient grace. But Wesleyans object to radical monergism on the grounds that pure determinism makes God equally responsible (by default) for the damnation of those He chooses not to save; it reduces freedom to puppetry and holiness to a legal fiction; and it runs counter to the total tenor of Scripture, which assumes a real capacity in man either to cooperate with God or resist Him.

See SYNERGISM, FREEDOM, PELAGIANISM, SEMI-PELAGIANISM, DETERMINISM, CONTINGENT.

For Further Reading: Luther, *The Bondage of the Will*; Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, vol. 3, chaps. 21–24; Lucas, *Freedom and Grace*.

WILLIAM J. ABRAHAM

MONEY. The Bible attaches great significance to money and its use. It is not only a form of wealth and a medium of exchange, but its use is an index to the character of those who possess it.

The sinful heart is prone to love money, first for what it can buy or do, but soon for its own sake. Such love is a root of all sorts of evil (1 Tim. 6:10, NASB). For the love of money is a form of covetousness, which, as Paul says, is idolatry (Col. 3:5). Its possession is seen by the carnal mind as the key to power, prestige, position, and pleasure—the four *p*'s of the world's value system. When one is in the grip of this love, all more worthy loves are either tarnished by it or withered completely. Blinded by this unholy obsession, men and women have sacrificed family, friends, and health, to say nothing of honor and integrity. This lust is often the driving force behind prostitution, crime, and violence, on the dark side of society; but also injustice and oppression in business and industry.

Because of these evils spawned by an inordinate craving for money, the Bible is full of warnings. For one thing, money will not satisfy; its promise of happiness is an illusion (Eccles.

5:10). Equally delusive is its promise of security (Matt. 6:19-20). Its possession, moreover, is a constant peril to the soul (13:22; 19:21-23). It is no wonder that the Word says: "Those who want to get rich fall into temptation and a snare and many foolish and harmful desires which plunge men into ruin and destruction" (1 Tim. 6:9, NASB).

How can Christians avoid the pitfalls of handling money? Fundamentally, of course, their love of money must be thoroughly broken and displaced by an all-consuming love for Jesus Christ. This means that not only the interests and goals of a new kind of life must captivate them, but they must experience total deliverance from the old bondage, so that they are no longer touchy about "money talk," but free to enjoy the delights and blessings of the cheerful giver (2 Cor. 9:6-7). This requires nothing less than total sanctification of the inner affections. A revised and Christianized value system will follow naturally (cf. Phil. 4:10-14; 1 Tim. 6:6-8).

There are two evidences of such inner sanctification. One is the capacity to be happy without a lot of money. The other is the actual cheerful demonstration of day-by-day stewardship with what we have. For we will now see money from a new perspective, not as a means of gratifying self or as something to hoard, but as a means of serving God and doing good (Eph. 4:28; 2 Thess. 3:7-12).

Energetic and able people especially need to watch the single-mindedness of their devotion, and guard against the peril of the subtle allure of affluence. For in the nature of the case, industrious and capable people are apt to become more or less prosperous. Such prosperity is not sinful but dangerous, as many have found to their sorrow. Only great devotion and discipline will avoid the creeping incubus of returning materialism, and enable Christians to own money without being owned by it (1 Tim. 6:17-19; Heb. 13:5).

In OT times, material wealth was seen as a sign of divine blessing. Often it really was (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Job, etc.). But not always did this sign hold (Heb. 11:36-39).

In the NT one test of spiritual depth is seen as the willingness to divest oneself of wealth for the Kingdom's sake, if called upon to do so; or if not so required, at least to use one's wealth for the Kingdom. Money and things became the hinge of discipleship for the 12 disciples themselves, for the rich young ruler, Zacchaeus, Barnabas, Ananias, and Sapphira.

Jesus measured generosity not so much in

terms of the amount given but by the amount left (Mark 12:42-44). He further laid down the principle that one's faithfulness in handling money would be the yardstick by which his trustworthiness in more important matters could be gauged (Luke 16:10-12). He urged such an investment of one's means in the Kingdom that they would when he died be to his eternal credit instead of to his eternal condemnation (v. 9). Yet one's stewardship is not to be showy and ostentatious, but quiet and modest (Matt. 6:2-4).

The legitimacy of money was never denied by Jesus, but dependence on it was. When the disciples were first sent out, they were to take no money with them, but trust themselves to the hospitality of the people (Mark 6:8). Yet elsewhere He concedes the inescapability of the material aspect of life, in the words "Your heavenly Father knows that you need all these things," and, "But seek first His kingdom . . . and all these things shall be added to you" (Matt. 6:32-33, NASB).

John Wesley advised his Methodists to make all they could, save all they could, and give all they could. The advice is still timely.

See STEWARDSHIP, CONSECRATE (CONSECRATION), COVETOUSNESS, MATERIALISM.

For Further Reading: Timothy L. Smith, ed., *The Promise of the Spirit* (Charles G. Finney on Christian Holiness), 94-105, 231-39. RICHARD S. TAYLOR

MONISM. *Monism*, a word derived from the Greek *monos* and coined by Christian von Wolff (A.D. 1679-1754), a German philosopher, is a world view or metaphysical system which emphasizes one ultimate form or substance of reality. This means either that reality is unchanging, i.e., permanent or motionless, or that reality cannot be differentiated into pieces or parts. Monism is thus to be contrasted with dualism, which holds that there are two basic powers or elements in the ultimately real, and with pluralism, which accepts common-sense experience, the dynamic and changing, and the need for free play as requiring a world of many initiating centers.

Monism emphasizes the need for a single explanatory principle to adequately satisfy rational demands; it may regard the real as the permanent and find change as illusory; it may give great consideration to the area of moral requirements in which standards must be established. Finally monism may develop the preceding into a concept of God with characteristics of perfection, absoluteness, and changelessness.

Absolute monism must be distinguished from ultimate monism in that in absolute monism ev-

ery piece within reality is so dependent upon the single will/energy/power that it has little or no sense of difference from it. In ultimate monism all things could derive from the one origin and be significantly dependent upon it, and yet have some degree of significant independence of it.

One of the key and crucial problems in monism is the presence of evil. Can evil really appear in such a closed system? Why, if it does not, do we seem to have so much evil?

See IMMUTABILITY, COSMOLOGY, METAPHYSICS, PERSONALISM, EVIL, DUALISM.

For Further Reading: Urmson, *Concise Encyclopedia of Western Philosophy and Philosophers*, 273; Bradley, *Appearance and Reality*; Hartshorne, *The Logic of Perfection*.

R. DUANE THOMPSON

MONOPHYSITISM. *Monophysite* is a combination of two Greek words that mean "single nature." This is a name applied to a Christian group which took form about A.D. 453. The Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) took the position that Jesus in His divinity was consubstantial with the Godhead in His Godhood, and consubstantial with humanity in His manhood. The aim was to avoid a position which compromised either His full deity or His full humanity. Monophysitism was one of the reactionary modifications which arose in the East. The monophysite concept was that the two natures were so united that, although the one Christ was partly human and partly divine, His two natures became by their union only one nature. Christ's humanity was an "accident" of His divine nature. This was but a revival of Eutychianism.

The movement survives today in the Coptic, Jacobite, Ethiopian, and Armenian churches. In Lebanon they are known as Maronites.

The church has viewed monophysitism as a heresy (condemned A.D. 553). The orthodox view is that the human and divine natures of Christ remain distinct, but find their union in one Person. This is called the hypostatic union.

See HYPOSTATIC UNION, CHRISTOLOGY, CREED (CREEDS), EUTYCHIANISM, MONOTHELITISM.

For Further Reading: Heick, *A History of Christian Thought*, 1:183-86; Wiley, *CT*, 2:163.

MENDELL L. TAYLOR

MONOTHEISM. *Monotheism* is a term used to indicate belief in one, and only one, God. Monotheism is distinct from polytheism, the belief in many gods, and henotheism (sometimes referred to as monolatry), the worship of one god without denying the existence of other gods. Of the world's religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam (Mohammedanism) are monotheistic.

One school of thought contends that monotheism developed gradually throughout the history of Israel from earlier polytheistic ideas. In this view Israelite monotheism is thought to have its beginnings in the eighth-century prophets. Earlier texts are said to presuppose a situation recognizing the existence of gods other than the supreme god of Israel. Many others, however, reject such views, asserting that monotheism is present in the teachings of Moses and is either directly taught or implied throughout all stages of the biblical record. Indeed, many regard monotheism to be one of Judaism's great contributions to the religious thought of mankind.

Those holding the latter view regard the idea of monotheism as implied in the Ten Commandments: "I am the Lord your God . . . You shall have no other gods before me" (Exod. 20:2-3, RSV). Deut. 6:4 is also regarded as a classic expression of Israel's faith: "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord" (RSV). The clearest affirmations of monotheistic faith are found in Isaiah. "Thus says the Lord, the King of Israel and his Redeemer, the Lord of hosts: 'I am the first and I am the last: besides me there is no god'" (44:6, RSV; cf. 45:5 ff.).

The monotheism of postexilic Judaism was such that the Jews reacted strongly against Jesus. His claim to be the Son of God was, in their minds, irreconcilable to the idea of the unity of God, stemming from their monotheistic thought. The NT writers, however, did not believe that the claims of Jesus regarding His divinity conflicted with OT monotheism. The Revelation to John affirms: "I am the Alpha and the Omega," says the Lord God, who is and who was and who is to come, the Almighty" (1:8, RSV).

See THEISM, GOD, ATTRIBUTES (DIVINE), TRINITY (THE HOLY).

For Further Reading: von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 1:210-12; Rowley, *The Faith of Israel*, 71-73; Wright, "The Faith of Israel," *The Interpreter's Bible*, 1:357-62; Baab, *The Theology of the Old Testament*, 48-53.

DON W. DUNNINGTON

MONOTHELITISM. Monothelitism, a Christological theory which appeared about the middle of the seventh century, might be said to represent the final ancient phase of the long debate on the problem of the two natures in Christ, stretching across some 300 years. How could the eternal Son be truly man?

Monothelitism (the word comes from Greek roots signifying "a single will") attempted to reconcile the disputants by positing that in Christ, the unique theanthropic Person, there are not two wills or modes of operation, one divine

and one human, but only one divine-human will. Otherwise, it did confess the two natures.

The concept, devised by Sergius of Constantinople, was promoted by the emperor, Heraclius, as a compromise attempt to persuade those who persisted in the monophysite position (the notion that the divine and human natures in Christ are blended into one nature in a "natural" union) to accept the Chalcedon Definition of A.D. 451. In this it failed.

Chalcedon had earlier defined the boundaries of the doctrine of the two natures, safeguarding the completeness and integrity of each. Beyond this human minds could hardly go. But because human logic and speech are inadequate in the face of this revealed mystery, controversy had persisted.

The Third Council of Constantinople (A.D. 681) condemned monothelism and declared that in Christ there were two natural operations and two wills, with the human will always subject to the divine will. The monothelite heresy was seen as a threat to faith in the complete humanity of the God-man, a very precious and essential truth.

See CHRISTOLOGY, MONOPHYSITISM, HYPOSTATIC UNION.

For Further Reading: Bethune-Baker, *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine*; Burkill, *The Evolution of Christian Thought*; Berkhof, *The History of Christian Doctrines*.
ARNOLD E. AIRHART

MONTANISM. This was a movement founded in the last half of the second century by a Phrygian named Montanus. He proclaimed the "Age of the Spirit" as the preparation for the end of all things. Montanism constituted a revivalistic reaction to the increasing worldliness of the church and the centralization of authority and charismatic gifts in the office of the bishop. In one or the other of its many factions it prevailed until the ninth century.

Charges of irregularity were brought against the self-proclaimed prophet Montanus and his female associates, Maximilla and Priscilla, not because of doctrinal deviation but because of their challenge to the growing institutional authority of the Catholic church of the time. Opposition arose largely in response to their claims to the right of personal revelation, personal prophesying, and their radical moralism which required a much stricter code of discipline than was held to by the church in general. They were against remarriage for any reason, mandated strict asceticism, and invited martyrdom. The

movement was greatly strengthened by the conversion of the famous Tertullian to its cause.

Similar tensions between irregular renewal movements and the contemporary established structures of the church have recurred throughout history. Reformers frequently have found comfort and support in early Montanism. John Wesley, among others, looked upon this "heresy" with more charity than did its Catholic contemporaries.

See REVIVALISM, FANATICISM.

For Further Reading: Lietzmann, *The Founding of the Church Universal*, 189-203; Baur, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, 132-46.

MELVIN EASTERDAY DIETER

MORAL ATTRIBUTES OF GOD. Biblically, there is only one moral attribute of God—holiness. Other moral attributes of God are derivatives of His holiness and fall into two seemingly contradictory categories, variously characterized as: God as a consuming fire/God as a transforming presence; the wrath of God/the love of God; the justice of God/the mercy of God; the righteousness of God/the forgiveness of God.

The apparent dichotomy of these moral attributes of God emerges from the interplay of God's holiness and His will for those beings whom He has created in His own image and likeness. God "spoke us forth" (a more dynamic rendering of the roots of the Greek *ek-legō* ["choose"] which reflects God's creative acts in Genesis 1: "God said . . . and it was so") in himself before "the foundation of the world, that we should be holy [*hagios*] and blameless before him in love" (Eph. 1:4, author's free translations in this paragraph); "this is the will of God, your sanctification [*hagiasmos*]" (1 Thess. 4:3); "for God has not called us for uncleanness but in sanctification [*hagiasmos*]" (1 Thess. 4:7). God's repeated call to His covenant people throughout the Bible is that they are to be a holy (LXX, *hagios*) nation (Exod. 19:6, et al.): "You shall be holy [LXX, *hagios*], for I the Lord your God am holy [LXX, *hagios*]" (Lev. 19:2, et al.; cf. 1 Pet. 2:9; 1:15-16); "Pursue . . . the holiness [*hagiasmos*] without which no one will see the Lord" (Heb. 12:14). Behind these sample statements of God's will and call is the implication (often expressly stated, Rom. 3:10, 23) that those addressed are not holy as God created them to be. The interaction of the holiness of God with the unholiness of humanity creates the seeming dichotomy of the moral attributes of God.

On the one hand, the holiness of God is a moral purity of being of such a total, absolute, in-

finite intensity that nothing unholy can endure or exist in His presence. The holiness of God "burns" against all that is unholy until it is completely consumed. The intensity of this antipathy to unholiness is often called the "wrath" of God. The uncompromising nature of this holiness is characterized as the "justice" of God. The unchanging quality of this holiness is termed the "righteousness" of God. These astringent attributes of God are manifestations of His holiness against the unholiness of humanity.

On the other hand, God's "holiness as the sum of His being must contain the creative love which slays but also makes alive again" (Kittel, 1:93). The "consuming fire" of God's holiness has at its heart the transforming purpose of God to make us holy. The "wrath" of God's holiness is but the love that abhors all that pollutes the beloved. The "justice" of God's holiness illumines His mercy which comes to us in our unholiness. The "righteousness" of God's holiness is magnified in His forgiving grace which delivers us from the bondage of our unholiness that He might make us holy. These regenerative attributes of God are manifestations of His holiness for the holiness of humanity.

Thus the basic dynamic of the moral attributes of God is encompassed in the fact that He is the holy God who kills, and makes alive; who wounds, and heals (cf. Deut. 32:39).

See ATTRIBUTES (DIVINE), GOD, HOLINESS, WRATH, JUSTICE, AGAPE.

For Further Reading: Anderson, "God, OT view of," *IDB*, 2:417-30; Mac Donald, "The Consuming Fire," *Creation in Christ*, 157-66; Moule, "God, NT," *IDB*, 2:430-36; Muilenburg, "Holiness," *IDB*, 2:616-25; Procksch, "hagios," Kittel, 1:88-115.

M. ROBERT MULHOLLAND, JR.

MORAL INFLUENCE THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT. As important as was the life and ministry of Jesus, of primary significance was His death and subsequent resurrection. Throughout the history of the Church, attempts have been made to determine how it is that Christ's death on the Cross atones for man's sin. The many theories can usually be classified into three main categories: (1) Those which follow the thinking of Irenaeus and Origen. They held that Christ's death paid the ransom price due Satan for man. This theory is often called the classic or patristic theory. (2) Those which follow the thinking of Anselm or of Calvin. Anselm contended that Christ's death satisfied the honor of God; and Calvin, God's justice. (3) Those which follow the thinking of Abelard. It is this third category that commands the attention of this article.

Abelard (1079-1142) disagreed with Irenaeus and Anselm. He felt that Christ came to be the perfect example for man to follow. Christ died in order to show man how much God loves him. Salvation comes when man recognizes this ultimate example of love as a life-style that he desires to pursue. God's purpose in the Cross, then, was to make such a disclosure of His love that men would be won over by it to a forgivable state (Hughes, *The Atonement*, 203). Some of the proponents of this view down through the centuries have been Socinius, Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Bushnell, and Rashdall, to name a few. Although variations have been made on the theme, the major thrust has remained the same.

The theory is an obvious attempt to deal with some of the flaws in the penal satisfaction theories. Since moral influence advocates contend that there is nothing in the divine nature that demands justice or penalty for sin, the sole obstacle to forgiveness of sins is found in the sinner's unbelief and hardness of heart. When through education and exposure to God's love this obstacle is removed, forgiveness is the natural outcome.

Some shortcomings of this theory need to be noted. For one thing, it is atonement by mere example. The Incarnation becomes the atoning event rather than the Crucifixion. Scripture is clear that it was Christ's death that makes possible forgiveness and renewal of the relationship between man and God. Another fault lies in the fact that it is totally subjective in nature. There is no room in this theory for God to act in the salvific process. Forgiveness comes as the natural outcome of a spiritual law. With this theory nothing happens in the mind of God when a person seeks forgiveness. The emphasis is on the human obedience rather than the divine sacrifice. Still another weakness is that there seems to be little sense of the cost of redemption in this theory. Little mention is made of the great price paid on the Cross.

While it is true that the motive for the Atonement is found in the love of God (John 3:16; Rom. 5:8), its necessity is grounded in God's holiness. Christ's death was more than an example to observe, and more than a moral influence on society. His death was a vicarious sacrifice. Passages like John 11:50; Rom. 5:6-8; 2 Cor. 5:14; Eph. 5:2; 1 Tim. 2:6; and a multitude of others, compel us to look beyond the moral influence theory for the definition of the Atonement.

See ATONEMENT, GOVERNMENTAL THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT, PENAL SATISFACTION THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT, MYSTICAL THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT, MORAL ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

For Further Reading: Abelard, *Commentary on Romans*, vol. 10; Bushnell, *The Vicarious Sacrifice*; Robert Culpepper, *Interpreting the Atonement*, 87-118; Purkiser, ed., *Exploring Our Christian Faith*, 243-68; Wiley, CT, 2:259-66, 271-76, 282-90. D. MARTIN BUTLER

MORALITY. Morality is the consistent practice of the mores (rules) of a culture. It is related to ethics as application is related to theory. The moralist may moralize, but only when theory is translated into conduct does the moralist become moral.

Christian morality differs from secular or other-religion morality in its basic assumption of a revealed divine standard of right and wrong, to be found in the Bible. From the standpoint of the Judeo-Christian ethic, any violation of the Decalogue is immoral. The Christian would refine this to specify the principles of the Decalogue as expanded and expounded in the NT, with love as the primary rubric.

In this respect Christian morality differs radically from process philosophy or any form of humanism, which eschews absolutes, and which is essentially relativistic and developmental. Harold B. Kuhn observes that Whitehead's philosophy, for instance, "has no place for either human redemption from outside man, nor for morality as obedience to a revealed will of a personal God" ("Philosophy of Religion," *Contemporary Evangelical Thought*, 228). Morality severed from supernatural revelation must in the nature of the case be a "soft" morality, pliable and changeable.

Yet Christian morality cannot justly be charged with being merely moralistic rule keeping. Christianity more than any other religion or philosophy drives straight to the heart and locates morality there. Rule keeping in the biblical view does not make a person moral unless the rules are kept for the right reason, in the right spirit, and with the active involvement of a personal moral sense. The substance of both the right reason and the right spirit is love, which seeks at once to please God and do right toward others. A loveless moralism falls far short of Christian morality. Many persons who are "moral" in the bare sense of rule keeping are immoral, in God's sight, in the secret springs of the life.

Christianity pushes moral persons toward moral maturity. This is vastly different from the so-called maturity of a licentious and permissive society, which glories in the abandon with which laws, divine or human, are thrust aside. It is rather the maturity of persons who learn to think ethically—"who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil"

(Heb. 5:14). The revealed law of God will be such a person's base, but everyday life will be his sphere of application. He will see the moral issues and implications that are everywhere, in business methods (including his own), politics, taxation, affluence, pleasure, recreation, leisure, social class—all of the myriad and complex situations not covered specifically by law, but which need the application of law principles to a razor-honed degree, an application prompted by love and aided by the Holy Spirit.

However, while most decisions, proposals, and actions have at least indirect moral overtones, it is conceivable that some may be amoral. In thought at least, sharp distinction should be maintained between morality and expediency. A question of expediency may not necessarily be a moral question. Two courses of action may be equally legitimate but not equally wise.

See VIRTUE, CHRISTIAN ETHICS, PRINCIPLES, NEW MORALITY, EXPEDIENCY. RICHARD S. TAYLOR

MORTAL, MORTALITY. "Mortal" is the word that indicates that man is subject to death. "Mortality" is the condition of being mortal. The Greek word is *thnētos*, and according to Brunner (Kittel, 3:21) was used in Greek thought of "men in contrast to gods." Paul uses the term primarily in reference to man's physical body (Rom. 6:12; 8:11; 1 Cor. 15:53-54; 2 Cor. 4:11).

According to Wesley, mortality is more than subjection to death. Wesley (*Works*, 7:347) held that the soul is "hindered in its operations" because of mortality. Infirmities are not sins; they are a part of mortality.

Mortality per se is not sinful. Neither does mortality make sin necessary or inescapable. Wesley's teaching (*Works*, 6:277) must be emphasized—"a thousand infirmities will remain . . . sin need not remain." Paul confirms this as he writes, "Do not let sin reign in your mortal body" (Rom. 6:12, all NASB).

"Death" is a broader term than mortality, and in the Bible reference is made to both physical and spiritual death (Mark 10:33; Rev. 2:11). The ideas are related in that the cause of the broader is obviously the cause of the narrower.

Christian theologians have generally held that there is an inseparable relationship between sin and death. Early biblical evidence is found in Genesis: "In the day that you eat from it you shall surely die" (Gen. 2:17). Paul's discussion in Rom. 5:12-21 is incisive. He observes that sin leads to death, "and so death spread to all men" (v. 12). Where the word "death" is not qualified, it should be taken to include physical death. The

whole race suffers the consequence of Adam's sin.

The biblical writers leave to conjecture what might have been had man not sinned.

"To dust you shall return" (Gen. 3:19) is an authentic word, but it is not the final word. Paul writes, "For . . . this mortal must put on immortality" (1 Cor. 15:53). On this text Grosheide (*New London Commentary*, 32:377) says, "The verb [put on] expresses identity along with a qualitative difference." It is *this* mortal body that becomes immortal. This is in keeping with the Wesleyan view that the body is not inherently evil. The final word to the Christian is not "to dust" but "Christ Jesus [has] brought life and immortality to light through the gospel" (2 Tim. 1:10).

See CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY, IMMORTALITY, DEATH, RESURRECTION OF THE BODY, SOUL.

For Further Reading: Wright, "Death," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 4:687-95; Wesley, "The Fall of Man," *Works*, 6:215-24; "The Heavenly Treasure in Earthen Vessels," *Works*, 7:344-48. ALDEN AIKENS

MORTIFY, MORTIFICATION. This concept appears only in Paul's writings, Rom. 8:13 (*thana-tōō*, "make to die") and Col. 3:5 (*nekroō*, "make dead"). Union with Christ calls for the "putting to death" of the "deeds of the body" (Rom. 8:13) and "your members which are upon the earth" (Col. 3:5, KJV) or "what is earthly in you" (RSV).

Across the centuries, some groups in the church have taken mortification to be an ascetic practice in which the body of the Christian is subjected to forms of discomfort in order that "the flesh and its lusts" may be subdued and eventually overcome. Fasting and abstention from other pleasurable activities are means of mortification, the end result of which is thought to be the purifying of the soul and the increase of holiness of life.

In the Wesleyan tradition, in particular, these Pauline passages have been taken to refer to the act of consecration, through the help of the Holy Spirit, whereby the believer is delivered not only of "evil actions, but evil desires, tempers, and thoughts," and as a result the life of faith becomes more abundant (J. Wesley). While experience of mortification is central, the idea of daily discipline is not denied.

See ASCETICISM, TEMPERANCE, DISCIPLINE, DEATH TO SELF, BODY. WILLARD H. TAYLOR

MOSAIC LAW. The Mosaic law refers to the revelation of God given to Moses at Mount Sinai. In the OT this consists of the Ten Commandments

plus other statutes for the life of the covenant community of Israel. That it was a revelation from God and normative for Israel is clearly stated in the OT, and failure to obey the law is the primary factor in Israel's spiritual failure. Over the many centuries since the time of Moses there have been different assessments of the Mosaic law, including pronouncements and evaluations from the NT.

The original intention of Mosaic law is seen by examining the Hebrew word for law, *torah*. It has a broader and more personal meaning than its English translation, coming from a root which signifies "teaching, guidance, or instruction." In this light, its basic nature is better understood as revelation from God and constituting divine guidelines for Israel.

The form of the Ten Commandments, the heart of Mosaic law, is mostly apodictic law—strong negative statements which do not admit to any qualifications or exceptions. Those negative commandments begin with the Hebrew negative which means "never." (There is a different negative particle in Hebrew for temporary injunctions.) Much of the rest of law statement in the OT, such as the Book of the Covenant (Exod. 20:22—23:33), as well as law codes of the ancient Near East outside of Israel, are in the form of casuistic law, wherein specific cases are covered, using the formula, "If . . . , then . . ."

Moses is the mediator of the law, and the five books of law in the OT (Pentateuch) are traditionally attributed to him. This era of Moses has lasting theological importance for Israel. The giving of the law must be seen in connection with the Exodus from Egypt, a deliverance which provided a setting of mercy and grace for the law, and Israel's response in the acceptance of the law. God had delivered Israel from Egyptian bondage, and now they were His people, bound to Him by covenant law.

In the subsequent history of Israel the theological meaning and importance of the law of Moses changed, especially during and after the Babylonian exile. Judaism became ingrown and developed as a religion of the law, and obedience to its letter became paramount. Motivation for such obedience lay in the fact that it was a means of meriting justification, rather than in gratitude for gracious redemption. It was this legalistic understanding of the law that brought forth strong condemnation by Jesus and Paul.

Jesus summarized the significance of the law and prophets by calling attention to two things: (1) Israel's *Shema* (Deut. 6:4-5), which calls for loving God with one's total being; and (2) the

command to love one's neighbor as oneself (Lev. 19:18). This emphasis on the moral inwardness of the Mosaic law stands in stark contrast to the literal legalism of Judaism. Paul's response to those who insisted that Gentile converts must keep the law in order to be justified is clearly stated in Gal. 2:15-16: "by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." For Paul, the purpose of the Mosaic law is twofold: (1) to reveal the nature of sin (Rom. 3:20); and (2) by man's inability to keep the law, he is brought to a recognition of grace given through Christ (the pedagogical idea expressed in Gal. 3:24).

"Freedom from the law" does not mean license to violate the basic moral law, reaffirmed so vigorously in the NT, but annulment of the Mosaic law-system as a means of either (1) being reconciled to God or (2) becoming personally holy.

See LAW AND GRACE, FREEDOM, LICENSE, JUSTIFICATION, WORK (WORKS), MOSES, PENTATEUCH, TALMUD.

For Further Reading: Richardson, ed., *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, 122-24; IDB, 3:77-89; *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 6:425-27.

ALVIN S. LAWHEAD

MOSES. Moses was the great leader and lawgiver of ancient Israel. Of Israelite birth, he was at the same time an Egyptian. He resided in the court of Pharaoh from his very early days until his adult years (Exod. 2:1-10; Heb. 11:23-24). He also experienced the austere, frugal life of the desert as a member of the household of Jethro in the land of Midian (Exod. 3:1). Thus his roots reached deeply into the ancient cultural soil. He was a man of his time.

The faith of ancient Israel in its beliefs, worship, and ethics, much of which is both basic and antecedent to the Christian faith, was fashioned by Moses out of the revelation God gave to him at Sinai. As for beliefs, the Israelites were to believe in and be committed to the only God, Yahweh. There was to be no place for gods of other peoples, nor any image or likeness of Yahweh among them for any purpose whatsoever. This was in striking contrast to what prevailed in the ancient setting, and it had ramifying effect on all Israel's religious beliefs. As regards worship, Moses, under divine leadership, consecrated Aaron as high priest and established the sacrificial system as the means for atonement of the sins of the people (see Exodus 24—31). Concerning ethics, he made the Ten Commandments (Exod. 20:1-17) and specific case laws the code for the conduct of Israel. He thereby categorically indicated that many aspects of behavior acceptable to other religions were prohibited among God's people.

This ethic, long the foundation for society in the Western world, is tragically crumbling under the impact of an encroaching pagan, non-Mosaic ethic.

The prophets, in their many references to Moses or Moses' law, show they were revivalists or reformers and not innovators, with respect to religious and ethical understanding. They called repeatedly for repentance and return to Mosaic faith on all major counts: belief in God, sacrifices, conduct.

The many references of the NT to Moses' deeds and words indicate there was concern with him not only as lawgiver and prophet, but with his life as an example for life under the new covenant. Especially is this so in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

See MOSAIC LAW, NEW COVENANT, LAW, LAW AND GRACE.

For Further Reading: Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 179-96, 236-44; Bright, *History of Israel*, 122-26; ZPEB, M-P: 279-94. HARVEY E. FINLEY

MOTHER OF GOD. This is a phrase which Roman Catholics apply to Mary, the mother of Jesus. In the very early centuries, some theologians began to speak of her as Mary, bearer of God, because of her giving birth to Jesus, who was fully God as well as fully man. Then advancement was made from "Bearer of God" to "Mother of God." It is this "high" view of Mary which, later, figured in various advances in Catholic Mariology. It figured in such Roman Catholic doctrines as her being called Redemptrix and Co-Redeemer, perpetually a virgin, conceived without original sin in her mother's womb, assumed into heaven without physical death, and, in general, so significant in the total faith and life of the Roman Catholic church.

Most Protestants are pleased to honor Mary because of her office in giving birth to the God-man Jesus, but object to the designation as Mother of God. Not only does the term unjustifiably elevate Mary, but it implies that she was the mother to God the Father—since that is the member of the Trinity usually called God in the NT.

See MARIOLATRY.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

MOTIF RESEARCH. Especially related to the theological methodology of the Swedish theologian Anders Nygren, motif research (m.r.) is the tool employed to distill from a theological system the one element which is absolutely foundational and which distinguishes it from all others. Instead of employing the insights gleaned from

other systems of belief, as practiced in the history of religions school in vogue when Nygren first developed his methodology, m.r. seeks to establish the motif and its meaning from a careful reading of the data in the "natural context" within which it occurs. Applied to Christianity, Nygren identifies and defines *agapē* as the *sine qua non*.

Nygren begins his m.r. from the assumption that all religions are valid and distinct forms of experience which seek to answer the question, "How does man relate to the Eternal?" but that Christianity alone answers the question in a theocentric fashion. Even Judaism is essentially ego-centric, with its foundational motif being *nomos* (law) or man's achievement.

Two major strengths can be seen in Nygren's m.r.: it seeks to identify unifying themes in a religious system, and it takes seriously the meaning in the natural context for precise definition of the motif. Two weaknesses may also be identified. First, because it seeks to identify the one basic motif in a rather complex religious system, on the one hand it risks reducing these complexities into a lowest common denominator so basic that its value and distinctiveness is lost; and, on the other hand, it risks forcing divergent concepts into one mould or even totally disregarding incompatible ideas. It may be questioned whether one can reduce Christianity to the one motif of love, however basic it may be, without doing an injustice to several other cardinal motifs. Similarly, the reduction of Judaism to the one motif of law, however carefully defined, leads to serious distortion of the spirit of Judaism.

Second, from a specifically Christian perspective, any attempt to subserve all the distinctive emphases of the biblical writers under one rubric can only lead to distortion. The recognition of the rich diversity of emphases in the Scriptures within unity is essential if one is to properly understand the dynamic character of God's revelation to man.

See AGAPÉ, LAW, BIBLICAL THEOLOGY, HERMENEUTICS.

For Further Reading: Nygren, *Agape and Eros*; Quenbeck, "Anders Nygren," *A Handbook of Christian Theologians*; Hall, *Anders Nygren*. KENT BROWER

MOTIVES. Motives refer to the internal factors which produce human behavior. They speak to the question of *why* a person behaves as he or she does. Motives are anything which consciously or unconsciously moves a person to action, anything that impels or induces him or her

to act in a certain way. They are internal to the human being.

Motives and *intentions* are sometimes used as if they were synonyms. Intentions, however, are prompted by motives. A minister *intends* to be a good pastor. The question is, *why* does he want to be a good pastor? That is the question of motivation. His motives may include a desire to be liked, a desire for professional success, or a desire for ecclesiastical recognition.

Are these wrong motives for *intending* to be a good pastor? Not necessarily, if they are secondary to one's primary motive to glorify God. The highest-placed motive is showing gratitude for the grace of God who, through the atoning work of Christ, has redeemed, cleansed, and called.

This implies that motives may be mixed, yet "pure." They are pure if kept subordinate to the will of God, and if they are free from malice, slander, bitterness, or any other motive contrary to love for God and His people (Eph. 4:31—5:2).

Motives may be better than performance or worse. A good deed may be done with a wrong motive; also, a serious blunder may be well motivated. The moral quality of the spirit of the doer is determined by the inner motive. Only God sees this without error. He will not record good deeds if done with poor motives, and He will not blame poor performance if the motive is love.

See INTENTION, HEART PURITY.

For Further Reading: Baker's DCE, 427 ff, 437 ff, 622. LEBRON FAIRBANKS

MURDER. Narrowly defined, "murder" means "to kill a human being unlawfully and intentionally." Biblically defined, however, murder includes *thoughts* as well as *acts*, *failing* to maintain as well as *deliberately* taking persons' lives (Matt. 5:21-22; 1 John 3:15).

In Adam Clarke's view, the sixth commandment, "You shall not murder" (Exod. 20:13, NIV) clearly applies to a multiplicity of acts, including, he says: (1) whatever "abridges" the life of a person; (2) killing in unjust wars, such as those waged for land or wealth; (3) forming and enforcing laws which impose capital punishment for less than capital crimes; (4) "all bad dispositions" whereby one inwardly hates his neighbor; (5) failing to help the needy, for letting people die is the same as killing them; (6) all forms of intemperance which damage our own bodies and shorten our own lives (*Commentary*, 1:405 ff).

Thus, while we frequently label only "first degree murder" as murder, restricting our definition to legal terms, the Scripture will not allow us to evade murder's full significance. For, as Lord Ac-

ton said: "Murder may be done by legal means, by plausible and profitable war, by calumny, as well as by dose or dagger." To refrain from murder involves our heart's attitude and our social conscience as well as our personal behavior. In all aspects of our life we must choose life rather than death.

Sinful people, from Cain onwards, have tried to gain their ends through violence. Some have, with premeditation, slain individuals, as did the two killers in Truman Capote's dramatic case study, *In Cold Blood*. Others, like David eliminating Uriah, have used their authority to dispose of others by ordering them killed. On a larger scale, Joseph Stalin and Adolph Hitler have systematically slaughtered millions.

Despite its civilized facade, the 20th-century Western world has writhed with murderous activity. Violence on the streets and in the homes takes thousands of persons' lives each year. Unjust wars have liquidated millions. Over a million aborted, unborn children die each year in America. Vast numbers of hungry people starve to death each year—people who could have been spared were the world's wealth shared fairly.

From the perspective of the sixth commandment, the world abounds with murders and murderers. A few pay for their crimes. Most kill indirectly and are not tried for their victims' deaths. But from God's standpoint he who sheds innocent blood, whether directly or indirectly, stands guilty of murder.

See HATE (HATRED), CAPITAL PUNISHMENT, ABORTION, EUTHANASIA, LIFE.

For Further Reading: DeWolf, *Crime and Justice in America*; Shakespeare, *Macbeth*; Wolfgang, *Patterns in Criminal Homicide*.
GERARD REED

MYSTERY, MYSTERIES. It has long been thought that the NT use of the word family *mustērion* draws its technical signification from the pagan mystery cults. While it is certainly true that some NT writers, Paul in particular, used terms familiar to the mystery religions of the day, such use really found no parallel with the sacramental use of the word family identified with those religions (Bornkamm, Kittel, 4:802-28). In recent years, several scholars have suggested that later Judaism provides us with the best context and background for a proper understanding of how the NT writers used the *mustērion* family.

In later Judaism, "mystery" was a description of both Yahweh's will and the revelation of it within Israel (M. Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:19-21). According to the Qumran materials, the term "mysteries of Yahweh" shaped Yahweh's plans at

three primary levels: (1) the order of the cosmos; (2) the history of His salvation; and (3) the history of His judgment on Belial's kingdom (i.e., of evil). The latter two especially—God's salvation and His judgment—were the very ground of Qumran's eschatology, for it was at the Day of the Lord when His redemptive will was to be made fully known.

The "mysteries of Yahweh" were disclosed to the prophets (or teachers) who then transmitted them to the faithful community. Indeed, mystery was understood only by the faithful; faith was revealed by comprehension. Thus, it was the privilege of the truly faithful community to know and to understand the "mysteries of Yahweh," which were hidden from all the others and which prepared them for the coming Day of the Lord. Their gnosis insured their salvation.

All of this has import for the student of the NT who locates these same emphases especially in the writings of Paul (cf. *Ephesians* and *Colossians*). However, we must hasten to suggest that Paul radicalizes the plural, "mysteries of Yahweh," into the singular, "mystery of Christ." For Paul, God's will and word were incarnated and revealed in the dying and rising of His Son, Jesus Christ. One mystery—the mystery of the Incarnation—was substituted for all the rest. Salvation and judgment, indeed the plan for the cosmos (Col. 1:15-17), were all revealed and represented in *Christological* terms by Christ's apostles to Christ's Body, the Church (Eph. 3:1-13).

Further, the mystery of God disclosed in the last days to that community which exists in Christ becomes for that community its new moral imperative. The mystery of Christ obligates the community in Christ to live a life which imitates Him (Eph. 4:1; 5:1-2). By so living, the community not only affirms the gift of life they have received by grace through faith, but they prepare for their day of redemption as well (Eph. 4:30).

See CHRIST, SALVATION, CHURCH.

For Further Reading: Kittel, 4:802-28; BBC, 9:154; Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, 383 ff.

ROBERT W. WALL

MYSTICAL THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT. This term designates what is really a group of related theories within the general category of moral influence theories of the Atonement, i.e., the effect it has upon man, rather than upon God ("satisfaction theories") or Satan ("dramatic" or "classic" view). These theories suggest that the work of Christ so affects man as to draw him into participation with the life of Christ, a life char-

acterized by love, obedience, and service to God and one's fellowmen. There is therefore a "mystical" identity between Christ and man: Christ identifies with man in His humanness and brokenness in the Incarnation, partaking of man's suffering, but in so doing sets a perfect example of sacrifice of self to God. Even more than this, Christ is seen as a kind of archetype of humanity, so that His perfect sacrifice is in some sense actually the sacrifice of all humankind. Such complete and perfect sacrifice establishes humanity on a "new plane" which individuals may share through repentance and faith, and living a Christlike life.

A basic assumption of the mystical theories—as of all moral influence theories—is that the only real impediment to forgiveness of sins is the sinner's own hardness of heart. Christ in himself overcomes this hardness of heart and in so doing moves the individual sinner to renounce his obstinacy and self-will and be reconciled to God. The stress here is on Christ's influence by example. Ideas of propitiation, satisfaction, and ransom are foreign.

Mystical theories of the Atonement may be traced all the way back to certain of the Early Church fathers and have been articulated in some form by such subsequent spokesmen as Abelard, Schleiermacher, F. D. Maurice, and notably in America by Horace Bushnell, the "Father of Modern American Liberalism."

See ATONEMENT, MORAL INFLUENCE THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT, GOVERNMENTAL THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT, PENAL SATISFACTION THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT, RANSOM, REDEEMER (REDEMPTION).

For Further Reading: Aulen, *Christus Victor*, 133-42; Bushnell, *The Vicarious Sacrifice*; Rashdall, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, 435-64; Wiley, *CT*, 2:261-69.

HAROLD E. RASER

MYSTICISM. Because of its claims to the possibility of personal, experiential knowledge of God, the mystical element in religion is difficult to define. Mystical experiences are a part of both Christian and non-Christian faiths. Examples of the latter are the Sufism of the Muslim tradition and the transrational states induced by meditation or other means among Hindus and Buddhists. Drugs have also been used to induce experiences that transcend those produced by the normal functions of the intellect, will, and emotions.

The popular conception of mysticism has been shaped frequently by the unusual phenomena which have been associated with it but are not of its essence. Visions, trances, prophecies, special spiritual gifts, occult knowledge are not the real-

ities of mystical experience. John Gerson's definition of it as "the knowledge of God arrived at through the embrace of unifying love" expresses the essence of Christian mysticism as well as any other.

Mystical experience frequently arises in Christianity as a counterbalance to the formalizing tendencies of liturgical, institutionalized worship. It is essentially wedded to Christian faith by the "Christ in you" and "you in Christ" themes of the Pauline and Johannine literature. The theology of the Eastern church is basically mystical, rising out of the Christian-Platonism of Alexandria. In the Western church mystical theology found its home largely in monastic circles under the encouragement of Augustine and other Catholics in the Christian-Platonic tradition who followed him.

The Reformers and Wesley make strong disclaimers against the mysticism of their times. All, nevertheless, were strongly influenced by it—Luther by Thomas à Kempis and the *German Theology*, among others, and Wesley by William Law, Thomas à Kempis, Madame Guyon, and the Cambridge Platonists. In spite of Wesley's vigorous rejection of the passive nature of the mysticism of his day, mystical writers from Macarius to the Cambridge school are broadly represented in his *Christian Library*. His common concern with them for perfection in love as the ultimate end of biblical Christianity made a complete divorce impossible.

The personal, experiential nature of American revivalism has created a similar affinity with the mystical tradition in historic Christianity. Through Wesley and the writings of Thomas Upham, the American holiness movement, particularly, found historic witness to its experience of entire sanctification in such Catholic mystics as Catherine Adorna, Molinos, Fénelon, Francis de Sales, and Madame Guyon. In the nonrevivalist tradition in America, mysticism found parallel expression among the New England Transcendentalists.

See EXPERIENCE, IN CHRIST, UNITY, COMFORTER, FORMALISM, QUIETISM.

For Further Reading: Hoffman, *Luther and the Mystics*; Inge, *Mysticism in Religion*; Tuttle, *John Wesley*, 330-34; Underhill, *Mysticism*.

MELVIN EASTERDAY DIETER

MYTH. In working with OT materials, some critics have determined that the stories of creation, the Fall, the Deluge, and their counterparts in Mesopotamian and Canaanite religions are mythological. Also, NT statements concerning

the Atonement, the Resurrection, Christ, miracles, and "last things" fall into this literary and historical category. Such critics find the basis for these mythological views in the dependence of biblical writers on religious ideas and ideologies current in their times. Syncretistic activity is considered to have been common, so that, for example, Gnosticism is believed to have had a profound influence on first-century Christianity.

While this method of studying the Bible became prevalent following the Enlightenment, it was popularized by Rudolph Bultmann through a publication in 1941. Essentially Bultmann and the post-Bultmannians have defined *myth* as that language which finite man uses to express infinite truth. It is the best he has available to him at any moment of attempted expression of his faith. As new information of his world opens up to him, man must "demythologize" or, better, "re-mythologize" what he knows about the infinite order. In the study of the Gospels, the issue of demythologization has become most crucial in the search for the so-called historical Jesus.

The presuppositions and methods in the use of the category of myth have varied from writer to writer. They have used existentialism as well as structuralism and evolution as presuppositions, sometimes identifying myth and symbol. It is quite obvious that the evangelical views of the inspiration of the Scriptures conflict with this method of interpretation.

However, one good result of this way of interpreting the *kerygma* has led to a renewed interest in the Scriptures and a revival of the study of hermeneutics. Some see all this as a conflict between religion and natural science (Miles, *in loco*).

The conservative and liberal scholars are quite apart in their methods and doctrinal beliefs that result from their study of the Holy Scriptures. The conservative scholar sees the narratives of the OT and the NT as the record of historical events and truths that are the gospel (*kerygma*) of Jesus Christ, the Savior of the world. They find very little myth as such, but do recognize parable, allegory, and symbol. The Scriptures are the full and final revelation of God through Jesus Christ, and He is the Source of our personal salvation.

See BIBLE, DEMYTHOLOGIZATION, BIBLICAL AUTHORITY, CRITICISM (OT, NT), INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE, TYPE (TYPOLOGY), LIBERALISM, HERMENEUTICS.

For Further Reading: IDB; HDB; ZPBD; Gill, "Myth and Incarnation," *Christian Century*, 94 (December 21, 1977): 1190-94; Miles, "Burhoe, Barbour, Mythology, and Sociobiology," *Zygon*, 12 (March, 1977): 42-71; Neuleib, "Empty Face of Evil: Myth," *Christianity Today*, 19 (March 28, 1975): 14-16; Saliba, "Myth and Religious Man in Contemporary Anthropology," *Missiology*, 1 (July, 1973): 281-93. ROBERT L. SAWYER, SR.

N

NATION. The Hebrew word *goy* is translated as "Gentile," "nation," and "heathen." The Hebrew *am* seems to reflect a group of individuals or persons with common blood ties. *Am* and *goy* seem almost antithetical after the Exodus. The Greek word *ethnos* is like *goy*, never a person, but "Gentile," "nation," or "heathen." The contrast between the nation of Israel and the surrounding nations is significant throughout the OT (Isa. 43:9).

There are at least 70 nations or ethnic groups mentioned in Genesis 10; and a great multitude from every nation, tribe, people, and tongue mentioned in Rev. 7:9.

The prophets of Israel were constantly calling the people to their responsibility to evangelize

the nations (cf. Jonah). They were to receive the Revelation to share it with all the nations of the earth (Jer. 1:10; Ps. 66:7; Ezek. 5:6). But instead of fulfilling this mission, Israel became like the nations and succumbed to the same idolatry.

While the words do not show a relationship, it is reasonable to assume that the nation of Israel, God's chosen people, was the forerunner of the concept of the kingdom of God and/or heaven. Spiritual Israel inherits the theocratic promises of the OT prophets.

The NT concept is more spiritual than material, more of a reign than a realm. But John reminds us of the new heaven and new earth and the coronation of our King of Kings, Jesus the Christ. All the covenantal promises will be

brought into fruition by the second coming of Christ.

"All nations will be brought into judgment" is the basic presupposition of the prophets.

See ISRAEL, CHURCH, MISSION (MISSIONS, MISIOLOGY), KINGDOM OF GOD.

For Further Reading: *HDB*; *HBD*; *ZPBD*.

ROBERT L. SAWYER, SR.

NATURAL LAW. Natural law is that part of the eternal law which pertains to man's behavior, according to Aquinas. The eternal law he believed, is God's reason which sets and controls the integration of all things in the universe. A law is called natural because it is universally valid. Natural law, *lex naturalis*, in Christian theology "traditionally refers to the inherent and universal structures of human existence which can be discerned by the unaided reason and which form the basis for judgments of conscience . . . right is the rational" (Harvey, *A Handbook of Theological Terms*, 157).

Originating in early Greek philosophy, natural law became basic in the moral philosophy of Aquinas, and hence in subsequent Catholic theology. Protestant theologians, especially Luther and Calvin, argued that fallen man cannot have direct knowledge from God apart from revelation (the Ten Commandments and supernatural law in Christ). Liberal theologians, both Catholic and Protestant, warn against accepting unchanging precepts based on unchanging nature, holding that natural law is an existential concept, the insurgent authenticity (Macquarrie, *Principles of Christian Theology*, 506).

On the other hand there can be seen a synthesis of natural law and revealed law in the revelation of God's love through Jesus Christ. "Love is the natural law because it is the law of man's essential nature" (Stumpf in Halverson, *A Handbook of Christian Theology*, 248). While fallen nature distorts or denies love as the law of life, redemption through sanctification restores it.

See REVELATION (NATURAL), REVELATION (SPECIAL), NATURAL THEOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Harvey, *A Handbook of Theological Terms*; Macquarrie, *Principles of Christian Theology*; Halverson, *A Handbook of Christian Theology*.

MEL-THOMAS ROTHWELL

NATURAL MAN, THE. The term is used to designate the man who is unregenerate, and therefore insensitive to spiritual matters. The apostle Paul contrasts the natural (*psuchikos*) man with the spiritual (*pneumatikos*) man, depicting the natural man as unresponsive and ignorant of those

things spiritually discernible (1 Cor. 2:14; cf. John 12:40; 2 Cor. 4:4; 1 John 2:11).

The natural man is not to be confused with the carnal man, who, while being a child of God, is not fully surrendered to Christ but lives under the domination of the flesh (*sarkinos*, 1 Cor. 3:1-3).

Wesley characterizes the state of the natural man to be one of sleep, where neither spiritual good nor evil is discerned. Because of his spiritual insensitivity, he is unaware of his true, precarious position and imagines himself to be wise, good, and free from "all vulgar errors, and from the prejudice of education; judging exactly right, and keeping clear of all extremes" (Sermon 9, "The Spirit of Bondage and Adoption").

The term "natural man" refers to that state in which man was found after the Fall. Though the divine image was marred, it was not totally lost, since he retained some degree of self-determination and a certain amount of intelligence in natural things. However, he was and is utterly incapable of understanding the things that have to do with obtaining God's grace and salvation without the aid of God's prevenient grace. In this condition and without the aid of the Holy Spirit, natural man cannot but regard the gospel, his only salvation, as foolishness (1 Cor. 2:14). Not only is the understanding darkened (Eph. 4:18; 5:8) but also the will is misguided (cf. Romans 7), and he is ruled by profound enmity toward God (Rom. 8:7).

See SPIRITUALITY, AWAKENING, REGENERATION, ORIGINAL SIN, FALL (THE), PREVENTIVE GRACE.

For Further Reading: Wiley, *CT*, 2:32; Wesley, "The Spirit of Bondage and Adoption," *Works*, vol. 5.

FOREST T. BENNER

NATURAL REVELATION. See REVELATION, NATURAL.

NATURAL THEOLOGY. The term *natural theology* has historically signified the interaction between humans and the world about them, through which was derived some knowledge of God's existence and being. The process of derivation of such knowledge usually assumes that some reliable intimations of His "eternal power and Godhead" (Rom. 1:20) may be gained apart from any special revelation. As such, the information thus gained is inferential, acquired by process of observation and deduction. Its raw material is, of course, the world, which is available to every normally perceptive person.

The classic scriptural statement is found in Rom. 1:19-20. This passage was basic to the de-

velopment of this phase of Christian teaching for the first 14 centuries. In the medieval era, natural theology was viewed as forming a basis for recognition and acceptance of revealed theology. It found its most complete expression in the *Summa Theologica* of Thomas Aquinas (1225-74) and especially in the five classical proofs for God's existence. The schoolmen of the Middle Ages were confident that natural theology could yield a good grade of certainty concerning God's existence, and some valid insight into His nature.

The Reformers, while valuing naturally derived intimations concerning God, made less of it than did, for example, Thomas Aquinas, for they felt more keenly the weakening of the human perceptive powers in the Fall. But both the Lutheran and the Calvinistic wings of the Reformation took seriously the biblical statements with respect to a degree of theological understanding derivable from a reverent study of nature.

The teaching has met with varying fortunes in more recent times. The Enlightenment, typically of the 18th century, exalted natural theology to a point at which it came to be regarded to be the chief source of religious knowledge. To reason was ascribed the ability to learn all that one needed to know concerning religion. Others in the same period (and down to our own day) held with Immanuel Kant that no knowledge of a personal God could be derived from impersonal nature.

In our century natural theology has again met with varying degrees of acceptance. The scientific world view has tended to merge "God" with the world. The process theologians see "deity" as a phase of the larger totality of the world process. Here the question resolves itself to the identification of the dynamic aspects of nature with "the divine."

The dialectical theology (commonly called neoorthodoxy) raised the question in the second quarter of our century. Karl Barth, eager to establish the uniqueness and adequacy of Scripture, sought to deny utterly the possibility of natural theology. His erstwhile colleague, Emil Brunner, took issue and tried to restate a modified view of man's ability to infer something vital concerning God from nature. This type of approach is generally accepted among evangelical Christians today.

See NATURAL LAW, REASON, RATIONALISM, REVELATION (NATURAL).

For Further Reading: *Baker's DT*, 372-73; *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 8:85; *Wiley, CT*, 1:51 ff.

HAROLD B. KUHN

NATURALISM. This term may be defined most simply as a frame of reference which denies the possibility of any reality which transcends material existence. By definition, naturalism is opposed to every form of supernaturalism. In a modern world which derives virtually every category of meaning from natural sciences and technology, all of which operates empirically, naturalism is a pervasive world view.

It does not necessarily follow that such non-material values as beauty, truth, goodness, etc., would be denied by a naturalist or that he would automatically be an atheist. These values and others are for the naturalist a reflection of what religious man terms God. They are a reflection of the highest forms of experience for natural man. It is essential for a consistent naturalist, however, to insist that all reality is temporal and spatial.

See GOD, CREATION, THEISM, MATERIALISM.

For Further Reading: *Harvey, A Handbook of Theological Terms*; *Henry, God, Revelation, and Authority*, 1:37 ff.

W. STEPHEN GUNTER

NATURE. This term designates the essential character or structure of being. A primary constituent, or the combination of those qualities which together give a thing or a being its true character, is said to be its nature. The Greek word *physis* refers to "everything which . . . seems to be a given" (Koster, Kittel, 9:253).

Often the word "nature" refers to the sum total of the universe apart from the interference of man. As such, it is frequently personified, almost deified, by those who refuse to acknowledge that it is created and sustained by God. Creationists, in contrast, believe that through nature God gives a limited understanding of himself.

The crucial issues concerning the term "nature" are in anthropology and Christology. In Christ we have one Person or Being, existing in two natures, human and divine. In respect to man, the question is whether nature is to be identified with (1) generic manness, or humanness, with (2) the individual self as an ultimate core of reality which remains unchanged throughout changes in its qualities or states (Moustakes), or (3) the individual traits which characterize the self. The first two are fixed and inalienable. The third is malleable.

Hence, while the being of man, or human nature as endemic and essential, remains unchanged, the moral nature of any person may be changed by God's grace. Wesleyans have been optimistic about this possibility. Wesley (*Works*, 10:367) insists, "You are really changed; you are

not only accounted, but actually 'made righteous.'"

The word "nature" is used in an accommodated sense by Wesleyans who speak of the sin nature as a propensity to evil, in contrast to acts of sin. This sin nature must be seen as an acquirement and not as an integral part of man's being.

Rom. 5:12 is a crucial text on this subject. Scholars generally agree that the use of the article with the singular noun (*hē hamartia*) introduced by Paul at this point in the Epistle means that from here on, the discussion majors on this kind of sin in such a way that the perversity being described can be called a nature. But it is "an inner moral tyranny that is alien to man's true nature" (GMS, 291).

Many attempts have been made by holiness writers to find a word or an expression that would adequately convey the notion of this "inner moral tyranny." Wesley (*Sermons*, 2:454) uses "proneness to evil" and "tendency to self-will." Delbert Rose (*The Word and the Doctrine*, 127) refers to the sin nature as "a principle," "an inherited corruption," "a disposition."

While Christians have generally held that this sin nature remains in the justified, believers are exhorted by Wesley (*Sermons*, 2:391) to press on to the "great salvation" through which God brings full deliverance from "all sin that still remains." This deliverance comes at the moment of decisive faith when one believes for entire sanctification. Various words and phrases such as "done away with" (Rom. 6:6) and "crucified" (Gal. 5:24) are used by the apostle Paul to express this deliverance.

Man's nature may be so deeply affected by God's grace that its renewal is profound—in place of the tendency to sin is love made perfect.

See MAN, HUMAN NATURE, ORIGINAL SIN, SELF, CARNAL MIND.

For Further Reading: Harris and Taylor, "The Dual Nature of Sin," *The Word and the Doctrine*, 89-117; GMS, 67-87, 251-302; Rose, "Sin in Believers: As a Principle," *The Word and the Doctrine*, 127-36; Wesley, *Sermons*, 2:360-97, 442-60.

ALDEN AIKENS

NAZARENE. As a designation for Jesus in the Gospels and Acts, this is understood to indicate that He came from Nazareth in Galilee. The one English term represents in fact two alternative Greek adjectives which are used as roughly equivalent. One of these, *Nazarēnos*, is the only form found in Mark, while it occurs twice in Luke but not at all in Matthew or John. The other term, *Nazōraios*, perhaps better translated into English as "Nazorean," is used exclusively by

Matthew and John, and is found in Luke-Acts some eight times.

This variation in spelling is generally accounted for by one theory or another regarding the origin of the second term, *Nazōraios*. Such theories are coincidentally bound up with the interpretation of Matt. 2:23. There, the question which must be answered concerns the exact location of Matthew's citation of that which "was spoken by the prophets." Three alternatives have been proposed: (1) that the term is derived from the village name, Nazareth; (2) that it is derived from the OT word rendered Nazirite (specifically, Judg. 13:5, 7; 16:17 read in connection with Isa. 4:3); (3) that it originated from the Hebrew word root that means "branch" (cf. Isa. 11:1) and that may mean "watchman" (cf. Jer. 31:6-7).

R. E. Brown argues convincingly for the position that these three theories need not be mutually exclusive. On the one hand, to argue for only one view on the basis of strict rules of word derivation in the biblical languages is to ignore the reality that biblical etymologies more often are the result of analogical thinking than they are the consequence of consistently followed rules of phonology. And furthermore, a particular term applied to Jesus may have been attractive to the early Christians because of its wealth of possible allusions, rather than by its well-defined limitations (Brown, 209).

See CHRIST, CHRISTIAN.

For Further Reading: Albright and Mann, *The Anchor Bible: Matthew*, 20-23; Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 209-13, 223-25.

HAL A. CAUTHRON

NECROMANCY. See SORCERY.

NEIGHBOR. The concept of "neighbor" was familiar to any Jew in Christ's day who knew the Hebrew Scriptures. That there was nevertheless some uncertainty concerning an exact definition might be indicated by the lawyer's question, "And who is my neighbor?" (Luke 10:29, NASB). The fact that the word had come to have in the Jewish mind an exclusive connotation can be understood when the various OT words, translated by "neighbor" in English, are noted. *Amith* means "equal, fellow." *Qarob* designates "near one." By far the most common word, *rea*, means "friend, companion." When *rea* is changed to *reuth*, it becomes "female friend, companion." *Shaken* means "dweller, inhabitant," generally nearby. Together these terms imply proximity and acquaintance. The Jews came to limit the meaning of neighbor to friends of the same race and class, with whom one was on intimate and

congenial terms. They could thus say, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy" (Matt. 5:43). By their definition an enemy was not a neighbor, therefore they were not under obligation to love him.

It was necessary therefore for Jesus to follow up His reminder that the second greatest commandment was, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Matt. 22:39 and parallels), by rebuking their narrow and exclusive application of the term. This He did, not only by direct command in 5:44-48, but by the parable of the Good Samaritan. Then Jesus turned the tables on the quibbling lawyer by asking: "Which now of these three . . . was neighbour unto him that fell among the thieves?" (Luke 10:36). The point was so unmistakable that the lawyer could not avoid giving the obvious answer. Fulfilling this second great commandment cannot be done by restricting the sphere of obligation but by expanding the concept of neighbor to include any person in need of any aid one can give. Especially did Jesus by the parable demolish the barriers of race and class. Loving the neighbor demands neighborly love, which not only *feels* ("he had compassion"), but *acts*, daringly, sacrificially, and selflessly—and with follow-through. The second great commandment points beyond convention and convenience. It is more than the absence of hate. It is practical and dynamic.

See GREAT COMMANDMENTS, LOVE, AGAPE.

For Further Reading: *Baker's DCE*; Taylor, *Life in the Spirit*, 19-28; DeWolf, *Responsible Freedom*, 60ff; Muelder, *Moral Law in Christian Social Ethics*; Wirt, *The Social Conscience of the Evangelical*.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

NEOEVANGELICALISM. Evangelicalism reached a high point in the mid 19th century when it dominated American religion. After the Civil War, conflict between evangelicalism and liberalism led to decline and separation. By 1910 the theological battle had resulted in the fundamentalist movement, which insisted on belief in certain basic doctrines as a minimum for a Christian. These doctrines primarily were the virgin birth of Christ, His deity, His substitutionary atonement and bodily resurrection, His second coming, and the authority and inerrancy of the Bible (NIDCC, 396). This movement reached its peak in the 1920s.

After 1940 there came a resurgence of evangelical activity both intellectual and evangelistic, often called *neoevangelicalism*. Among many similar developments which could be cited, the founding of Fuller Theological Seminary, the

Graham campaigns, and the launching of the periodical *Christianity Today* were especially influential. Neoevangelicalism agreed with the doctrines of the fundamentalists and the historic church confessions, but disagreed on matters of emphasis and strategy. The movement won an intellectual respectability with writers such as E. J. Carnell and Carl Henry (William Hordern, *A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology*, 55; Bernard Ramm, *Handbook of Contemporary Theology*, 88). Also in the 1940s arose the National Association of Evangelicals.

In the 1960s the new evangelicalism took on a new mood that increased emphasis on the spiritual mission of the church. This "resurgence of evangelicalism" flowered in the 1970s by Inter-University Missionary Conference (Urbana), Campus Crusade for Christ, Key 73, church growth emphasis, new publications, evangelical colleges and seminaries, the "This Is Life" movement, and a revitalization of the Christian Holiness Association and other Wesleyan advances (Donald G. Bloesch, *The Evangelical Renaissance*, 13-18).

See EVANGELICAL.

For Further Reading: Wells and Woodbridge, *The Evangelicals*; Baker's DT, 200; Quebedeaux, *The Young Evangelicals: Revolution in Orthodoxy*; and *Christianity Today*.

LEO G. COX

NEOORTHODOXY. *Neoorthodoxy*, a term that can be loosely applied to an influential theological movement of this century, is best understood as a reaction to the failure of religious liberalism to provide an adequate answer to the crisis of Western society in the early part of the century. World War I had brought into question many of the major beliefs of religious liberalism: the belief that progress in Western society was bringing the kingdom of God to fruition; the belief in the intrinsic goodness of man; the overemphasis on the immanence of God; and the reduction of Christianity to experience and ethics. This questioning burst as a bomb in the playground of Europe's theologians with the publication in 1919 of Karl Barth's *Commentary on Romans*. Barth strongly criticized theological liberalism as being unable to provide adequate answers to the questions he as a pastor in Safenwil, Switzerland, was being asked to answer. The "strange new world of the Bible," where God was God and not "man written large," which Barth sought to explore in his commentary, became known as "new" or "neoorthodoxy." This theological viewpoint, also known as *crisis* theology or *dialectical* theology, found varied expression in the writings of men

such as Barth, Emil Brunner, Rudolph Bultmann, Paul Tillich, and Reinhold Niebuhr.

The varied expressions which range from the more "orthodox" Barth and Brunner to the more "neo" Bultmann, Tillich, and Niebuhr, still find some common principles and themes in their theologies. At least three basic principles undergird their thought. First is the influence of existentialism as espoused by Søren Kierkegaard (though Barth later sought to repudiate his reliance on S. K.). Second is the dialectic method (i.e., dialectical theology) which is not the progression of the Hegelian dialectic but rather sees religious truth as best expressed in *paradoxes*. Third is the acceptance of modern critical methods and modern views of science in the interpretation of the Bible.

Along with these three principles of interpretation, a number of common theological themes are found in neoorthodoxy. God is the Wholly Other, the one whose "infinite qualitative difference" from man makes it impossible for finite man to bridge the infinite gap between them. God transcends man as Creator and Redeemer, pointing to man's responsibility for his radical sinfulness and his inability to save himself. The infinite gulf between God and man can only be bridged when God speaks His Word, thereby revealing and disclosing Himself to man. The Bible is the witness to this Word of God, though it is not the Word of God itself. This means the Bible is more than just great religious literature, it is inspired, but its inspiration is "hidden" in the words of men. It is thus historically conditioned and contains human error.

The Word of God is most fully expressed in Jesus Christ, in whom eternity breaks into time, the infinite becomes finite, and God becomes man. Jesus reveals both God's judgment on man's sin and His grace which alone can redeem man. The paradox of judgment-grace as revealed in the Word, Jesus, lays a claim on man, obligating him for responsible decision. Thrust into the knowledge of God's claim, man is faced with a "crisis," a decision which he cannot escape. The crisis, hence "crisis theology," is one of faith, where the "leap of faith," while not resolving, transcends in a divine-human encounter the paradox of judgment-grace. Man only truly knows himself and God in this divine-human encounter.

The theme of man's knowledge of himself as sinner is important in neoorthodoxy. The question of how man became a sinner is answered by saying we are all our own "Adam." We all rebel against our finitude and, wanting to be God, we

all commit the Fall. Thus, the Fall is important in the explanation of the sinfulness of all mankind but not as a historical event. Concern for its historical facticity only leads to conflict with science, a conflict in which the Bible comes second best (according to neoorthodoxy).

The seriousness with which neoorthodoxy takes the sinfulness of man calls for a concomitant seriousness about the Atonement. Jesus, as the Word of God, was more than just a religious genius and martyr. It is in the Cross that victory over sin, death, and evil was realized because "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself" (2 Cor. 5:19).

Man's radical sinfulness taints all his life, including society. This led neoorthodoxy to state that the structures of society are sinful also and in need of redemption. Therefore they concerned themselves with critiquing politics and unjust social structures, and commenting on controversial social issues, in hopes of bringing a Christian viewpoint to shine on them. But, there is no unanimity among these theologians on the answers to the perplexing social problems.

Though there is a variance of views on social issues, neoorthodoxy agrees that man's sinfulness makes it impossible to find more than a poor approximation of the kingdom of God within history. One result of this has been a renewed interest in the church as the unique bearer of God's purpose and grace within history. The other result is the renewal of interest in eschatology as the object of ultimate hope. While never being literalists in their view of eschatology, they did see the kingdom of God as being beyond historical analogy and man's ethical attainments. Eschatology is not so much about the end times as about the end of time.

Neoorthodoxy has provided a much-needed corrective for the theological liberalism of the early 20th century, in its emphasis on orthodox doctrines such as the transcendence of God, the sinfulness of man, and the efficacy of the Atonement for sins. But there are issues such as the relation of the Word of God to the word of man in Scripture, and the relation of religious symbolism to historical fact, along with others, that make neoorthodoxy less than satisfactory for most evangelical scholars.

See ORTHODOXY, EVANGELICAL, NEOEVANGELICALISM, FALL (THE), LIBERALISM.

For Further Reading: Kuhn, *Contemporary Evangelical Thought*, ed. Henry, 233-36; Porteous, *Prophetic Voices in Contemporary Theology*; Gundry and Johnson, *Tensions in Contemporary Theology*; Patterson, *Makers of the Modern Theological Mind*; Heron, *A Century of Protestant*

Theology; Nineham and Robertson, *Makers of Contemporary Theology*; MacKintosh, *Types of Modern Theology*.
MAXIE HARRIS III

NEO-PENTECOSTALISM. Sometimes referred to as the "Charismatic Revival," Neo-Pentecostalism is a movement active both in and out of organized churches that gives renewed attention to the work and ministry of the Holy Spirit and particularly to the spiritual gifts. Although it does not include some of the excesses and extravagances of the earlier and more revivalistic type of classical Pentecostalism, Neo-Pentecostalism is similar in affirming the distinctive teaching regarding the "baptism in the Spirit" as a spiritual experience for believers subsequent to their conversion. A more recent development within the movement seeks to give greater emphasis to tongues as a private prayer language than to public tongues speaking. Within Neo-Pentecostalism there is a much greater emphasis placed on experience than doctrine, allowing those involved to have a sense of unity that crosses many traditional doctrinal lines.

While often a divisive force within the established churches, Neo-Pentecostalism has contributed positively by necessitating a reexamination of the scriptural teachings regarding the work and ministry of the Holy Spirit, by bringing a renewed sense of emotion into many relatively "dead" religious groups, and by encouraging a more widespread involvement of the laity within the work and worship of the churches.

Most Wesleyans rejoice in whatever authentic renewal has occurred in Neo-Pentecostalism. They do, however, disavow the hermeneutical underpinnings of the movement, believing that the excessive emphasis on tongues speaking has insufficient biblical support.

See PENTECOST, PENTECOSTALISM, BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT, GIFTS OF THE SPIRIT, TONGUES (GIFT OF).

For Further Reading: Synan, ed., *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*; O'Connor, *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church*; Quebedeaux, *The New Charismatics*; Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals*.

DON W. DUNNINGTON

NEOPLATONISM. This refers to a revival of Platonist teachings that began in the third century A.D. and largely ended by the sixth century. The most distinguished of the Neoplatonists were Plotinus (c. 205-70) and Proclus (411-85). Ammonius Saccas (c. 175-242), Plotinus' teacher, is often considered the founder. Porphyry (c. 232-303), a student of Plotinus, collected his teacher's writings into the many volumes of the *Enneads*.

The Neoplatonists influenced Christian theology especially through Origen, Augustine, and Pseudo-Dionysius.

See PLATONISM.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

NEO-THOMISM. This has to do with the official revival of the teachings of Roman Catholic theologian Thomas Aquinas (1225-74). Through papal encyclicals of 1879 and 1907, Roman Catholic priests and priests-to-be were required to read Aquinas—partly, to ward off the encroachments of modernism. Theologians such as Etienne Gilson and Jacques Maritain, who adapt Aquinas' teachings to our 20th-century times, are called Neo-Thomists. Neo-Thomism is most respectful of Aristotle's views, and it makes wide use of natural as well as revealed sources for constructing Christian theology.

See THOMISM.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

NESTORIANISM. This is a Christological heresy. It represents the theology of Persian Christianity and the Christology of the Antiochian School. Named after Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople (428-35), Nestorianism attempted to preserve the humanity of Christ, and held that in Christ there are two distinct substances (Godhead and manhood) with their separate characteristics (natures) complete and intact, though united in Christ. However, this concentration upon the humanity (in contrast to the Alexandrian focus upon the divinity of Christ), and the emphasis upon the separateness of substances and natures, implied in Christ a dual personality. The Incarnation becomes therefore merely a moral and voluntary union between the Logos and the man Jesus. "The man whom the Word assumed was a temple in which divinity dwelt through a voluntary union" (Gonzalez, *A History of Christian Thought*, 2:215). Since the Logos knew what the man Jesus would become, He entered into fellowship with His person in the womb of Mary. "As the man Jesus became morally stronger this intimate relationship became closer, climaxing into the resurrection and the ascension" (Heick, *A History of Christian Thought*, 1:175).

Restricted by this conceptuality with emphasis upon the humanity of Christ, it was natural therefore that Nestorius should object to the term *theotokos*, "mother of God," attributed to the Virgin Mary. It was this objection which brought Nestorius to a head-on clash with Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria (412-44), and Nestorian Christology was declared unorthodox in 431 at the Council at Ephesus. Nestorius was banished

in 436, but he found a home in Persia, where the imperial ban could not harm him. Here his teaching became the official theology of Persian Christianity. Concern for the lost motivated this body of Christians who took the gospel as far as India.

Some scholars in recent years have sought to exonerate Nestorius from the charge of heresy. "He did not teach that in Christ two persons were mechanically joined together," declares Bethune-Baker. It was personal rather than doctrinal reasons which determined Nestorius' fate. "Nestorius was sacrificed to save the face of the Alexandrians. Nevertheless, the manhood of Christ was safeguarded, as distinct from the Godhead. . . . the union was left an ineffable mystery" (Bethune-Baker, 197-211).

See HUMANITY OF CHRIST, HYPOSTASIS.

For Further Reading: Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and His Teaching, A Fresh Examination*; Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*; Moule, *The Origin of Christology*; Pannenberg, *Jesus—God and Man*.

ISAAC BALDEO

NEW BEING. In contemporary theology this is a term used by Paul Tillich (1886-1965) to describe Jesus the Christ as the bearer and manifestation of the New Being. In His life, ministry, and death, He remained in complete union with the Ground of all Being. He sacrificed everything He could have gained for himself to conquer "estrangement" and maintain this unity. Hence He is the Man-from-above, the Christ, the Son of God, the Spirit, the Logos-who-became-flesh, the "New Being" (Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, 1:135-36; 2:97-180).

The term also describes the new life and even nature of the Christian whose life is radically transformed by the Holy Spirit. He is one who participates in Christ and as a result is a new creation (Tillich, *The Shaking of the Foundations*, 130-48; *Systematic Theology*, 3:138-72). Natural man belongs to the "old creation"—the "old state of things." In his "estrangement" (*Systematic Theology*, 2:29-78) he knows himself as the old being, flesh, the distortion of human nature, the abuse of his creativity (*Shaking of the Foundations*, 133). The new being is essential being under the conditions of existence, conquering the gap between essence and existence and united with the Ground of all Being. Christ brings in this new state of things, and Christianity is the message of the new creation (*The New Being*, 15-24).

The term New Being has its biblical basis in the Pauline terms "new creature" and "new creation." Salvation from the old state of things

includes "participation" in the New Being (regeneration), "acceptance" of the New Being (justification), and "transformation" (sanctification) by the New Being. It is a complete "renewal" in terms of reconciliation, reunion, and resurrection (*Systematic Theology*, 3:221-43; *The New Being*, 20).

The theology of the "new being" is a theme central to the Law, Prophets, and Psalms. It is God who will make a new covenant with His people in which the law will be written in the heart. It is the gift of the new heart and a new spirit (Jer. 31:31-34; Ezek. 11:17-19; 18:31-32; Heb. 8:10-12). It is the creation of a new heart and the renewal of a right spirit resulting in love and obedience (Ps. 51:10; Jer. 9:23-26; Deut. 30:6).

In the NT Jesus is at once the Initiator and Fulfillment of the new covenant, as the only Mediator between God and man (Heb. 9:11-22; 12:24; Matt. 26:28; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25; John 14:6; Acts 4:12). Through His life, death, and resurrection, all who belong to the old order of things (the first Adam) and therefore dead in trespasses and sins, can be created anew in Him (the Second Adam) by faith and have the witness of the Spirit that they are the children of God by redemption. Through Christ, God is doing a new thing (Romans 5—8; Ephesians 2; 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15). Those made new in Christ no more live after the flesh (Rom. 6:6; Gal. 5:19-21), but live in the Spirit through faith as new creatures. They are born of the Spirit and made alive from the dead (John 3:1-7; Eph. 2:1-6). Their hearts may be made pure through faith in the blood of Jesus Christ and by the in-filling of the Holy Spirit (1 John 1:1-9; Acts 15:8-9). They may be sanctified wholly by the Spirit (1 Thess. 5:23).

See NEW COVENANT, NEW BIRTH, REGENERATION, NEOORTHODOXY, SANCTIFICATION.

For Further Reading: Tillich, *Systematic Theology*; *The New Being*; *The Shaking of the Foundations*; Kerr, *Readings in Christian Thought*; McKelway, *The Systematic Theology of Paul Tillich*.

ISAAC BALDEO

NEW BIRTH. The term *new birth* refers to that work of grace wrought by God in the heart of a repentant sinner when he believes in Christ as his Savior and is given spiritual life. *New birth* is not found in the Bible but is based on statements found in John 1:12; 3:3, 5, 7; 1 John 3:1; etc.

The word "regeneration" is synonymous with *new birth*. It comes from the Latin word *regeneratus*, meaning "made over" or "born again." It appears twice in the NT: in Matt. 19:28 and in Titus 3:5. In the latter passage it refers to the per-

sonal spiritual birth of a believer; in the former, to the general renewal at the end of time when God will make all things new (cf. Isa. 11:6; 65:25; Rom. 8:18-23; 2 Pet. 3:13; Revelation 21—22).

The spiritual renewal that takes place in a believer is described in John 3:5-8; 10:28; 1 John 5:11-12; and 2 Pet. 1:4 as the communication of divine life to the soul. In 2 Cor. 5:17 and Eph. 2:10; 4:24 it is shown to be the impartation of a new nature.

Jesus, Peter, James, and John refer to spiritual regeneration as a birth (John 3:5, 7; 1 Pet. 1:3, 23; 2:2; Jas. 1:18; 1 John 3:9). Paul uses the term "adoption" to describe it (cf. Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:5; Eph. 1:4-5). *New birth* underlines the reception of the nature of God (the Father) by the believer; "adoption" stresses the believer's change of family. Once he was a child of the devil (John 8:44; 1 John 3:10), but now he belongs to the family of God (Ephesians 1—2; 5:1).

Because regeneration sometimes is referred to in Scripture as a birth, some Calvinists hold that the new birth, like physical birth, is an experience in which the individual does not participate. That is, repentance and faith are said to come after regeneration, which is completely a sovereign act of God (cf., e.g., Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 465). But the Scriptures indicate that repentance and faith precede and are conditions for regeneration (Isa. 55:7; Luke 13:3, 5; John 3:16, 18; Acts 2:37-38; 3:19; 16:31; etc.). No scripture passage suggests that repentance and faith have their origin subsequent to regeneration. Some Calvinists press the analogy of birth farther than Jesus and the apostles intended.

Birth and adoption are among a number of analogies used in the NT, none of which excludes the others. Christ is called the Good Shepherd, and believers are called sheep. Christ is the Vine; believers are the branches. Christ is the King (Lord); believers are subjects (servants). Christ is the Master (Teacher); believers are called disciples. Christ is the Chief Cornerstone; believers are building stones. Christ is the Bridegroom, and believers are the Bride. Each analogy expresses an important truth; but none of them can safely be pressed beyond the point of scriptural support. To do so is to fall into error.

See REGENERATION, FIRST WORK OF GRACE, JUSTIFICATION, ADOPTION.

For Further Reading: Ralston, *Elements of Divinity*, 417-33; Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 465-79; Gamertsfelder, *Systematic Theology*, 503-13; Wakefield, *A Complete System of Christian Theology*, 424-32.

W. RALPH THOMPSON

NEW COMMANDMENT. Jesus' statement in John 13:34 immediately raises the question of how He could describe the love command as a "new" commandment. The injunction to love one's neighbor as oneself is found in the OT (Lev. 19:18), and the Synoptic Gospels recount Jesus' application of that commandment earlier in His ministry (Matt. 22:39; cf. Mark 12:31; Luke 10:27). The context of Jesus' words in the Gospel of John supplies three possible meanings for the newness of the commandment, any one or all of which may be applied with edifying results.

The command may be new in the degree of love it enjoins. The evangelist has already described the extent of Jesus' love for the disciples (13:1). Later in the discourses, Jesus himself will speak of demonstrating love by laying down one's life for one's friends (15:13). The newness of the command may be in terms of the motive for loving one another. Jesus does not ask them to do any more than He himself has done (cf. vv. 10-12). The disciples are to love to the degree which Jesus commands, because He has loved them to that same degree. There is the new motive. But the commandment may be understood as new because it is at the center of the new covenant. In John's Gospel, Jesus' words of command have the place that is filled in the Synoptics by His words instituting the Lord's Supper (cf. Luke 22:20). This new covenant of mutual love is the earthly counterpart of the relationship between the Father and the Son (cf. John 14:23; 17:23, 26).

See AGAPÉ, NEW COVENANT, GREAT COMMANDMENTS.

For Further Reading: Brown, *The Gospel According to John XIII-XXI*, 612-14; Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, 278-80; Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, 463-64; Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, 632-33.

HAL A. CAUTHRON

NEW COVENANT. "Covenant," biblically and theologically speaking, is an agreement between God and man which becomes the basis of divine blessing and eternal salvation. Such an agreement or contract is initiated by God, and its terms specified by God. Man becomes a partner to the agreement voluntarily. In the covenant God undertakes certain obligations and promises certain divine blessings on clearly defined moral conditions. God will not violate His promises, though they may be annulled and hence forfeited by man's violation of the terms.

The entire Bible is a history of covenants entered into by God with man, first with Adam, then Noah, Abraham, and then with the children

of Israel at Mount Sinai, through the mediatorial agency of Moses. The "new covenant" is the covenant of grace instituted by Christ Jesus, an agreement made available by God through His Son to all believers. That portion of the Bible called the New Testament is totally about the new covenant. It is "new" in relation to all previous covenants, now made old and obsolete. Especially is its newness in contrast to the Mosaic system.

The exposition of the new covenant is the very backbone of Paul's writings, even though the word "covenant" is not often used. His interest focuses on "two covenants" (Gal. 4:24), the Mosaic and the Christian, one providing justification by law, the other justification by faith. Paul's exposition of these two major contrasting systems are primarily in Romans and Galatians, though fundamental motifs of his covenant teaching run throughout his Epistles.

The Epistle most systematically devoted to an elucidation of the new covenant is Hebrews. In this Epistle the writer argues that the new covenant is better, because initiated by One greater than Moses, because based on better promises (content, not reliability), and ratified by better blood. The epitome of the new covenant is given twice, in 8:6-12 and 10:15-18. This epitome is a quotation from Jer. 31:31-34, the clearest OT promise of a new covenant.

The new covenant provides for three privileges distinctly superior to any previous covenant. (1) Reconciliation with God will not depend on repeated sacrifices, but will be complete forgiveness based on a once-for-all sacrifice of Christ's own blood (Heb. 10:1-18). (2) Knowledge of the Lord will not be secondhand but personal, individual, and experiential (8:11). One could be under the Mosaic covenant, even honestly endeavoring to observe it, without personally knowing the Lord. But under the new covenant, knowing the Lord belongs to its very essence. (3) Righteous behavior will not be achieved by law and its sanctions, by elaborate systems of ceremony and restraint, but by an inner transformation so profound that the nature is conformed to the demands of righteousness.

From being written on tablets of stone, the new covenant provides for the writing of God's moral law on the heart (8:10). The lack of such inward conformity was the one cause for the failure of all previous covenants. Yet this could not become experientially available until Christ and Pentecost had come (though individuals did at times leap ahead of their dispensation, e.g., Isaiah). Paul before his conversion exemplified that

kind and measure of righteousness which was normative under the Mosaic system, but he testifies to its inadequacy and the great superiority of that righteousness made available in Christ (Phil. 3:4-9).

The old covenant was corporate first, then individual as a reflex of its corporate inclusiveness. That is to say, an Israelite was born into the covenant and received subvolitionally its mark, circumcision. He had no choice in being in the covenant, though he could be "cut off" from Israel by deliberate affront to the community. Physically or racially no one is born into the new covenant. Access is by the new birth and is personal and voluntary first, corporate only second, as the reflex of the personal.

An emphatic insistence in Hebrews is the radical obsolescence of the old covenant (8:13, NASB). With it goes the validity of any religion which depends on forms and ceremonies. Even the sacraments must not be allowed to become the absolutes that circumcision was.

See COVENANT THEOLOGY, BIBLE: THE TWO TESTAMENTS, LAW AND GRACE, HOLINESS, HOLY COMMUNION.

For Further Reading: Wesley, *Works*, 5:63-76; 10:238-42; BBC, 10:91-129; Taylor, *A Right Conception of Sin*, 91-101; Hughes, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*, 115-27.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

NEW HEAVENS AND NEW EARTH. This is a phrase used several times in the Bible to describe the ultimate destiny of the redeemed. The popular Christian idea of final salvation is that we die and go to heaven. This contains a truth, for indeed to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord (2 Cor. 5:8). However, this refers to the intermediate state, not to final salvation. Redemption includes the redemption of the body in the resurrection, and it includes also the redemption of the earth. "Creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay and obtain the glorious liberty of the children of God" (Rom. 8:21, RSV). In creation the earth was created to be man's dwelling place, and at the end the earth will be redeemed and transformed to be the dwelling place of the resurrected saints.

The new redeemed earth stands in both continuity and discontinuity with the present order. Sometimes in the OT the new order is pictured in very "this worldly" terms, as though the redeemed earth is nothing but this earth delivered from its bondage to decay and death. "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid . . . The sucking child shall play over the hole of the asp . . . They shall not hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain; for the

earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea" (Isa. 11:6, 8-9, RSV). This concept of a renewed earth appears with great variety of detail in the prophets. Later in Isaiah we have a different picture where the element of discontinuity is prominent. "For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former things shall not be remembered or come into mind" (65:17, RSV; see also 66:22).

The element of discontinuity is most strongly emphasized in 2 Pet. 3:12 f. In the day of God "the heavens will be kindled and dissolved, and the elements will melt with fire! But according to his promise we wait for new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells" (RSV).

This is the picture given us in the Book of Revelation, but with considerable detail. "Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and the sea was no more" (21:1, RSV). The center of the new earth was the new Jerusalem, the holy city, which John saw coming down out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her bridegroom (v. 2). The city is pictured in highly symbolic terms. It seems to be the shape of a cube 1,500 miles high, 1,500 miles long, and 1,500 miles wide. Such a city is nearly impossible to visualize in this-worldly terms; it relates to the vastness and the perfect symmetry of the city. It is surrounded by a wall 225 feet high—obviously out of proportion to the dimensions of the city. But why does the heavenly city need a wall? Only the redeemed have access to the city. The answer again is simple: ancient cities had walls, and John is trying to describe the ineffable by the familiar. Through the middle of the street of the city flowed the river of life. On either side of the river was the tree of life, whose leaves were for the healing of the nations. Taken as stark prose, this presents an impossible picture, for we must then ask, In which street was the river? Obviously, this is the wrong question.

The great reality of the new earth and the heavenly city is that "there shall no more be anything accursed, but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it, and his servants shall worship him: *they shall see his face*" (22:3-4, RSV, italics added). In these words the whole of redemption is embodied.

See HEAVEN, RESURRECTION OF THE BODY, ESCHATOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Biederwolf, *The Millennium Bible*, 708-26; Smith, *The Biblical Doctrine of Heaven*, 223-36; Hughes, *A New Heaven and a New Earth*.

GEORGE ELTON LADD

NEW HERMENEUTIC. The root meaning of *hermeneia*, from which *hermeneutic* is derived, is "translation" or "interpretation." It includes exegesis (what *did* the text mean?), interpretation (what does it *now* mean?), and the transition from one to the other. Linguistically, *hermeneia* includes language translation and clarification or articulation of the obscure or mystical (commentary), particularly by priests in reference to numinous or revelatory events.

The *new hermeneutic* focuses specifically on the reinterpretation of the ancient text (Bible) for contemporary (20th century) proclamation by attempting to transfer the meaning of the past into present reality and by emphasizing the interrelatedness of language, faith, history, and understanding. Three basic areas are addressed: the credibility of the Bible for the modern age; the normative nature of the past for the present; the validity of historical knowledge.

The roots of the new hermeneutic are found in Schleiermacher, Dilthey, and Heidegger; its chief recent proponents are Bultmann, Fuchs, and Ebeling. Against the fragmented results of the historico-critical method and the presuppositional approaches of philosophical theology, the new hermeneutic questions the unchanging structure of reality, and advocates existential involvement with the text through both historical awareness of prior interpretations and openness to new expressions and forms.

God's "word-event" of Scripture discloses the truth and reality of the human situation; this "essential word" (Heidegger) must be renewed in each situation as new reality is uncovered. The text is independent but also interrelates with the listener (interpreter). The more that is known, the greater is the possibility of asking the right questions of the text in an I-Thou relationship. The text is interpreted; the interpreter is in turn interpreted by the text (the hermeneutical circle).

The process of "demythologization" seeks to reaffirm language as communication, rather than information; the text interprets, challenges, and affirms human existence in the decision of faith as authentic, interrelated, united, and freeing, or inauthentic, fragmented, enslaving, and corrupting. God himself is the *word-event* of biblical language. Man is not *creative* of language but responsible toward it. Language reflects what is taking place within a given culture but also expedites our authentic self-understanding.

The response of faith is thus a way of life to be rearticulated further as God confronts us in the *word-event* of the biblical language, the sermonic proclamation and its challenge, and the

hearer's response of authentic existence within the changing cultural context.

See HERMENEUTICS, BIBLICAL AUTHORITY, EXEGESIS, BIBLE: THE TWO TESTAMENTS, KERYGMA, BIBLICAL THEOLOGY, CRITICISM (OT, NT), PROGRESSIVE REVELATION.

For Further Reading: Achtemeier, *An Introduction to the New Hermeneutic*; Robinson and Cobb, Jr., *The New Hermeneutic* (*New Frontiers in Theology*, vol. 2); Ridderbos, *Studies in Scripture and Its Authority*.

JOHN S. LOWN

NEW MORALITY. Popularly, this refers to the recent "playboy" philosophy which advocates new moral views that have maximum sexual pleasure as their goal.

Theologically, the *new morality* refers particularly to the views of Joseph Fletcher, advocated in his *Situation Ethics* and elsewhere. This new kind of ethical theory advocates acting, in each life situation, according to what is the most loving thing to do at the time. Fletcher, an Episcopalian seminary professor, said his view is not antinomian because it does advocate obedience to one law—the law of love. Also, Fletcher wanted people to be informed by the stored-up Christian wisdom of the centuries as they make the decision about what is the most loving thing to do.

Yet the view has many inadequacies. One is in its advocating that there is only one principle: love. For example, the most just thing might be to put a mass murderer to death. Justice and other interests, as well as love, surely, are proper bases for our actions. Another inadequacy of the view is that the individual is the one who decides what to do, instead of God (by His revealed will). Still another inadequacy is that it advocates deciding "in the situation"; and that might be a poor time to do this deciding. On the basis that there are rights and wrongs, a person can decide ahead of time what course he would follow on, say, sexual relations—before he or she is thrown into a situation when sexual desire might well prejudice the situation. Still another inadequacy is that what seems the most loving thing to do might not take into account future guilt and guilt feelings, or other future undesirable results, of doing what seems to be the most loving thing at the time.

Perhaps the most serious defect in Fletcher's thesis is its assumption that man is able to know what is the most loving thing to do and able to do it. This presupposes inherent goodness and wisdom, and ignores the sinful proclivity toward selfishness and moral obtuseness which is universally observable. The underlying optimism in the so-called new morality, which in effect denies man's sinfulness and need of regenerating

grace, is not supportable by either Scripture or the facts of life.

See ETHICAL RELATIVISM, ETHICS, CHRISTIAN ETHICS, MORALITY.

For Further Reading: Henry, *Answers for the Now Generation*, 89; DeWolf, *Responsible Freedom*, 25-39; Geisler, *Ethics: Alternatives and Issues*, 60-77.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

NEW TESTAMENT. See BIBLE: THE TWO TESTAMENTS.

NICENE CREED. The Nicene Creed is one of the so-called ecumenical creeds of the Christian church, i.e., those statements of belief adopted by "ecumenical" councils of clergy as definitive of the church's theological understanding and teaching prior to the permanent split between Eastern and Western Christians in A.D. 1054.

The creed takes its name from the Council of Nicea called by the Emperor Constantine in June, A.D. 325, to settle a dispute over the teachings of Arius and his supporters, and thereby to bring about much-needed unity in the church and the empire as a whole. Constantine's goal was not realized, however, for while the council did agree on an anti-Arian statement of belief, it did not bring to an end debate in the church, which swirled on for over a century. In fact, the version of the Nicene Creed most widely accepted and used in later times did not reach its final form until the Council of Constantinople set it down in A.D. 381 after a tumultuous period in which, totally contrary to the creed, the Arian position had actually managed to become the "official" one in the church for a time and various pro- and anti-Nicene leaders had been alternately banished and reinstated. The Council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451 was still wrestling with some of the same issues, in somewhat altered form, raised by Nicea.

The main issue addressed by the Nicene Creed is the full deity of the Second Person of the Trinity; this it affirms. Arius, by contrast, taught that the Son was a being created in time, qualitatively different from God the Father, by no means immutable or coeternal with God, "alien from and utterly dissimilar to the Father's essence and individual being" (Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 228). Arius believed that the Son was "God," but only in a derivative sense, yet held that He is worthy of worship.

Arius' opponents, led by Alexander and Athanasius, saw this as practical polytheism and held that the Scriptures affirm that God is One, the Son being eternal, uncreated, and in essence the same as the Father. They also saw the Chris-

tian doctrine of redemption in Christ assaulted by Arius' position, for, only if the Redeemer were truly divine, they argued, could fellowship with God be reestablished by Him. Their position was adopted by the clergy at Nicea and reaffirmed at Constantinople with the essential identity of Father and Son being enshrined in the creed in the Greek phrase *homoousian*—i.e., Christ as the Son is of "the same essence or substance" as the Father, and thereby is himself God. This has remained the teaching of the Christian church through the centuries.

See APOSTLES' CREED, ATHANASIAN CREED, CREED (CREEDS), CHRISTOLOGY, HYPOSTASIS, ARIANISM.

For Further Reading: Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 205-62; *Early Christian Doctrines*, 223-51; Pelikan, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition*, 191-225; Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, 1:24-29. HAROLD E. RASER

NOMINALISM. See REALISM AND NOMINALISM.

NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS. In order to be properly understood and evaluated, the non-Christian religions need to be examined in the light of some general observations.

1. *The Bible's own explanation of their appearance.* This is to be found in Rom. 1:18-32 and 2:14-18. Romans 1 states that, at the beginning, all men knew God but did not want to retain Him in their knowledge because of their sin; therefore they invented gods of their own which did all of the wicked things they committed. The polytheism of Greek and Roman religion is a particularly clear example of this. However, though man rejected the true God, he still retained the "work of the law" in his heart (2:14-18).

These two facts are clearly illustrated in all of the primitive religions. They have certain moral standards corresponding to the principles stated in the Ten Commandments, though in perverted forms. And they do retain, in their folklore and religious practices, days when they commune and worship the "High God" or "Sky God." Because He is entirely kind and good, they generally worship Him only one day in the year. In contrast they worship the other deities often in order to protect themselves from their evil powers.

2. *The appearance of biblical concepts and customs among the primitives.* Don Richardson, as a missionary of the Christian and Missionary Alliance in Indonesia, discovered and used the concept of a "peace child" in some cannibalistic tribes, and deciphered other biblically related

phenomena (cf. his *Lords of the Earth and Eternity in Their Hearts*).

3. *The existence of certain highly rational monotheistic concepts.* These may be found in Zoroastrianism with its Ahura Mazda, and in Muhammadanism (Islam) with its Allah. However, only the Christian, with the aid of the Scriptures, can develop monotheism in a fully logically satisfactory manner. The monotheism developed by Zoroaster and Muhammad, as well as that of modern Unitarianism, is self-destructive.

A study of Aristotle's view of God illustrates this. When he developed his idea logically, he ran into serious difficulties. If God, who has existed as a personal being from eternity past, were to create a physical universe, then He would add an I-it or subject-object relationship between himself and the universe; and if He made man, an I-thou relationship between himself and man; and He would experience, for the first time, a we-you, or social relationship, as He saw Adam and Eve bring forth and nurture their first child. This would be impossible, Aristotle argued, since it would mean that God was not eternally fully developed within himself, or, as he put it, *actus purus*. Further, we can add He would need the universe, man, woman, and child, to be equal to man.

The Christian revelation alone handles this problem. God has always been *actus purus*. All of His personal potentialities have been fully developed within himself since eternity past. The explanation for this is in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

Reason without revelation has always led to error in all man's unitarian views of God. From this we can make a further observation.

4. *Revelation and reason belong together.* Revelation, so-called, which conflicts with reason cannot enable men to reach a sound view of God. Aristotle's struggle with the problem of the need for a monotheistic view of God proves that reason alone is insufficient. Muhammad's writings in the Koran prove equally that a mystical revelation which is not rationally self-authenticating also fails.

5. *The Bible addresses itself to the entire spectrum of man's existential problems* and yet distinguishes man's primary need (guilt and sin and the need of salvation) from his lesser problems (cf. Mark 8:36). The non-Christian religions address themselves only to certain secondary and often tangential needs.

Specific non-Christian religions should be examined with these background observations in

mind. They may be summarily classified as follows.

Primitive religions. Primitive religions are polytheistic, and yet they retain, in the form of myths, a worship of the true God.

Greek and Roman religions. These were polytheistic and illustrated Paul's description of paganism very clearly. They included the "mystery" religions, so expressive of both spiritual darkness and spiritual hunger.

Eastern mysticism. This starts off with the concept of monism, with everything existing as Being or God, and called the One, in which—as a logical consequence—no dualities, such as subject and object, good and evil, and time and space, exist. Being becomes active and creative through a polar dialectic which develops between Yang and Yin, male and female principles. The universe and man come into being through this dialectic. Eastern mysticism stresses the total difference between existence in God and physical existence, which it calls *Maya* or illusion. Man passes through thousands of reincarnations—as man, animal, insect, or plant—before returning to *Being*.

The problem addressed by Eastern mysticism is that posed by inequalities due to birth and race, to health, and to personal fortune and misfortune. The law of karma, or cause and effect of man's deeds, determines man's particular existences both as to class and kind. Because of the successive cycles of existence Lord Krishna returns, from time to time, to repeat revelation. Salvation consists in attaining to reunion with Being or the All through enlightenment and meditation. At this point the soul enters *Nirvana*, which is timeless and spaceless and beyond good and evil (no dualities), and becomes totally impersonal.

Eastern mysticism lacks a truly personal God. He materializes himself in the physical universe and comes to self-consciousness in man. Man is therefore greater than God, on the one hand, and needed by God, on the other. Eastern mysticism uses evil to make God creative, and it leaves man to struggle with this evil in his existence. It presents the most extended religion of works, on the one hand, and the most hopeless plan of salvation on the other. In its own way it builds in all of the polytheism found in the later Greek and Roman religions. It confines itself to one problem and ignores the rest. And it finally consigns man to the oblivion of *Nirvana*.

Humanism. This needs to be studied separately since it is essentially atheistic. Confucius was the first great humanist. He worked out a religion of

social ethics. Humanism emerged as a distinct system of religion in the Western world with the appearance of *Humanist Manifesto* No. 1 in 1933 and No. 2 in 1973. It deceptively describes itself as "religious humanism," though it is totally atheistic. It defines religion as love and concern for man and his needs alone. It is the main cause of the failure of modern education.

Monotheistic religions. These fall into two classes. First, there is the rationalistic monotheism of Zoroastrianism and of Muhammadanism (Islam). Second, there is the revealed monotheism of Judaism and Christianity. The two examples given of rationalistic monotheism are based upon reason plus mystical experience. In contrast, revealed monotheism rests upon revelation and logical reason—it clears with reason. This is most clearly seen in Christianity where the doctrine of the Triune God presents the only absolutely holy, yet fully personal God.

In the OT, which alone is accepted by the Jews, all of the manifest qualities of a fully personal, self-sufficient God appear, though in such a form that they have never been grasped without the acceptance of the NT. The blindness of the Jews to the revelation of the Triune God in the OT is paralleled by their blindness to the prophecies of the Messiah, concerning His first coming and His substitutionary atonement on the Cross, as revealed in Isaiah 53.

See HUMANISM, ZOROASTRIANISM, CULTS, ISLAM, HARE KRISHNA, JUDAISM, Gnosticism, Christianity, UNIFICATION CHURCH, TRANSCENDENTAL MEDITATION, TRINITY (THE HOLY), COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

For Further Reading: Perry, *The Gospel in Dispute*; Anderson, ed., *The Theology of the Christian Mission*, 135-228; Parrinder, *A Dictionary of Non-Christian Religions*; Noss, *Man's Religions*. R. ALLAN KILLEN

NONCONFORMITY. In the general sense of the term Webster defines nonconformity as "absence of agreement or correspondence in any matter." Thus each snowflake or grain of sand is nonconformist in that it differs from others.

Usually the term has social, cultural, or religious relevance. It is "a relative term which supposes some previously existing system of observances, established either by political authority or general consent, and denotes a practical secession or non-communion, on grounds conceived by the parties to require or justify it" (McClintock and Strong, *Cyclopedia*, 7:161).

"Nonconformist" with a capital N is "used generally to describe the position of those who do not conform to the doctrine and practices of an established church," more particularly to "those who left the Church of England rather than sub-

mit to the Act of Uniformity (1662)" (Douglas, *NIDCC*, 714). "Dissenters," "Nonconformists," "Free Churchmen" were and are terms used to describe Quakers, Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and others. The intensity of the feelings and rigors of the ecclesiastical and political tensions across three centuries would be difficult to exaggerate.

However, with the erosion of the dominance of established or state churches and the fluid relativism of church life in general, nonconformity has tended to become so common as to be the conformity of our day.

Biblical Christians are not to conform to secular worldliness, and yet as the salt of the earth they must identify with society in order to exert their saving influence. It is reasonable to suppose that one should balance a respect for the opinions of one's social and religious groups with a commitment to one's own choice and conscience.

See *WORLD (WORLDLINESS)*, *OBEDIENCE*, *CONFORMITY*, *SURRENDER*.

For Further Reading: Baker's *DT*, 380; Qualben, *A History of the Christian Church*, 326; Taylor, *A Return to Christian Culture*, 62-77.

JOHN E. RILEY

NONDIRECTIVE COUNSELING. See *ROGERIAN COUNSELING*.

NUMINOUS, THE. *The numinous* is a term for the mystery and majesty of God, who is "wholly other," beyond sensory perception, logical defini-

tion, or even the beautiful or good. He does, however, make us aware of His presence and His holiness. A study of the holiness of God so perceived attracts those who stress holiness in Christian experience.

The root meaning of the holiness of God is what Rudolf Otto seeks among primitive people, reporting that they sense His power, not His purity. In *The Idea of the Holy*, Otto analyzes this concept: overwhelming might, yet fascination for men, even bliss in God's fellowship. These make up what Otto calls the *numinous*.

Evangelical believers appreciate Otto's motive: to establish intuitive knowledge of God, transcending rationalistic objection. Men cannot comprehend God but they can contact Him.

Some holiness theologians accept the concept of the numinous, for purity without mystery and awe could lead to ethical standards without power. God, however, is not wholly "wholly other," for He can redeem and sanctify men through Christ, and is pleased to indwell through the Holy Spirit. And while Jesus taught reverence ("Hallowed be thy name"), He also taught us to pray, "Our Father" (Matt. 6:9; Luke 11:2).

See *GOD*, *ATTRIBUTES (DIVINE)*, *TRANSCENDENCE*.

For Further Reading: Otto, *The Idea of the Holy*; Purkiser, ed., *Exploring Our Christian Faith*, 324-27; Barker, *Who's Who in Church History*, 213.

LOUIS A. BOUCK

NURTURE. See *DISCIPLING*.

O

OBEDIENCE. Obedience is compliance with external commands or requirements. The authority to be obeyed may be statutory law, of God or man, or it may be an authority person such as parent, employer, policeman, or commanding officer. Obedience may be external and formal only, perhaps even grudging, or it may be willing, prompted by an inward acknowledgment of the other's rightful authority. There seems to be, therefore, two clearly defined uses of the term, one objective and practical, and the other ethical and psychological. The first refers more to conduct, and the second to belief and one's mental attitude toward the object of obedience.

In the OT God revealed His plans and pur-

poses to Israel by the use of His "word" or His "voice" through His messengers. Thus the idea of obedience is intimately connected with the Hebrew word *shama*, "to hear." So closely intertwined is "hearing" and "obeying" that translators are often pressed to know when to translate *shama* "hear" or "obey." In Hebrew religion to truly hear is to obey. Failure to obey would indicate that a person had not really heard.

In Scripture the matter of hearing and obeying is often used in human relationships, as between parents and children, slaves and masters, kings and subjects, etc. But it is man's obedience to God that is of paramount importance. It is plain

that God expected obedience from man from the very beginning. Obedience then is the supreme test of one's faith in God and one's love for God. In the OT it is the one important relationship that must not be broken. Man's relationship to God at this point is best expressed by the prophet Samuel, "To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hear than the fat of rams" (1 Sam. 15:22).

In the OT the future blessedness and prosperity of the chosen people were conditioned upon their obedience to the covenant God made with them at Sinai (Isa. 1:19; Exod. 19:5; 23:22). Unfortunately, Israel's history has been one of persistent refusal to follow God's plan and program. All the nation's troubles can be traced to her failure to obey God's commands.

The NT follows the OT idea of obedience. The usual Greek term is *hupakoē*, "to hear." Jesus was following the OT usage when He said to the multitudes, "He that hath an ear, let him hear." He clearly meant that He not only wanted them to hear from a physical standpoint, but to respond in faith to the precepts that He had laid down, that is, obey His injunctions. In this way their hearing would become obedience. This is precisely the kind of action that the prophets of the OT had hoped to get from their hearers. Again Jesus said, "Every one who hears these words of Mine, and acts upon them, may be compared to a wise man, who built his house upon the rock" (Matt. 7:24, NASB). Thus "to hear" meant that the hearers believed and acted. The evidence that people had "heard" (obeyed) was that they repented and believed the gospel and went forth to live different lives.

In the Wesleyan movement the idea of obedience is intimately bound up with the doctrine of entire sanctification or Christian holiness. For most people who seek to enter into this relationship with God the matter of genuine obedience is the sticking point. It is at the same time the most difficult and the most important prerequisite for entering into this experience. Thus wholehearted obedience lays the groundwork for real faith—in fact, it is real faith. We can now see that the terms "complete consecration," "utter abandonment," or "absolute surrender" mean nothing more or less than complete obedience to all the known will of God; and further, that there is no such thing as *saving* faith apart from obedience.

See FAITH, CHRISTIAN, UNBELIEF, REPENTANCE.

For Further Reading: Clippinger, "Obedience," *ISBE*; Kittel, 1:216; Knight, "Philippians," *BBC*; Stoger, *Sacramentum Verbi*, vol. 2. C. PAUL GRAY

OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST. The obedience of Christ is inextricably bound up with God's plan for redeeming the human race. Sometime, somewhere, the Godhead had to make a decision if the race was to be saved. We do not know all the details of this decision. But we do know from Scripture that a sacrifice had to be provided as an atonement for man's sin. We know still further that Christ gave himself to be the Propitiation for the sins of the whole world (Rom. 3:25; 1 John 2:2; 4:10; Gal. 1:4; Eph. 5:2; 1 Tim. 2:6).

But for the plan to work, the Second Person of the Triune Godhead had to become man; the Creator must become the creature. What condescension! It is at this point that the program of obedience began. Finding himself a man, Christ the Son humbled himself and became obedient to death—even death on a cross (Phil. 2:8).

While here on earth, although He knew himself to be the Son of God, He was definitely, and sometimes painfully, human. Since He had emptied himself of His heavenly prerogatives, He must live and learn, work, suffer, and die as a man. "Although He was a Son, He learned obedience from the things which He suffered; and having been made perfect, He became to all those who obey Him the source of eternal salvation" (Heb. 5:8-9, NASB). His obedience to the Father's plan led Him straight to the Cross. And His death on the Cross marked the fulfillment of His perfect obedience.

Many have raised the question, If Jesus was really the Son of God, why was it necessary to *learn* obedience? How and why should the perfect be *made* perfect? The answer seems to be that since He, the Son of God, emptied himself of His heavenly powers to become true flesh-and-blood man, it was necessary for His humanity to pass through all the stages of human life in order to complete His Saviorhood. Only then could He be truly the God-man. He must learn as men learn, He must obey as men must obey, for His Saviorhood to be complete.

Let us see what His obedience accomplished. First, He was the perfect exemplar of obedience: He was subject to His parents; was careful to keep the moral law; had a proper attitude toward authority; and was always ready to obey the Father. The old pattern so characteristic of Israel's disobedience was broken by the perfect obedience of Christ.

Second, His obedience qualified Him to be our Savior. A failure would have been fatal—the salvation of the race was at stake. But since He passed through all the vicissitudes of human ex-

istence, and was obedient in everything, no finger of scorn can be pointed at Him, but with the redeemed hosts of the Book of Revelation we cry in exultation, "Worthy is the Lamb" (Rev. 5:12).

Third, His obedience was the means by which He procured eternal salvation for men. The first Adam failed to obey God and brought death and destruction upon the human race. The Second Adam, although under the fiercest kind of temptation, rendered perfect obedience to the Father. His obedience, reversing what happened at the Fall, now makes it possible for man "to have a life that laughs at death, overleaps the grave, and swings outward and sweeps upward forever."

See OBEDIENCE, KENOSIS, CHRIST, ESTATES OF CHRIST, GETHSEMANE.

For Further Reading: Crannell, "Obedience of Jesus," *ISBE*; Knight, "Philippians," *BBC*; Wiley, *CT*, 2:143-216.

C. PAUL GRAY

OBJECTIVITY. Objectivity, usually contrasted with subjectivity, refers to the attitude of being unbiased in the process of knowing. Objectivity is usually considered, certainly by the scientific community, as a highly desirable goal, since it implies the absence of all distractions, all intervening or distorting (subjective) elements in the process of knowing an object. Since this goal is extremely difficult to achieve, *pure* objectivity is rarely if ever claimed. Many would say that such a state of pure receptivity is psychologically impossible.

In recent theological discussion, however, the traditional dichotomy between subject and object has, to some extent, given way to an "I-Thou" vs. an "I-It" distinction. In this context, subjectivity and objectivity are both viewed in their relation to the eternal. Truth, in the thought of Emil Brunner, for example, is seen as "encounter" rather than "truths" objectively revealed to man through the Bible and the Church. Revelation thus is not knowledge *about* God; rather, it is God *giving himself*. For this reason, natural theology and metaphysics cannot ever provide adequate knowledge of God; they see God as an "It" rather than as a "Thou", whom to know in the latter fashion is to be shaken to the depths and remade.

A more conservative approach sees revelation as both divine, personal self-disclosure and authentic teaching of timeless truths about God.

See I-THOU, PROPOSITIONAL THEOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Brunner, *Man in Revolt*; Hordern, *A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology* (rev. ed.).

ALVIN HAROLD KAUFFMAN

OBLATION. See OFFER, OFFERING.

OCCULT, OCCULTISM. *Occult*, from the Latin *occultus*, means "secret" or "mysterious." The term has come to refer to knowledge beyond the range of ordinary understanding; knowledge of a supernatural kind, not bounded by modern scientific law. A fortune-teller, for example, claims knowledge of the occult because he says he can explain things which people generally cannot know.

Occultism is the belief in hidden, mysterious, supernatural agencies and the possibility of subjecting them to human control. Through alleged occult sciences, such as astrology, fortune-telling, magic, spiritism, and sorcery, occultists, usually insecure persons, seek to bend the will of God, as it were, and to hold their own against men whom they think oppose them. They try thereby to gain the upper hand in life's power struggle.

During ancient times there was wide belief in the occult, and the OT abounds with references to it. But both in Mosaic and prophetic times all types of occult practices were condemned. Examples are: Lev. 19:26; Deut. 18:9-13; Isa. 8:19. In the NT Jesus and His followers also met and opposed various forms of the occult. The apostle Paul, for example, faced up to the occult in Philippi (Acts 16:16-18). In Gal. 5:20 witchcraft, a form of the occult, is listed among the grossest of sins.

Writing of the theological place of the occult in the Bible, Kurt Koch suggests that in the OT occult phenomena are rooted in heathen magic; whereas in the NT activities are understood as symptoms of the conflict between the kingdom of the devil and the kingdom of God. Because of their implications in this conflict, all forms of occultism come under divine judgment and end in chaos (*Christian Counselling and Occultism*, 274).

The fact that in the last half of the 20th century the occult has mushroomed to epidemic proportions, much of it with clear marks of demon power, could very well be a sign of the times. When people reject Christ, their unbelief often becomes credulity. Not receiving a love of the truth, they are easy prey for satanic deception (2 Thess. 2:1-12).

See UNIFICATION CHURCH, TRANSCENDENTAL MEDITATION, HARE KRISHNA, SWEDENBORGIANISM, SATAN, DEMONS (DEMON POSSESSION).

For Further Reading: Unger, *Biblical Demonology*; Koch, *Christian Counselling and Occultism*; Tenney, "Worship of the Occult," *New Testament Survey*.

ARMOR D. PEISKER

OFFER, OFFERING. To offer, in religious context, is to present a sacrifice or gift as an act of worship. That which is presented or given is called an *offering* or *oblation*. The latter term derives from the Latin *oblatus* (offered up, devoted, dedicated), used as a past participle of the verb, to offer.

In the OT, these terms are especially prominent in Leviticus and Numbers (where there are more than 500 occurrences). Several kinds of offerings are prescribed within the Mosaic sacrificial system: (1) Sin offerings, for acts of unconscious transgression, mistakes, or other inadvertencies; (2) Trespass offerings, for guilt incurred by specific offenses; (3) Burnt offerings, symbolizing entire surrender to God; (4) Peace offerings, in renewal of right spiritual relations; (5) Meal and drink offerings, from the fruits of God's blessings upon the earth; (6) Heave and wave offerings (so called from the ceremony for their presentation), regarded as special gifts unto God.

The prophets and Psalmists repudiate the efficacy of multiplying offerings (Amos 5:21-23; Isa. 1:11-14; Mic. 6:6-9; Ps. 40:6-8). The protest was not so much against the sacrificial system itself as its abuse. Offerings and oblations alone cannot atone for sin. The presenting to God of a gift implies the personal surrender of the giver in living obedience to God's will.

Several fundamental ideas underlie the biblical conception of offerings: (1) God desires communion with His people; (2) Sin must be punished and/or expiated (atoned for); (3) Without the substitutionary sacrifice of life (shedding of blood), there is no forgiveness of sin.

The NT, especially Hebrews, points to the fulfillment of the old sacrificial system in Jesus Christ. The former repeated sacrifices were ineffectual to cleanse the conscience of the worshipper. But now Christ's sinless self-offering has effected once for all a perfect and eternal redemption.

The NT also exhorts us, as Christians, to present certain offerings to God: (1) The dedication of our bodies and minds (Rom. 12:1-2); (2) Deeds of love and fellowship (Heb. 13:16); (3) Material gifts and offerings (Phil. 4:18); (4) Praises and prayers (Heb. 13:15). Such are well-pleasing to Him.

See SACRIFICE, CONSECRATE (CONSECRATION), STEWARDSHIP, MOSAIC LAW, EXPIATION.

For Further Reading: Richardson, *Theology of the New Testament*, 297-301; Unger's *Bible Dictionary*, 942-52; Behm, *TDNT*, 3:180-90. WAYNE G. MCCOWN

OFFICES, ECCLESIASTICAL. The simple distinction, well established by the early third century if not before, between *clergy*, as signifying those Christians set apart as ministers by consecration or ordination (cf. Acts 6:6; 13:3; etc.), and *laity* (from the Gr. *laos*, "people"), as signifying the remainder of the Christian community, through the centuries grew into a more complex situation involving distinctions between several offices within the Christian ministry itself.

In fact, some differentiation in ministerial function is discernible already in the NT, though there can be no certainty as to exactly what the titles there signify or how they differ from one another. Among the various names for those who were involved in the instruction and care of the churches are "elders" (Gr. *presbyteroi*, Acts 15:2; 20:17; 1 Tim. 5:17; Titus 1:5; Jas. 5:14); "those having charge over you" (1 Thess. 5:12); "overseers" or "bishops" (Gr. *episkopoi*, Acts 20:28; Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:2); "deacons" (Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:8, 12); "pastors" (Eph. 4:11); "apostles," "prophets," "evangelists," and "teachers" (Eph. 4:11; 1 Cor. 12:28). Paul, writing to the Corinthians, places some order on this array of ministerial offices in declaring that apostles, followed by prophets, and then teachers, head up a kind of "hierarchy" in which helpers and administrators of various sorts occupy lesser roles (1 Cor. 12:28 ff).

By the time of Ignatius of Antioch (d. A.D. 115) the "apostles," "prophets," and "teachers" of the first missionary generation had given way to "bishops," "presbyters," and "deacons" as the chief offices of ministry. The process of change is obscure, but it would appear that as local congregations consolidated, travelling missionaries came to be eclipsed by permanent resident ministers who could more adequately and consistently oversee the needs of the Church in each area. In this way a transition occurred from an itinerant ministry to a local and pastoral ministry. The "bishops," "presbyters," and "deacons" were the primary practitioners of the developing pastoral ministry.

Numerous writings of the second century indicate that at first the offices of bishop and presbyter were the same, with deacons making up a second, somewhat lesser office. Liturgical functions apparently set them apart with the presbyter-bishop presiding over the celebration of the Eucharist while the deacon assisted. Deacons were also administrators of church property and charitable relief. The latter role was shared by "deaconesses" who had special responsibilities for women.

In time, as certain presbyter-bishops arose to positions of preeminence, they assumed exclusively the title "bishop," while their ministerial brethren continued as "presbyters." These bishops claimed the power to ordain and to correspond on a church's behalf with other churches. Both offices came to be assisted not only by deacons but also a host of lesser offices, including those of "reader," "exorcist," "sub-deacon," and "acolyte."

See CLERGY, EPISCOPACY, CHURCH GOVERNMENT, CHAIN OF COMMAND, MINISTER (MINISTRY).

For Further Reading: Chadwick, *The Early Church*, 41-53; Dowley, ed., *Eerdman's Handbook to the History of Christianity*, 117-19, 187-95, 239-40; Walker, *A History of the Christian Church*, 39-42, 81-84, 150-52, 189-90.

HAROLD E. RASER

OFFICES OF CHRIST. See ESTATES OF CHRIST.

OLD MAN. Although it occurs only three times in the NT (Rom. 6:6; Eph. 4:22; Col. 3:10), the expression "old man" (KJV) is a central concept in the Wesleyan interpretation of Christian holiness. However, within this tradition differences exist as to the exact relation of the term to the preconversion life-style and to the sinful nature in the unsanctified believer. Because Rom. 6:6 appears in a more detailed and extended setting than the other two references, it provides the primary meaning of the term and may perhaps provide the clue to approaching this interpretive problem in the Wesleyan tradition. With this as our point of departure, we may proceed through three intersecting areas of concern:

Grammatically, a common environment for all three passages is the contrasting moods of the indicative (statements of fact) and the imperative (commands) involving the status and treatment of the "old man." (See BBC, 9:218-21, 414-15; Howard, *Newness of Life*, 102-3, 134-48.) This raises the questions, *When* were or are these indicative facts accomplished, and *What*, then, are the foci of the imperative commands?

The answer to these queries are contextually discovered. The indicative statement about the "old man" in Rom. 6:6 is related to sin as an inner, dynamic force rather than to sin as an act (vv. 1-11). The means for dealing with this sinful principle is death (vv. 2-4, 7); for the "old man" it is crucifixion. Because the instrument of death of and to indwelling sin is the cross of Christ (vv. 3-5, 9), the "old man" which is crucified is thereby identified with the sinful nature.

Since the "old man" is identified with the sin principle and the purpose of its crucifixion is the destruction of the "body of sin" (v. 6), the latter

expression cannot be the sinful nature, otherwise a tautology is created. In light of the subsequent imperatives of vv. 12-19 being related to the body as representative of the total person, we may say that the "body of sin" is the human personality when it is the vehicle of the sinful nature (cf. Howard, 104). By this purposive function of the destruction of the "body of sin," the indicative mood in which the crucifixion of the "old man" is expressed is thereby so related to the imperatives for liberation from inbred sin as to indicate that the "old man" refers to the principle of sin rather than to the preconversion life-style.

Lexically, by recognizing the close identification of the "old man" with the term "flesh" (Barclay, *The Mind of St. Paul*, 199-200) and by understanding the "old man" as a likely rephrasing of "in Adam" (Rom. 5:12-21), it is possible to state that the "old man" is an inner, moral condition "carried over" from the pregenerate state into the justified relationship, rather than the complex of preconversion deeds.

Although this approach does not solve all interpretive difficulties, we may, by employing the above framework, relate the three references to the "old man" in this way: The "old man" is closely related to the past life of sin (Col. 3:10), but is not necessarily identical with it (Eph. 4:22). Rather, it is a morally dynamic "carry-over" from the unregenerate state (Rom. 6:6) which may be resolved subsequent to conversion through a personal, subjective, and decisive identification with the death and resurrection of Christ (cf. Purkiser, *Sanctification and Its Synonyms*, 89, fn. 14).

See CARNAL MIND, CARNAL CHRISTIANS, CLEANSING.

For Further Reading: Agnew, *Transformed Christians*, 99-111; Chapman, *The Terminology of Holiness*, 108; Corlett, *Lord of All*, 37-38; GMS, 406, 502.

JOHN G. MERRITT

OLD TESTAMENT. See BIBLE: THE TWO TESTAMENTS.

OMNIPOTENCE. Omnipotence as an attribute of God is "that perfection of God by virtue of which He is able to do all that He pleases to do" (Wiley, *CT*, 1:349). God is "almighty" (Rev. 1:8). He has all power and is the ultimate Source of all the power and authority which exists.

Omnipotence is necessarily consistent with the attributes of self-existence, infinity, unity, and sovereignty. There is but one God, hence, there is no other who limits Him. In order to be sovereign, God must be free to do whatever He

wills, at any time, anywhere, and in every detail (Ps. 115:3).

Divine omnipotence is consistent with moral impossibilities, i.e., whatever is contrary to God's nature and will; e.g., the fact that God cannot lie, do unjustly, or love sin. It also implies the power of self-limitation, since it does not exclude human freedom. It is consistent with delegated creaturely powers. Whatever God entrusts to remains His and returns to Him again (Rom. 13:1).

God's power is inferred as absolute from the incomprehensible work of creation (Ps. 33:8-9; Jer. 10:12-13; 32:17, 27; Rev. 4:11). It is evident in nature (Rom. 1:20). It is the source of nature's orderliness (Heb. 1:3). The so-called laws of nature are "the paths God's power and wisdom take through creation" (Tozer, *The Knowledge of the Holy*, 72).

Modern positivistic philosophies which allow for no knowledge beyond scientific description deny such power inasmuch as they deny causality in the usual sense. A few theistic thinkers, wrestling with the problem of natural evil, have been impelled either to deny God's goodness or limit His power, and have usually opted for the latter. Such answers merely push the problem further back and create greater problems with the resulting dualisms. Such are contrary to Scripture.

Practically, the revealed truth of the divine omnipotence has given faith, hope, courage, and strength to the inner life of believers under testing (Gen. 17:1; Isaiah 40; Matt. 19:26; John 10:29; Eph. 3:20-21).

See EVIL, ATTRIBUTES (DIVINE), DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY.

For Further Reading: Tozer, *The Knowledge of the Holy*; McConnell, *The Christian God*; Clarke, *The Christian Doctrine of God*.
ARNOLD E. AIRHART

OMNIPRESENCE. This is a term that signifies that God is everywhere present at the same time. He is present with all that exists; He is absent from nothing that exists, thus we can speak of God's immanence. Daniel Steele held that God exists everywhere, not by an extension of His parts, but by His essential being. That God is repletively in space is not to be understood as God being diffused or extended like matter. Extension as a property of matter is subject to division and fragmentation. Hence, omnipresence does not pre-empt, or betoken, pantheism, a view which holds that all things and beings of nature and existence are merely modes, attributes, or perhaps appearances of a single reality, as Spinoza believed. Christian theologians reject pantheism since it fails to make a distinction between the Creator

and His creation; such failure portends fateful theological consequences. The nature god of pantheism is without personality.

Omnipresence indicates divine essence, not simply knowledge and power. God could not be omniscient unless omnipresent; His perfection is preconditioned by all-presence, all-knowledge, and all-power. God is not habituated or restricted by space in His power and acting; the full force of His omnipotence can be brought to bear anywhere, any time. For instance, God is not obligated to move from place to place in case of emergency—He's already there. To challenge this thesis is to impugn His very existence as God, for He could not be a real and living God, sufficient for His universal responsibilities, apart from all-inclusive, boundless presence.

God acts equally diverse and detailed wherever crises arise, whether redeemingly, lovingly, creatively, knowingly, or illuminatingly. God in total potential and full actuality can respond in infinite fashion to aggregate claims and needs. Contemporary theologians argue that omnipresence does not refer to an imprecise, extended space any more than eternity implies only unlimited time. These theologians disallow metaphysical significance for the divine attributes and claim that omnipresence is the ability of divine love to maintain itself unimpaired by the discrepancies of space (cf. 1 Kings 8:27; 2 Chron. 2:6; Isa. 66:1; Acts 17:28; Eph. 1:23).

See ATTRIBUTES (DIVINE), OMNIPOTENCE.

For Further Reading: Clarke, *An Outline of Christian Theology*, 3rd ed.; Hills, *Fundamental Christian Theology*; Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 7.

MEL-THOMAS ROTHWELL

OMNISCIENCE. See ATTRIBUTES, DIVINE.

ONENESS. See UNITY.

ONLY BEGOTTEN. The word *monogenēs* occurs nine times in the NT, referring to Isaac (Heb. 11:17), the widow's son (Luke 7:12), Jairus' daughter (8:42), the demoniac boy (9:38), and Jesus Christ (John 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18; 1 John 4:9).

In the first four references the word simply means "one child" born to a father. In a culture where children were considered to be a "heritage of the Lord" (Ps. 127:3), it is quite natural to expect that the greater the number of children, the greater the heritage. In an "only child" family the heritage was therefore precariously restricted to a single offspring. And where this was the case, the quality of relationships within the family structure was marked by a peculiar concern.

In the Johannine writings the use of *monogenēs* in describing Jesus Christ goes beyond a mere exercise in numbering. It is used in the sense of a title which God ascribes to His Son. It is meant to convey an honor which is unparalleled and incomparable. The idea of "one of a kind" is projected. The singularity of Jesus Christ being the only One who can mediate salvation and life is stressed. Thus the emphasis of the Apostles' Creed is upon God's "only Son."

Consistent with the whole thrust of Scripture is this emphasis upon the fact that Jesus Christ alone is the Savior of the world: "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven . . . whereby we must be saved" (Acts 4:12).

The significant fact is preserved that there is not a variety of salvations; there is only one Door into the sheepfold (John 10); there is "one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. 2:5).

See ETERNAL GENERATION, FIRSTBORN, CHRIST.

For Further Reading: Kittel, 4:739-41; Westcott, *The Epistles of St. John*, 169-72; Vos, *The Self-disclosure of Jesus*, 213-26.

ROBERT A. MATTKE

ONTOLOGICAL ARGUMENT. The ontological argument infers the being of God from the nature of thought. (Other traditional arguments infer God from design, purpose, and values.) For the ontological argument God alone exists in a way thought is powerless to deny.

In the 11th century Anselm of Canterbury developed this line of reasoning, the validity of which has been debated ever since. "God is that than which a greater cannot be conceived. Whoever understands this correctly at least understands that he exists in such a way that even for thought he *cannot not* exist. Therefore, whoever understands that God is so cannot even conceive that he is not" (Proslogian, cited in *The Many-faced Argument*, ed. Hick and McGill, 8, italics added).

Anselm began his reasoning from the posture of prayer: "O Lord, . . . give me to understand that you are just as we believe, and that you are what we believe" (ibid., 4).

The devotional approach, *faith seeking to understand*, epitomized medieval philosophy. Dogmatism eroded and distorted that value. Under Descartes, Leibniz, and Hegel, the argument supported the autonomy of reason.

To move from a logical necessity (God as idea in the mind) to an ontological necessity (God as really "here" or "there") lacks logical force for many persons as it did for Gaunilo who debated

Anselm. Some reject this proof for devotional reasons—God cannot be reached by inference, but by faith alone. Others do this for humanistic reasons. God cannot be verified, hence stands with other value terms as a human construct.

The wars of this century diminished confidence in the autonomy of reason and once again theologians examined ontology, both as a means of reassessing faith (Paul Tillich) and as a way of understanding God (Karl Barth).

Barth reasoned that Anselm's "proof" breaks out of the circle of human thought by acknowledging the falsity of a god who exists in the thought alone and by confirming the God who, uniquely, reveals himself. "We can interpret his Proof only when, *along with Anselm*, in Anselm's own sense, we share the presupposition of his inquiry—that the object of the inquiry stands over against him who inquires . . . as the unmediated 'thou' of the Lord" (*Many-faced Argument*, 153).

Eugene Fairweather properly acknowledges that Anselm is parent to a mode of thought which "recognizes in faith the ultimate key to reality . . . working from principles accessible to reason" (*Library of Christian Classics*, 10:53).

See THEISM, THEISTIC PROOFS.

For Further Reading: Hick and McGill, eds., *The Many-faced Argument*; or Anselm, *Library of Christian Classics*, vol. 10.

ARTHUR O. ROBERTS

ONTOLOGY. The word *ontology* is a combination of two Greek terms, the participle of the verb "to be," *ontos*, "being," and *logos*, the term for "discourse, science or doctrine of." Hence we may define it simply as "the science of being, or the theory of being as such." Some distinctions that need to be kept in mind are in order here.

When we speak of "isness," we have the concept of *existence*, which is simply the assertion that a thing is. When we refer to "whichness," we have the concept of *being* in the simple assertion of "that which is," or "that which acts." When we declare "what a thing is," we have the concept of its "whatness," its make-up or its *essence*.

In the field of philosophy *ontology* may be identified with that branch of philosophical thought called metaphysics. Aristotle referred to this under the heading of "first principles."

The word *ontology* was first introduced into philosophy by Christian F. von Wolff. He divided metaphysics into four parts: Ontology, Psychology, Rational Cosmology, and Theology. The modern philosophical theologian, Paul Tillich, defines God as "BEING in and of itself." This relates closely to the sacred Hebrew name for God,

Yahweh; a term which specifies God as "He who has absolute Being and who causes to be whatever comes into being and has existence."

Thus in ontology we are concerned with a study of the fundamental stuff of existence. We grapple with the problem of reality itself. Ontology is a quest for a reasoned understanding of what comprises reality. Is it mind or is it matter? Is it one or many? Is it dynamic or is it static? Is it personal or impersonal? Is it experience or does it take its stance in a subway below experience? Is it knowable or unknowable?

It is Tillich's contention that: "God is the answer to the question implied in being"; for "the ontological question is: What is being itself?" (*Systematic Theology*, 1:163).

We Christians affirm that "God is a Spirit" (John 4:24), and that "in him we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts 17:28). H. Orton Wiley defines God under the three categories of: "Absolute Reality," "Infinite Efficiency," and "Perfect Personality" (cf. *CT*, 1, chaps. 11—13).

What one thinks about God, the Source of all Being, largely determines what one thinks about reality as a whole. And Being is given not so much in the conclusions of one's philosophic thinking as in its basic premises.

See METAPHYSICS, PLATONISM, PHILOSOPHY, THOUGHT.

For Further Reading: *ER*, 548ff; Brightman, *Person and Reality*; Harvey, "Being," *Handbook of Theological Terms*, 39-41; Hutchinson, "Being," *A Handbook of Christian Theology*, Halverson, ed., 31-35; "Ontology," *Encyclopedia Americana* (1947 ed.), 20:696; Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 1, part 2, chap. 1; Wiley, *CT*, 1:255-78.

ROSS E. PRICE

ORDAIN, ORDINATION. In the NT we have a record of the ordination of man to several types of ministry. The procedure was that of "laying on of hands." Thus, the word has come to imply the setting aside of persons to holy office in the church by the laying on of hands.

In the Roman Catholic and Anglican confessions ordination is deemed to be a sacrament of the church and is performed only by bishops. This highlights the concept of "apostolic succession" which is accepted by these groups. This, of course, is not seen as the passing on of grace but rather of apostolic authority. Other religious bodies follow to a lesser degree in this tradition. Some make ordination a matter of authority, and others make it a function of a local church when a man is inducted to a first pastorate.

In each case it is admission to the official ministry of the visible church, and there is no ordina-

tion apart from the church. The word for appoint (*cheirotonein*) means "lay on hands." The practice is derived from the Jews—Jewish rabbis were appointed by the laying on of hands. Paul's practice was to appoint "elders" in every city (Acts 14:23; Titus 1:5).

The role of the appointee in the NT included that of pastor, steward, or ruler in the local church; and to this end the ordained was to be duly consecrated. In the Protestant confession ordination is viewed as a symbolic act of setting aside to special ministry.

See LAYING ON OF HANDS, CLERGY, MINISTER (MINISTRY), OFFICES (ECCLESIASTICAL).

For Further Reading: *HDNT*, 4:114-18; Wiley, *CT*, 3:135.

HUGH RAE

ORDINANCES. The Bible term "ordinances" is translated from various word meanings. In the OT, the main Hebrew words used are: *choq* (or *chuqqah*) (cf. Exod. 18:20; Job 38:33), meaning "statute, decree"; *mishpat* (cf. 2 Kings 17:34, 37; Ps. 119:91; Isa. 58:2), meaning a "judgment"; *mitsvah* (Neh. 10:32), meaning a "command, charge, precept."

In the NT, the Greek words commonly used are: *dikaïōma* (Luke 1:6; Heb. 9:1, 10), meaning a "judicial appointment"; *paradosis* (1 Cor. 11:2), is a "binding tradition," or "apostolic rule"; *dogma* (Eph. 2:15; Col. 2:14), meaning a "determination, decree"; *dogmatizō* (Col. 2:20), "to be under a decree."

It is clear that the Church very early developed customs and rules regulating conduct in public worship, dress, ordination procedures, and such matters as social welfare.

Wesley required members of his societies to attend all the ordinances of God. These were "the public worship of God; the ministry of the word, either read or expounded; the supper of the Lord; family and private prayer; searching the Scriptures; and fasting, or abstinence" (*Works*, 8:271).

Christians ignore much of the Jewish legal system, but problems of the law and legalism remain. It is inevitable that church groups should develop a legal framework for their common life. But regulations should foster unity, not disunity. The fellowship of the Spirit should be the supreme objective.

See CHURCH, CHURCH GOVERNMENT, CANON LAW.

For Further Reading: *HDNT*, 4:114; *ISBE*, 4:2201.

IVAN A. BEALS

ORDINATION OF WOMEN. This controversial issue has brought some churches almost to schism, with both sides appealing to different scriptures.

contradict itself, the problem is to understand the meaning of texts which on surface may appear contradictory.

Churches which refuse to ordain women appeal to such passages as 1 Cor. 11:2-16; 1 Tim. 2:9-15; and Eph. 5:22-24. Those which ordain women stress Gal. 3:28, as well as Jesus' own treatment of women, noting especially that the first tidings of His resurrection were imparted to women, who were charged to announce it to His (male) disciples (Mark 16:6-7).

Some dispose of the apostle Paul's strictures on women as just a residue of unchristianized rabbinic prejudices, but this does violence to the belief that the Scriptures are inspired throughout and were written under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Much more convincing is the argument that (as in the case of human slavery) the passages in question, and others in both Testaments, were intended to ameliorate the condition of women caught in societies dominated by unregenerate males, both the patriarchal society of OT times and the NT world in which Greek and Roman women were often "liberated" to standards and conduct contradictory to Christianity and disruptive of the Church. Some strict discipline of church members in Corinth, both male and female, was apparently necessary in Paul's day. But just as the application of standards of Christian love to all men led to the abolition of slavery, though by an evolutionary rather than a revolutionary process, so the recognition that in Christ there is "no male and female" removes all barriers to the participation by women in ministries to which the Lord calls them.

Some writers stress the fact that headship or sequential order, shown in the creation of Adam before Eve and in the place of man as the head of the family, does not prove inequality or inferiority of women, even though male chauvinists may so interpret. Scriptures teach and otherwise imply the equality of women; the "battle of the sexes" is a result of the Fall, through which mutual loving support and recognition have often been turned to jealous striving. The standard of holy discipleship, rather than the prejudices of unregenerate humanity, should set the standard for this and all other relationships.

See WOMAN, CHAIN OF COMMAND, FAMILY.

For Further Reading: Jewett, *Man as Male and Female*; Baker's DCE, 712. PHILIP S. CLAPP

ORIGINAL RIGHTEOUSNESS. See DIVINE IMAGE.

ORIGINAL SIN. *Original sin* in the exact sense is man's first transgression of God's law. In a more

general sense, original sin is often defined as "the universal and hereditary sinfulness of man since the fall of Adam" (*A Handbook of Theological Terms*, 221). Original sin has also been described as "the human self corrupted, diseased, fevered, or warped—a condition brought about by alienation from God" (GMS, 86).

Survey of basic issues. A leading issue in any consideration of original sin is whether or not the biblical account of the Fall has any basis in history, or whether it is mythical, i.e., a timeless but nonhistorical truth about man's existence. Those who hold to a mythical view of the Fall move in the direction of Pelagianism or existentialism. Pelagius rejected the doctrine of original sin. The existentialists hold that all men "fall" at some point in their psychological development. In either case, the result is to damage the key doctrines of the Atonement and redemption.

Wiley and Culbertson conclude: "The account of the probation and fall of man found in Genesis 3:1-24 is an inspired record of historical fact bound up with a deep and rich symbolism" (*Introduction to Christian Theology*, 160-61).

Some hold that pride is the essence of sin; others would see this essence as selfishness or self-sovereignty. Perhaps no single quality is sufficiently comprehensive. Whatever the conclusion, "the most characteristic feature of sin in all its aspects is that it is directed against God" (NBD, 1189). Paul speaks of the carnal mind as "enmity against God" (Rom. 8:7); hence it is more than a weakness, it is a deeply rooted dispositional hostility or resistance to God's authority. But whatever its inner essence, most Christians would concur with Reinhold Niebuhr's assertion: "The view that men are 'sinful' is one of the best attested and empirically verified facts of human existence" (*A Handbook of Christian Theology*, 349).

Development. Like other Christian doctrines, the doctrine of original sin developed gradually. The raw materials were present in the Bible, but the church soon found it imperative to clarify its teaching. This historical development included the fifth-century debate between Pelagius and Augustine. While Pelagius rejected the concept of original sin, Augustine made it a cornerstone of his theology. In later centuries, Roman Catholic theologians developed a view known as semi-Pelagianism, that original sin is a weakness rather than an inability. In post-Reformation times Calvinists stressed the effectual calling of the elect as God's means of breaking the barrier of original sin, whereas Arminians emphasized the power and availability of grace for all. De-

spite erosion of the doctrine of original sin among theological liberals, it seems to be robust today (See *Christian Theology: An Ecumenical Approach*, 159).

Biblical data. The early chapters of Genesis describe the Fall and its racial consequences. Created superior in talent, with capacity for fellowship (1:26-28), man sought self-exaltation (3:1-6). The result was humiliation (vv. 7-10), alienation (vv. 12-13), suffering (vv. 16-19), and a morally twisted nature, described as an "imagination" which "was only evil continually" (6:5; cf. 8:21). The word "imagination" may be rendered "inclination" or "propensity." Abel's blood sacrifice suggests that he too was aware of personal sinfulness, even though it did not erupt in violence as did the sin of Cain. Accelerating universal depravity resulted in the Flood. But the virulence persisted, and soon evil was again rampant, requiring the dispersal of the people (11:1-9).

David confesses, "I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Ps. 51:5). This is not normally understood as a confession of illegitimacy or as an indictment of the procreative act per se, but as a clear tracing of his evil acts to an original or transmitted moral defect (cf. 58:3). Between the Testaments, the Apocrypha clearly teaches the idea of original sin (2 Esdras 3:21-22; 4:30-31).

In the NT, the concept of racial sinfulness is equally pervasive. Jesus teaches that man's moral woes spring from the depravity of his heart (Matt. 15:18), and Paul's contrast of the two Adams in Rom. 5:12-21 and 1 Cor. 15:22, 45-47 clearly requires the development of a doctrine of original sin. His most vivid and powerful exposé of human sinfulness, as a subvolitional propensity which overcomes both reason and resolution, is Rom. 7:7-25 (cf. Eph. 2:3).

Wesleyanism. John Wesley considered the doctrine of original sin a cornerstone of biblical religion. Without it, he says, "the Christian system falls at once" (*Works*, 9:194). According to traditional Wesleyanism, original sin is cleansed in the divine work of entire sanctification (cf. Wiley, *CT*, 2:470, et al.).

Wesleyans have differed concerning the relation of original sin to the guilt of Adam's representative disobedience. Wesley himself was thoroughly Augustinian in ascribing to Adam's posterity an element of guilt, but insisted that such guilt was removed as one of the universal and unconditional benefits of the Atonement.

See SIN, FALL (THE), AUGUSTINIANISM, PELAGIANISM, ARMINIANISM, CARNAL MIND.

For Further Reading: *NBD*, 1189-93; *GMS*, 79-87, 268-302; Wiley, *CT*, 2:96-140.

A. ELWOOD SANNER

ORTHODOXY. *Orthodoxy*, derived from two Greek words (*orthos* and *doxa*), can be translated "right thought" or "correct belief," and is related to *orthopraxy*, which means "correct conduct." Orthodoxy is most easily understood in contrast with the *unorthodox*, defined first as *heterodoxy* (a divergent mode of belief), and then as *heresy* (a condemned choice of belief).

It was from the Trinitarian, Christological, and Gnostic controversies of the first five centuries that an orthodox and universally acceptable understanding of Christianity emerged. Orthodoxy eventually encompassed that which the "faithful" believed was "right" and that which they were convinced God would ultimately vindicate as right. The roots of orthodoxy, though not its terminology, are to be found in the Bible and the gospel itself (cf. 1 Tim. 6:3 and 2 Tim. 1:13 for an "orthodox" reaction to the implications of wrong belief, and Gal. 1:6-9; 1 Cor. 15:1-13; 1 John 4:1-3; and 2 John 7-11 for the ramifications of right belief in doctrine, preaching, and practice).

The earliest community's belief in "sound doctrine" implied the normative nature of the Christian revelation, encapsulated in the canon as a "fundamentally orthodox collection of books" (Turner). This somewhat tautologous position vis-à-vis Scripture was basic to the evolution of Christian orthodoxy and crucial to its polemic and apologetic. Appeal and argument was made to Scripture, to tradition, and to reason—to consolidate and protect the purity of the received gospel from distortions of Scripture, denial of common tradition, and assimilation to secular philosophical movements. These remain today the primary concerns of orthodoxy.

Historically orthodoxy was constituted in the "rule of faith" (*regula fidei*) with considerable fluidity during the first three Christian centuries. Only in the next two centuries was an attempt made, in response to heterodox movements and groups, to render traditional beliefs into definitive terminology through the major church councils (Nicea, 325; Ephesus, 431; Chalcedon, 451). Arianism, Apollinarianism, and Nestorianism were all refuted and condemned, as the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian creeds affirmed orthodox statements concerning Christology, the Trinity, and the work of the Holy Spirit.

Development of these dogmata in the Western church led to the dictum: "Outside the church

there is no salvation" (*Extra ecclesiam nulla salvatio est*), thus tying together ecclesiology and soteriology in orthodoxy. Eastern orthodoxy maintained a less definitively dogmatic and differentiated view of the mystical unity (Sobornost) of belief, practice, and liturgy, and recognized only seven great councils, ending with Nicea II in A.D. 787 and the reaffirmation of iconism. The Catholic West recognized 21 councils (including Trent, 1545-63, and Vatican II, 1965), and continued to promulgate individual dogmata for orthodoxy into the 20th century (e.g., Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, 1950).

The rise of Reformation scholarship and historical criticism led to reexamination of the dogmatic approach to orthodoxy, affirmed the revelatory nature of immutable reality, and reopened the question of changing conceptual

frameworks in which orthodoxy might be articulated (*sola fidei, sola gratia, sola scriptura*). Creeds were not replaced but reformulated for contemporary classification in the various denominational confessions. The core of orthodoxy is therefore still affirmed in Protestantism by adherence to the historical, revelatory character of biblical faith; the doctrines of the Incarnation, the Atonement, and the Trinity; and the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist. These are the fundamentals of the faith.

See CHRISTIANITY, APOSTLES' CREED, CHURCH COUNCILS, HERESY.

For Further Reading: Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth*, 241-498; Webber and Bloesch, eds., *The Orthodox Evangelicals*, 43-67; Chesterton, *Orthodoxy*.

JOHN S. LOWN

OVERSEER. See BISHOP.

P

PACIFISM. Based on the word "peacemakers" (Matt. 5:9), pacifism is the belief that war is contrary to the scriptural way of peace, and therefore Christians are not to participate in it. Some authorities have used the word *nonresistance* to identify a conservative, nonpolitical, biblical rejection of war, and have related the word *pacifism* to a more liberal and pragmatic rejection of war.

The high points in the history of pacifism have been the first centuries of the Christian church (to Constantine, A.D. 313), the emergence of the historic peace churches (Mennonites, Friends, and Brethren—16th to 18th centuries), the rise of modern liberal pacifism (19th century), and the contemporary wrestling over the use of nuclear weapons. Opposition to war has been based on the life and teachings of Jesus Christ and on the NT love ethic. Also there are humanitarian considerations, the demonic character and destructiveness of war, the power of nonviolence, and the possible annihilation of mankind. Often these bases of objection have been combined.

Biblical pacifists deal with the OT endorsement of war by suggesting that the fullness of the revelation or the revelation for today came in the NT. Thus, the NT is determinative. Furthermore, they believe their position to be essentially Christological.

Those who are born again know God's love overcomes evil because when they were alienated from God, Christ's love overcame their hostility (Rom. 5:10). In sanctification perfect love becomes a heart reality, and sin is no more a necessity for the saint. The Lordship of Christ means that all of life, including governmental responsibilities, is lived in obedience to Christ. Unconditional loyalty can be given only to Jesus Christ. Christ's Lordship includes His Headship of the Church. That Body is international, and for Christians to be fighting other Christians is to deny Christ's Headship. His Lordship also calls for obedience to the Great Commission. Christians killing non-Christians is to deny those killed the opportunity to accept Christ.

The repeated teachings of the NT that Christians are to love their enemies in the loving, self-sacrificing manner of the crucified Christ, must be taken, according to the biblical pacifists, with all seriousness. Both the deity of Christ and the authority of Scripture are involved. Jesus Christ is the Model of love and holiness. Christian perfection involves a loving that seeks the highest good even for the most wicked, and a holiness that will have no part of evil. To take life is inherently an evil act.

The cross and resurrection of Christ are therefore central to the biblical pacifists. As Christ

died in loving Servanthood, so must His disciples be faithful unto death (Mark 8:31-35). Christ's resurrection is the sign that Christ has conquered death and the devil. It is tangible evidence that the way of the Cross is the power of the resurrected Lord bringing in the new age.

Those who reject pacifism on biblical grounds use some of the following arguments. (1) God commanded war in the OT, and there is no explicit teaching against war in the NT. (2) Romans 13 and similar scriptures call upon Christians to obey government. (3) The heart of perfect love can be maintained in war. (4) Since God at times works His will through the state, a Christian in fighting can be doing God's will. (5) The Western nations have at times through war kept the world open for missionary work, as well as for democratic freedoms.

See WAR, CITIZENSHIP, CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE.

For Further Reading: Hostetler, ed., *Perfect Love and War*; Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace*; Myra, *Should a Christian Go to War?* Yoder, *Nevertheless*.

MARTIN H. SCHRAG

PAGANISM. This is any life-style, value system, and complex of beliefs not based on and shaped by Christ and the Bible. As a term it is equivalent to heathenism. It was into a thoroughly pagan Roman Empire that the fledgling Church was thrust on the Day of Pentecost. But Christians so outthought, outlived, and out-died the pagans, that paganism was subdued, though of course never eradicated. Today paganism is again on the rise, in the avowed humanism, scientism, ethical relativism, materialism, and raw hedonism which threatens to engulf and suffocate the Church. Western nations are once again more pagan than Christian. The expression *post-Christian* has its validity in the fact that cultures which once openly claimed ties with the Judeo-Christian ethic have now openly severed all such ties. The Church that does not challenge the surrounding paganism will succumb to it. And paganism will either purify the Church or permeate it.

See CHRISTIANITY, EVANGELISM, MISSION (MISSIONS, MISSIOLOGY).

For Further Reading: Anderson, ed., *The Theology of the Christian Mission*.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

PAIN. See SUFFER, SUFFERING.

PANENTHEISM. Whereas *pantheism* means "all is God," *panentheism* means "all in God." It is a term peculiar to process theology, especially to the thought of Charles Hartshorne. *Surrelativism* and

dipolar theism are terms used interchangeably by Hartshorne for panentheism.

Panentheism differs from traditional theism by stressing the dependence and interrelatedness of God upon the world as a condition for His own being. Alan Gragg explains: "Panentheism entails that there never could have been God without a world" (Charles Hartshorne, 95 ff). In theism God relates himself voluntarily to the world, through providence and omnipresence, but in His essential being is transcendent, which means separate and independent. But in panentheism the world is in God and God in the world, in what Hartshorne prefers to explain as a mind-body relationship.

Panentheism differs from pantheism by denying the flat equivalency of God and the world, and predicating a degree of independent thought and action to both. The freedom of the cosmic side of this dipolar reality is sufficient to make evil possible; the union is sufficient to impinge on God's consciousness and make the suffering His own.

The theology and cosmology of panentheism, with their endless evolution of both God and man, is far from biblical Christianity.

See THEISM, PANTHEISM, ATTRIBUTES (DIVINE), TRINITY (THE HOLY).

For Further Reading: Gragg, Charles Hartshorne.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

PANTHEISM. *Pantheism* is that religious or philosophical theory which postulates the identity of God and the universe. The theory has taken two forms. If the assumption is from a scientific conception of the world as a unity, God as a person is lost in the cosmos, and pantheism becomes the equivalent to naturalism and may be called *pancosmism*. If, on the other hand, the assumption begins in a religious or philosophical position that God is infinite and eternal reality, then the finite and temporal world is so eclipsed by God as to result in *acosmism* (i.e., the world is illusion and God alone is reality). The first approach becomes, in fact, a form of atheism, while the latter becomes a form of belief in which a dynamic personal God is only indirectly involved (if indeed at all) in a temporal universe.

As Charles Hartshorne points out (*ER*), pantheism leaves many questions unanswered. Is this pantheistic god a person? Is it conscious? Is it immutable or in flux? What is the relation of the parts to the whole? In what sense are the parts free—if at all?

The statement that "God is everything" can mean (1) that everything (i.e., all actual being) is

completely bound by God as well as God being completely bound by everything. Then God is without distinct individual being and without personality. If, on the other hand, the statement means (2) that God includes everything but yet is more than the aggregate of the material universe, then the way is left open to conceive of God in personal terms. But this is hardly pure pantheism, and Hartshorne suggests it might better be called *panentheism*.

Pantheism as a religious concept was present in Greek and Roman thought, and is basic to all of the Hindu religions, and from time to time has appeared in Western thought (e.g., Christian Science). It is not possible to reconcile pantheism with Christianity, for the Bible teaches that God is personal, transcendent as well as immanent, eternal in contrast to the world's temporality, and is both the universe's Creator and its Ruler.

See PANENTHEISM, THEISM, TRANSCENDENCE, CREATION.

For Further Reading: *ERE*, 9:609-17; *ER*, 557; *Lutheran Cyclopedia*, 599. FOREST T. BENNER

PAPACY. See CATHOLICISM, ROMAN.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY. The doctrine of papal infallibility is the claim that the pope of the Roman Catholic church can and does speak without error and with divine authority when he speaks according to certain stipulations. These stipulations are three: (1) The pope must be addressing the entire Christian church. Papal decisions concerning the problems of a particular parish, for example, could not be considered infallible on the basis of the dogma. (2) The pope speaks infallibly only when he addresses the issues of faith and morals. Although the pope may direct his considerable influence to the solution of international tensions, the dogma of infallibility will not buttress papal enunciations concerning purely secular issues. (3) The enunciation must be made *ex cathedra*; i.e., it must be a formal and official pronouncement in harmony with (1) and (2), and by virtue of his office.

The dogma was established on July 18, 1870, by a vote of a Vatican Council called by Pope Pius IX. The pope had flexed his muscles earlier by raising to the status of dogma the doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary without the consent of a council. Liberal Catholics, who at first believed that the council called by Pius IX would provide them with an opportunity to assert the authority of council decisions, soon discovered that, in fact, the intent was just the opposite. A quasi-official publication of the Holy

See anticipated the council with the words, "All genuine Catholics believe that the Council will be quite short. . . . They will receive with joy the proclamation of the dogmatic infallibility of the sovereign pontiff." In spite of a few abstainers and only two negative votes, the dogma was promulgated. Authority passed clearly from council to pope.

Since the establishment of the dogma only one decree has borne the character of infallibility (the doctrine of the bodily assumption of Mary into heaven). However, the elasticity of the stipulations governing infallibility makes it difficult to discern exactly when the pope is speaking infallibly.

See CATHOLICISM (ROMAN), PROTESTANTISM.

For Further Reading: Heick, *A History of Christian Thought*, 2:312 ff. DANIEL N. BERG

PARABLES. A parable is a story meant to teach a religious truth, "an earthly story with a heavenly meaning." Usually it is fictitious.

The word "parable" comes from the Hebrew *mashal* and the Greek *parabolē*, meaning "a comparison."

A parable is similar to an allegory with an important exception. While the parable is meant to convey but one truth, all parts of the allegory are meaningful. A fable also emphasizes but one truth; but it differs from the parable and the allegory in that it puts words in the mouths of fanciful characters (animals, trees, etc.). Jesus never used fables, but some of His stories blended elements of allegory and parable.

Various people spoke parables in the OT (2 Sam. 12:1-7; 14:5-11; 2 Kings 14:9; Isa. 5:1-7), but only Jesus used them in the NT. Because scholars do not agree on a standard definition for parables, the number of them spoken by Jesus has been variously estimated from 33 to 79. Most authorities agree on about 50.

Jesus began to use parables after the leaders of the Jews blasphemously charged Him with deriving His power from Satan. When His disciples enquired why He spoke in parables, His reply seems to imply that His purpose was to conceal spiritual truth from those who obstinately rejected it (Mark 4:10-12). A careful exegesis on the parable passage in Matt. 13:10-15 indicates the opposite intention. Jesus speaks ironically, implying that while the parables are intended to illuminate the truth, they unfortunately have the opposite effect due to the hardness of the hearts of the hearers. The result was much like that which Isaiah experienced centuries earlier. But, Jesus said, parables are vehicles of truth to recep-

tive hearts (Matt. 13:11, 16-18). Because one's attitude toward truth is so critical, Jesus cried, "He who has ears, let him hear" (Matt. 13:9, 43, NASB, NIV, RSV; cf. 11:15; Mark 4:9, 23; 7:16; Luke 8:8; 14:35; Rev. 2:7, 11, 17, 29; 3:6, 13, 22).

Jesus drew His parables from nature and from the domestic, social, and political life of the times—things with which the people were familiar.

See HERMENEUTICS, ALLEGORY.

For Further Reading: Hunter, *Interpreting the Parables*; Buttrick, *The Parables of Jesus*; Armstrong, *The Gospel Parables*; Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*.

W. RALPH THOMPSON

PARACLETE. This is a transliteration of the Greek *paraklētos*, variously translated as "Comforter" (KJV), "Strengtheners," "Instructor," or "Encourager" (Wesley), "Counselor" (RSV), "Helper" (Moffatt), "Spokesman" (Danish), "another to befriend you" (Knox), "Someone else to stand by you" (Phillips), and "Advocate" (NEB; Weymouth). Literally the word means "One called alongside to help."

Paraclete appears only four times in John's Gospel (14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7), and once in 1 John 2:1 in reference to Christ himself. Elsewhere Christ consistently uses the Greek word *pneuma* (breath, wind, or spirit) for the Holy Spirit. Outside the NT usage *Paraclete* conveyed the sense of "one who speaks in favor of another (an intercessor, or helper) in an active sense—corresponding to Manahem, the name given the Messiah" (Souter, *A Pocket Lexicon of the New Testament*, 190; so Arndt and Gingrich, 623).

Advocate has a strong forensic significance—one who pleads in favor of, defends, vindicates, or espouses the cause of another. Thus Christ delegates to another (Gr. *allon*; not different, *heteron*), the Holy Spirit, His own authority as Revealer, Teacher, Guide, and as Prosecutor of sin and Satan (John 16:7-11). Christ himself is the believer's Advocate before the Father (1 John 2:1-2). The idea of advocacy had strong OT roots (esp. Job 1:6-12; 2:1-10; 5:1; 9:33; 16:19-22; 19:25; cf. Zech. 3:1-10).

Thus, following Christ's ascension, the *Paraclete* was God's permanent Gift to all believers (John 7:38-39), from whom all other divine gifts issue. This included (1) representing the Father to the believer (Rom. 8:11-16), as Christ represents their cause before the Father in heaven (1 John 2:1-2); (2) instructing the believer concerning the person, work, and teachings of Christ (John 14:25-26; cf. 1 John 2:20-27); (3) witnessing to Christ in the lives of believers, and through them

to the unconverted world (John 15:26-27); (4) acting in the world as the divine Witness against sin, to the righteousness of Christ, and of God's final judgment upon Satan (John 16:7-11). To the Christian the *Paraclete* is One "who has, reveals, testifies, and defends the truth as it is in Jesus" (Wesley, *Notes*). Adam Clarke admirably sums up Christ's teaching concerning the function of the *Paraclete* as follows:

The Holy Spirit is thus called [*Paraklētos*=Advocate or Helper] because He transacts the cause of God and Christ with us, explains to us the nature and importance of the great atonement, shows the necessity of it, counsels us to receive it, instructs us how to lay hold on it, vindicates our claim to it, and makes intercessions in us with unutterable groanings. As Christ acted with His disciples while He sojourned with them, so the Holy Ghost acts with those who believe in His name (1:623).

See COMFORTER (THE), HOLY SPIRIT, ADVOCATE.

For Further Reading: Carter, *The Person and Ministry of the Holy Spirit*, 126-43, 324-31; CC, 1:623; Kittel, 5:800-814; Agnew, *Transformed Christians*, 42-52; Wesley, *Notes*, 364-73.

CHARLES W. CARTER

PARADISE. The word "paradise" has its roots in the Persian word *pardes*, meaning a garden or wooded park. It describes the pleasure gardens of Persian kings and nobles.

In the OT the word means an orchard, a garden, and a forest (Eccles. 2:5; Neh. 2:8; Song of Sol. 4:13). The original paradise was the Garden of Eden at the beginning of human history. Here, God walked with the first humans in their innocence; here the tree of life and the tree of knowledge stood in the midst of the garden, and the animals were friendly and harmless (Genesis 2-3; cf. Danielou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 297-98). As a consequence of their disobedience and sin, the first pair were driven out of the garden and forbidden to return.

In the NT paradise refers to the "intermediate state." It is the abode of the righteous dead, in the presence of Christ and awaiting their resurrection, judgment, and final reward and future life (Luke 23:43; 16:22-31). Paul speaks of paradise as the "third heaven" (2 Cor. 12:1-4).

Finally, paradise describes the final abode of the righteous after their resurrection. It is a new creation restoring the original beauty and blessedness. The righteous live in the presence of God; they partake of the tree of life and participate in the blessedness of paradise (Rev. 2:7; 21-22). The unjust and the unrighteous are without and shall not share in the blessings (22:11, 15).

Originally, paradise was a creation of God and a gift to man in his innocence. It was lost to him because of disobedience. It is restored to the righteous through the life, death, and resurrection of the Second Adam, the Lamb of God (Matt. 4:1-11; Mark 1:12-13; Luke 4:1-13; Rom. 5:12-21). Those who are washed in the blood of the Lamb are made holy and righteous and have the right to participate in the tree of life that is in the midst of the paradise of God (Rev. 2:7; 21:1-7; 22:14).

See SHEOL, INTERMEDIATE STATE, HEAVEN.

For Further Reading: Danielou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*; Wiley, CT, 3:224-40, 375-86.

ISAAC BALDEO

PARADOX. Literally, *paradox* meant what was "contrary to expectations." It is commonly used in contemporary theology to refer to the phenomenon of making two apparently contradictory statements about a single subject. But the contradiction is only apparent in a true paradox, since both statements are necessary to explain the nature of the subject, which reconciles the paradox within its own nature. The more complex the subject is, the more needful it is to employ paradoxical language. As long as it is possible to completely comprehend the essence of the subject, the two truths may be explained. For example, when Jesus declares that "whoever will save his life shall lose it" (Matt. 16:25 and parallels), we understand that the "saving" and "losing" are referred to the subject "life" in different ways, and that "life" is such a complex subject that it can be rationally referred to as being "saved" and "lost" without involving a contradiction.

However, in the case of God it is different, because God cannot be known in His essence. He is known only to himself (Wiley, CT, 1:218). Consequently we may experience the manifestation of God in such a way as to require us to both assert and deny the same quality to Him; and this must forever remain a mystery.

Augustine expresses this irreducible mystery in his classic passage: "What, then, art Thou, O my God . . . stable, yet contained of none; unchangeable, yet changing all things; never new, never old. . . . Always working, yet ever at rest; gathering, yet needing nothing; . . . seeking, and yet possessing all things" (*Confessions*, bk. 1, chap. 4).

The supreme paradox of the Christian faith is the Incarnation in which we affirm Jesus to be both fully God and fully man.

See TRUTH, REASON, RATIONALISM, NEOORTHODOXY, EXISTENTIALISM.

For Further Reading: Gilkey, *Maker of Heaven and Earth*; Hepburn, *Christianity and Paradox*.

H. RAY DUNNING

PARDON. See FORGIVENESS.

PARENTS AND CHILDREN. Parenthood is both privilege and responsibility. Children are a gift from God, but they still belong to Him. Parenthood is one form of Christian stewardship, and the Bible clearly indicates the duties of parents.

Parents are to be loving and accepting. Human fatherhood is derived from the fatherhood of God (Eph. 3:15). Parents must treat their children as God treats His sons and daughters. From the child's perceptions of his parent's esteem, he develops his self-concept. In a warm and loving home environment, he is more likely to be able to develop love for God and others.

Parents are the primary agents of moral and religious education. In His covenant with Israel, God clearly commanded parents to teach their children His laws, first by obeying and making them part of their own lives, and then orally, visually, and continually, impressing them on their children that they may fear the Lord (Deut. 6:1-9).

Parents are to give guidance and discipline, meted out with understanding and encouragement. The writer to the Hebrews asserts that love and discipline are inseparable and a proof of sonship even when the discipline brings pain (Heb. 12:5-11). But Paul warns against the kind of harsh treatment that frustrates and discourages the child (Eph. 6:4; Col. 3:21). Fathers are not "to excite the bad passions of their children by severity, injustice, partiality, or unreasonable exercise of authority" (Charles Hodge, *Epistle to the Ephesians*, 359).

Children also have duties. The Christian ethic is one of mutual obligation (Barclay, *The Daily Study Bible*, 10:193). As parents are responsible for training and discipline, children are responsible to respect and obey their parents (Eph. 6:1-2; Col. 3:20).

Among the theological implications of the parent-child relationship are these. Because of Adam's sin, the child begins life with a tendency toward sin, an inherent selfishness. Moral behavior is not natural but learned. Learning will not take place without resistance. On the positive side, the prevenient grace of God is at work in the child's total personality, awakening to need and gently drawing his soul toward God. The

Holy Spirit will give discernment and wisdom to parents who seek His aid.

Although the influence of parents is the most determinative factor in developing a child's character, parental power is not absolute (*Family Love in All Dimensions*, 119-20). The child is a free moral agent. Through grace and his own personal faith, he can experience true repentance, genuine conversion, and a life-changing relationship with Jesus Christ. So although parental influence is an important element in what a child will become, the final product is the result of the child's own choices in the midst of positive and negative forces.

See FAMILY, FATHERS, CHILD (CHILDREN), OBEDIENCE, CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.

For Further Reading: Dobson, *Dare to Discipline*, 222 ff; GMS, 553 ff; Wiley, CT, 3:92-95; Taylor, "Growth by Design," Nielson, ed., *Family Love in All Dimensions*, 115-33; Sanner, Harper, eds., *Exploring Christian Education*, 148 ff.

MAUREEN H. BOX

PAROUSIA. *Parousia* is a term that has been brought over from the Greek (transliterated) into the common language by the theologians. It originally meant "presence" but eventually came to mean "coming" or "arrival." It appears 24 times in the NT, 17 of which (Matt. 24:3, 27, 37, 39; 1 Cor. 15:23; 1 Thess. 2:19; 3:13; 4:15; 5:23; 2 Thess. 2:1, 8; Jas. 5:7-8; 2 Pet. 1:16; 3:4, 12; 1 John 2:28) refer to the eschatological coming of Jesus Christ in glory (Second Coming) at the end of the age. It is an integral part of the "doctrine of expectation" so characteristic of both Testaments. And the NT is quite emphatic that all history is moving toward this climactic event.

Modern theologians have sought to interpret the above scriptures to mean that only Christ's spiritual presence is intended, but evangelical Christians have always insisted that the passages can only mean that there will be a personal, visible return of our Lord.

The idea of Christ's return appears many times throughout the NT, and other terms are used along with *parousia* in regard to Christ's coming. From *apokalupsis* we get our word *apocalypse*, which means an "uncovering," "disclosure," or "revelation." When used with *parousia*, it indicates that Christ's coming will be an "unveiling" or "disclosure." In the light of His presence many things will become clear. *Epiphaneia* (from which we get our word *epiphany*) carries the meaning of a visible manifestation of some important personage or deity. Its use in 2 Thess. 2:8; 1 Tim. 6:14; 2 Tim. 4:1, 8; Titus 2:13, strongly supports

the idea of a personal, visible appearance of our Lord.

Christ indicated that His coming would be sudden and unexpected (Matt. 24:42-44; 1 Thess. 5:2; 2 Pet. 3:10). Only the Father knows the time of His coming (Matt. 24:36; Acts 1:7); therefore, believers should be ready and watching (Matt. 24:44; Luke 12:40; Phil. 3:18-21; Jas. 5:9). However, men need not be caught unawares (Matt. 24:14; 2 Thess. 2:1-2; 1 Tim. 4:1-3).

Why will He come? From Christ's own words we can discern a threefold answer. (1) He comes to judge men. There is so much in this world that is unfair, unjust, and wrong that He will come to set things right. The righteous will be rewarded and the wicked will be punished (Matt. 25:31-34, 41-46; 13:41-43, 49-50). (2) He will bring about a final consummation of this present world order (Rev. 10:5-6). And (3) He will usher in the reign of God (Rev. 11:15; 19:6).

The *parousia* holds such an important place in the NT that it is viewed as the climax of the earth's history.

See SECOND COMING OF CHRIST, RAPTURE.

For Further Reading: Oepke, Kittel, 5:858 ff; Purkiser, ed., *Exploring the Christian Faith*, 538-59; Wiley, CT, 3:246-62.

C. PAUL GRAY

PASCHAL CONTROVERSY. The Paschal Controversy was the disagreement in the Early Church concerning the date for the celebration of Easter. The controversy began in the second century and ended in the eighth century.

The churches in Asia Minor followed the custom of observing Easter on the traditional day of the Jewish Passover, the 14th day of the month of Nisan. This practice meant that Easter might be observed on any day of the week.

The Western churches, led by Rome, developed a tradition of observing Easter on Sunday, the first day of the week. For a period the Western church celebrated Easter on a fixed date in March. In 325 the Council of Nicea attempted to present a uniform date by declaring that Easter should be observed on the first Sunday following the final full moon after the spring (vernal) equinox. Because various calendars were used in different areas of the church, the date set by the Council of Nicea was not universally accepted.

Even today the time celebration of Easter in the Eastern and Western churches may vary as much as five weeks.

See PASSOVER, CHRISTIAN YEAR.

For Further Reading: *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 4:43-47; ODCC, 1020 ff.

DONALD S. METZ

PASSION OF CHRIST. See DEATH OF CHRIST.

PASSOVER. The name "Passover" is taken from Exod. 12:23, which tells how the destroying angel did "pass over" the houses of Israel when the last of the plagues took the lives of the Egyptian firstborn. In the Bible the Passover celebration is called the Feast of Unleavened Bread.

The word "Passover" denotes the paschal lamb, the sacrifice offered on the eve of the celebration. The nature of this ceremony is described in detail in Exodus 12. At the time of the full moon in the first month of spring every Jewish family slaughtered a lamb at twilight (the "lamb" could be a kid, v. 5). Then, in the middle of the night, the family hastily ate the roasted lamb, along with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. In addition, as soon as the animal was killed, a bunch of hyssop was dipped into the sacrifice's blood, and a few drops sprinkled on the doorposts of each house.

The Passover Festival began on the 15th of Nisan (March-April), the first month of the Jewish religious year. The feast lasted seven days. The Passover was celebrated as an agricultural feast also, a kind of Thanksgiving Day. It marked the beginning of the barley harvest in Palestine. In harmony with Lev. 23:9-12 a sheaf of barley (omer) was presented as a wave offering to the Lord.

The primary meaning of the Passover comes from the special historical event it celebrates—the Exodus from Egypt. The Passover commemorated the great deliverance—the deliverance which transformed a horde of slaves into the people of God. It was Israel's birthday. Passover is the festival of freedom. The freedom of Israel was the freedom to serve God voluntarily. Passover leads to Sinai. Sinai points to Israel's voluntary acceptance of its special distinction and mission.

See BLOOD, LAMB (SACRIFICIAL), LAMB OF GOD, PASCHAL CONTROVERSY, SACRIFICE, EXODUS, ATONEMENT.

For Further Reading: Gaster, *Festivals of the Jewish Year*, 31-58; Segal, *The Hebrew Passover*, 189-230; Golden, *A Treasury of Jewish Holidays*, 128-85.

DONALD S. METZ

PASTOR. Addressing the elders of the church of Ephesus, Paul speaks of two functions of ministry that belong to the office of elder. He writes: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, ~~to feed the church of God~~, which he hath purchased with his own blood" (Acts 20:28). The first function is that of overseer

(Latin, "supervisor," sometimes translated "bishop," Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:2; Titus 1:7; 1 Pet. 2:25). A second function is that of pastor or shepherd. Inasmuch as feeding the flock is of primary concern to the shepherd, the pastoral concept is dominant. Implied also is the expected capacity of the elder to give wise counsel and demonstrate his wisdom, as a man of God.

The pastor is one called of God to minister, especially to the spiritual needs of God's people, with concern to present every man mature in Christ (Col. 1:28). His concern also for all sorts and conditions of men is shown by his interest in those peoples who are without the light of the gospel: "I am debtor both to the Greeks, and to the Barbarians; both to the wise, and to the unwise" (Rom. 1:14).

In his personal life the pastor seeks to live above reproach and "provide things honest in the sight of all men" (12:17). In our world of competitive values with its emphasis upon "becoming" rather than on "being," the pastor's watch-care over himself is inseparable from his pastoral concern for others. In the pulpit he speaks the things that become sound doctrine (Titus 2:1). In problem confrontation with individuals or groups, he seeks solutions in the light of God's Word. He must manage his own household well, keeping his children submissive and respectful (1 Tim. 3:4). In his Epistles Paul, speaking of the spirit of the pastor, cites among others these qualifications: not partial, not violent, not quarrelsome, not arrogant, no lover of money; but upright, dignified, hospitable, gentle, master of himself.

As administrator, the modern pastor is responsible for the total well-being of the church, including such areas as church budget, Christian education, music, church witness, church growth, missions, and recreation. Confronted with involvement in these tasks, the pastor usually requires help from qualified laymen, either by election or by appointment.

See CLERGY, ELDER, CHURCH GOVERNMENT, PASTORAL COUNSELING.

For Further Reading: Jones, *The Pastor: The Man and His Ministry*; NBD, 1175-76; Schaller, *The Pastor and the People*.
JAMES D. ROBERTSON

PASTORAL COUNSELING. Pastoral counseling is the effort of a Christian minister (or a trained lay counselor) to help people through personal mutual discussion of difficult life situations. It combines a knowledge of the Christian religion, a basic understanding of the human psyche, and interviewing skills. Its most immediate purposes

are (1) to lead troubled people to a better understanding of their problems, and (2) to enable them to make self-chosen decisions that are right from Christian and personal points of view.

Pastoral counseling differs from the broader term *pastoral care* inasmuch as the latter refers to all of the minister's personal and group efforts to help parishioners grow. Pastoral counseling differs from many of the professional therapies inasmuch as it rarely gives attention to the areas of the unconscious, dreams, and psychotic processes. Pastoral counselors deal primarily with many of the less "psychologically difficult" life problems such as normal grief, marriage, physical illness, guilt over wrongdoing, and matters of religious and theological concern. The pastor normally carries on a shorter series of interviews than many therapists, perhaps not more than 10 or 12 and usually fewer. He has brief series for two reasons: (1) active pastors cannot spend all of their counseling time with only a few persons in their parishes, and (2) they have not been trained to deal with highly complex life problems that often arise in extended counseling.

There are three primary values in pastoral counseling: (1) it provides support to troubled parishioners, (2) it helps them to make wise solutions of problems, and (3) with deeply troubled persons, it leads to the pastor's referral to professional therapies.

Counseling is related to other aspects of an active pastor's work. His sermons on difficult human problems are an indirect invitation for needy people to confer with him. His pastoral calling is a favorable context for people to mention inner needs. His pastoral concern for his parishioners often provides him with an opportunity to take the initiative and, as in pre-counseling, to mention personal needs that are not clearly recognized by anxious and frustrated parishioners.

Pastoral counseling, as a practice based on an organized body of knowledge, developed in the 20th century. In 1925, Anton Boisen began clinical training and supervision of pastors' "counseling" in mental hospitals. In 1936 Richard Cabot, a physician in Massachusetts General Hospital, and Russell L. Dicks, a Christian minister, began teaching pastors certain principles of ministering to the sick in hospitals. That practice spread rapidly, and today there are many hospitals, as well as other institutions, where ministers learn pastoral counseling by actual practice along with academic study (commonly called CPE—Clinical Pastoral Education). Many of the Protes-

tant theological seminaries have structured clinical opportunities for many of their students.

The competence of pastoral counselors depends upon a number of basic personal factors: (1) good personal adjustment, (2) a personal sensitivity to and concern about the problems of troubled persons, (3) the ability to empathize with needy persons, (4) an ability to listen to others, and (5) nonjudgmental attitudes.

In addition to local church settings, pastoral counseling is increasingly being carried on by chaplains in hospitals and prisons and by ministers who set up counseling offices that are associated with professional therapists.

See PASTOR, ROGERIAN COUNSELING, REALITY THERAPY.

For Further Reading: Clinebell, *Basic Types of Pastoral Counseling*; Adams, *The Christian Counselor's Manual*; Howe, *The Miracle of Dialogue*; Hiltner, *Pastoral Counseling*.
W. CURRY MAVIS

PASTORAL THEOLOGY. See PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

PATRIPASSIANISM. See MONARCHIANISM.

PEACE. Peace is a state of tranquility and harmony. In an organism it is produced by homeostasis, a tendency toward balance among the organism's interacting and interdependent systems. Between nations peace is not only the absence of either "hot" or "cold" war but open relations with freedom of movement and exchange. Seldom is such peace absolute, for generally while nations may technically be at peace, they are usually struggling with some tensions and disputes. In interpersonal relationships peace is, minimally, freedom from quarreling and bitterness, and, maximally, a mutual sense of ease and pleasure.

However, the peace most universally coveted and sought is inward—peace of mind or heart. This is freedom from guilt, hostility, and anxiety; positively it is a deep sense of personal well-being. Such peace Jesus promised His followers (John 14:27) and such peace is actually experienced by Spirit-controlled believers (Gal. 5:22).

The peace which is available is spiritual, not necessarily environmental. It is not freedom from tribulation (John 16:33). Its prerequisites are not freedom from economic necessity or physical pain; nor do they include the possession of ideally happy relations with people (Phil. 4:10-13; 2 Cor. 12:7-10; Rom. 12:18; Gal. 2:11). The Christian may possess a profound rest of soul in the

midst of outward tumult or even at times his own emotional agitation.

The one absolute requisite for peace of mind is rightness with God (Rom. 5:1). Any so-called peace not thus based is illusory. It is but the inertia and stupefaction of a seared conscience (1 Tim. 4:2). While peace with God becomes possible through faith in the atoning work of the Lord Jesus Christ, certain moral concomitants belong to such faith. One is repentance; clinging to sin will make authentic peace impossible. Another is obedience, including adjustment with one's estranged fellows (Matt. 5:23-24; Heb. 12:14). Unchristian disruption with those around one (i.e., disruption not morally required, or demanded by conscience) disrupts peace with God.

Such moral concomitants of peace are reminders that peace with God is much more than a personal feeling, or the absence of a sense of condemnation; it is true rightness with God, involving the forgiveness of our sins, and an inner knowledge that we are reconciled to God and God is reconciled to us. Peace with God is therefore inseparable from fellowship with God. Many gain relief from guilt feelings through tears, confession, or counsel of men, and mistake this for peace with God, when the ethical dimension has been deficient, or the faith has not rested solely in Christ and His cross as the basis of the reconciliation.

Requirements for the maintenance of peace are faith, obedience, and meekness. It is only through unwavering faith in God that poise and tranquility can endure in the face of puzzling providences and crushing events. It is only through obedience that fellowship can be sustained. But perhaps the most difficult requisite is meekness. Pride, self-willfulness, self-importance, and ego touchiness are all destroyers of peace. For this the word is: "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls" (Matt. 11:29).

Yet the meekness which is essential to personal peace must never be interpreted as capitulation to evil. Peace cannot be kept without also keeping a clear conscience; and a good conscience demands the prosecution of the war against sin and evil. In the name of peace Christians must never compromise with the devil or any of his representatives. Whether thinking of the nation, the church, the family, or self, "peace at any cost" is a slogan never on the lips of those sharing the nature of a holy God. Holiness may demand the abandonment of peace on one level in order to preserve it on a deeper level. For peace can be

costly, as "the blood of his cross" demonstrates (Col. 1:20).

See RECONCILIATION, REST (REST OF FAITH), FRUIT OF THE SPIRIT, PACIFISM.

For Further Reading: Wesley, *Works*, 5:80, 216, 283; 6:34, 79, 399, 486; 7:433. RICHARD S. TAYLOR

PELAGIANISM. Pelagianism is a system of moral and doctrinal concepts originating with Pelagius, a British monk who visited Rome in the fifth century. Pelagianism expresses the rationalistic tendency in early Christianity (Wiley, *CT*, 2:415). The doctrines had three great leaders: Pelagius himself; then Julian of Eclanum, who served as the architect of the teaching; and Celestius, who popularized the dogma (Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition*, 1:373).

Spiritual and ethical neutrality of Adam. Pelagius taught that Adam was born spiritually neutral. Adam was endowed with freedom and placed under the law of righteousness. Adam, and all men, had the capacity of achieving sinless perfection in this life. The presentation of a commandment by God implied the ability of Adam to obey.

Denial of original sin. The denial of primitive holiness in favor of initial spiritual neutrality carried with it a denial of the Adamic fall and the subsequent depravity of the human race. Adam's sin injured only himself, not his descendants. Pelagius placed extreme emphasis on the self-determination of the individual to good or evil. Man is born capable of either good or evil. Each individual enters life without either virtue or vice. There is no inherited depravity. The doctrine of original sin is rejected. Because of the denial of original sin and death as the result of sin, Pelagianism was formally condemned as a heresy by the General Council of Ephesus in A.D. 431.

The innocent state of all newborn infants. Newborn infants are in the same condition as Adam before the Fall. Every descendent of Adam is born morally neutral. Sin is the result of the free choice of every man. Wiley quotes a statement describing the state of each person: "At birth, each man's voluntary faculty, like Adam's, is undetermined either to sin or holiness. Being thus characterless, with a will undecided for either good or evil, and not in the least affected by Adam's apostasy, each individual man, after birth commences his voluntariness, originates his own character, and decides his own destiny by the choice of either right or wrong" (*CT*, 1:44). Personal sin is entirely a matter of wrong choices.

Personal holiness is possible by means of right choices.

A humanistic view of salvation. The change effected in regeneration results from an act of the human will. Regeneration is not a renewal of the personality by the operation of the Holy Spirit. Regeneration comes when God's grace illuminates the intellect by the truth. The individual hears of God's grace, learns of God's commandments, accepts the truth, makes a decision to obey, and by self-discipline follows divine commands by his natural power.

The mortality of the human race. Man was destined to die even if Adam had not sinned. The human race neither dies on account of Adam's sin nor rises on account of Christ's resurrection.

The central principle of Pelagianism is a belief in man's ability to do by his own power all that God's righteousness demands.

See AUGUSTINIANISM, ORIGINAL SIN, FREEDOM, PREVENIENT GRACE, ABILITY.

For Further Reading: Wiley, *CT*, 2:102-3, 348, 415; Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition*, 1:313-31; Warfield, *Studies in Tertullian and Augustine*, 291-92.

DONALD S. METZ

PENAL SATISFACTION THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT. Among the Christian interpretations of Christ's atoning work, the penal satisfaction theory has been dominant, especially among orthodox voices of the church. Based on the language of Isa. 53:4-5, 10 (see 1 Pet. 2:24), and on the legal interpretation of Christ's death which was congenial to Roman Christianity, the theory stressed the requirements of divine justice. Sin is a violation of the divine will, which declares that the sinner must pay the penalty of death (Gen. 2:17 and Ezek. 33:14-16). Nevertheless, the principle of substitution permitted the penalty to be borne by another. Thus the penalty, while not removed, could be diverted. The substitute's acceptance of the penalty satisfied the justice of the divine demand and freed the sinner.

This theory is found in Origen of Alexandria (A.D. 185-254) and is developed by Anselm of Canterbury (A.D. 1033-1109).

Anselm's thought lacks the "penal" aspect. His concept is sometimes denoted a "commercial" theory because of its emphasis on debt and payment. Anselm does not develop the substitution motif in his doctrine of the Atonement. In his famous work *Cur Deus Homo* (Why God Became Man), he stresses the necessity of the Incarnation. If Christ is to pay mankind's debt, He must become one with us. His life and death is a full

compensation for the dishonor man has done toward God.

Penal satisfaction receives its full explication in Reformed theology. Sin must be fully punished or God's justice is abrogated. As the Reformed position matured, it incorporated the concept of substitution, including substituted punishment and substituted obedience. Sin requires punishment. This is satisfied by the substitutionary death of Christ. In Reformed thought substituted obedience must be added. Since human obedience can never satisfy, Christ's obedience is necessary. Jesus bears both penalty and the demand of obedience for those who are among the elect.

See ATONEMENT, MYSTICAL THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT, GOVERNMENTAL THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT, MORAL INFLUENCE THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT, SACRIFICE, PROPITIATION, SATISFACTION.

For Further Reading: Miley, *The Atonement in Christ*, 135-43; Wiley, *CT*, 2:241-51. LEON O. HYNSON

PENANCE. This is one of the seven sacraments of the Roman Catholic church. It originated, in part, because Jerome's Vulgate version of the Bible translated the various NT imperatives "Repent ye" (*metanoete*) as "Do penance." Thus Roman Catholics, instead of understanding that we are to change our minds about sin and become obedient to God, have supposed that we are to do this or that good work.

The sacrament arose also through incorrect interpretations of Heb. 6:4-6 and 10:26. Those passages were interpreted as suggesting that a person who has known Christ, and falls away, cannot be forgiven. So they worked out a system of good works for reinstatement. These good works were made into a sacrament in medieval times—the sacrament of penance. It is such doctrines as those on which penance is based that Luther and Protestants in general were reacting to when they began to teach that salvation is by grace alone, through faith alone.

See REPENTANCE, PENITENCE.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

PENITENCE. This describes the penitent's disposition or state of being. It is associated with an experience of remorse or a feeling of sorrow. In NT times a clear distinction was made between *penitence* and *repentance*. The latter described a change of heart which led to changes in attitude and actions. Even though the former word was used less frequently, it referred to a change in the emotions so as to express feelings of regret or contrition. This result comes not so much be-

cause of a fear of punishment but because a just and holy God is offended.

There seems to be in the NT a stress on keeping the rational acts of the will independent of passing moods and feelings. In actual life, however, the distinctions are less obvious. One complements the other. A good example is Paul's statement: "For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of: but the sorrow of the world worketh death" (2 Cor. 7:10).

Judaism's appreciation for penitence is evident in its liturgical forms. The following psalms were labeled Penitential Psalms: 6; 32; 38; 51; 102; 130; and 143. And in the writings of Isaiah there is an interesting emphasis upon the "contrite heart" (57:15; 66:2).

In Roman Catholic theology the fourth of the seven sacraments is called the sacrament of penance. In order to stress the element of godly sorrow, this sacrament has at times been referred to as a second baptism in terms of a "baptism of tears."

See REPENTANCE, PENANCE.

For Further Reading: Kittel, 4:626-29; IDB, 4:33-34.

ROBERT A. MATTKE

PENTATEUCH. Pentateuch is the Greek name for the first five books of the OT, forming the first division of the Hebrew canon of Scripture, also known as the Torah. The name means "the five scrolls" and was used by Alexandrian Jews as early as the first Christian century to correspond to the Hebrew description of Torah as the five-fifths of the law.

The material of the Pentateuch has always been of supreme importance for the theology of Judaism, much more so than the Prophets and the Writings of the Hebrew Scriptures. This fact is reflected in the attitude of the Samaritans and Sadducees who accepted only the Pentateuch as being divinely inspired. The NT clarifies the proper place of the Pentateuch in Christian theology and records the conflict which distinguished Christianity from Judaism on this basis.

The problematic question of authorship of the Pentateuch is one of the most persistent in biblical studies. The traditional view is that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, based on the internal evidence of the text where specific passages state that Moses wrote the law (Exod. 24:4; 34:27; Deut. 31:9). Later historical books such as Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah reflect this well-established tradition. The conservative date for the composition of these books indicate that this tradition of Mosaic authorship was well settled by the fifth century B.C. This was not the begin-

ning of such a tradition; it merely perpetuated an established tradition from earlier centuries. Later witnesses from the intertestamental period assert that Moses authored all of the Pentateuch. In the NT the Pentateuch was regarded as the work of Moses (Mark 12:26; Luke 24:27, 44; John 5:45-47).

A serious challenge to the tradition of Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch was mounted in the 16th century A.D., climaxing with the wave of higher criticism which centered in Germany during the 19th century. Ingenious attempts were made to explain the composition of the Pentateuch from various sources and different hands across the centuries. A bewildering plethora of theories and modifications resulted. At present, there is little agreement among critical scholars on this question, and the more specific one becomes, the more disagreement is evident.

The dominant element in the Pentateuch is the direction or guidance contained therein. God's purpose in revealing the law was to provide direction and guidance for the worship and life of His covenant people. At such, it was never intended to be a penal burden to be borne, but an expression of divine grace and caring.

During His ministry Jesus recognized the authority of both the law (Matt. 5:17) and its official interpreters (23:2-3). Paul also recognized the basic worth of the law in the purpose of God (Gal. 3:24). But the NT is equally clear that Christ is the end of the law (Rom. 10:4); it was never an end in itself. The NT writers saw clearly that the law was only temporary until the time had fully come when God sent forth His Son to redeem those who were under the law (Gal. 4:4).

Distinction must be made between the moral law contained in the Pentateuch and the ceremonial law concerned with sacrifices and the rituals of worship as a means of justification. The former, such as the Ten Commandments, is binding upon NT believers, while the latter is superseded by Christ. A careful reading of the Epistle to the Hebrews is enlightening as Christ is presented as a *better* revelation, sacrifice, high priest, etc., so that the old is done away with because of the actualization of the new.

See TALMUD, MOSAIC LAW, LAW, LAW AND GRACE, LAW OF LIBERTY, FREEDOM, ANTINOMIANISM.

For Further Reading: *The Interpreter's Bible*, 1:185-200; Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 495-541; ISBE, 3:711-27. ALVIN S. LAWHEAD

PENTECOST. "Pentecost" is a term which comes from the Greek word *pentecostē*, meaning "50." Being Greek, it does not appear in the OT. It was

a Jewish feast which fell 50 days after the Passover. The Jews called it "The Feast of Weeks" (Exod. 34:22; Deut. 16:9-11); "The Feast of Harvest" (Exod. 23:16); and "The Day of the Firstfruits" (Num. 28:26).

The day was established for the celebration of the firstfruits of the wheat harvest. After the Romans destroyed the Temple and its sacrificial system (A.D. 70), the day was remembered as the anniversary of the giving of the law to Moses.

All adult males were required to go to the sanctuary to celebrate this feast (Exod. 23:14, 16). The worshipper brought a sheaf of wheat to the priest who waved it before the Lord in recognition that the harvest comes from God. A lamb and a cereal offering likewise were brought (Lev. 23:11 ff; cf. v. 18). A portion of the sheaf was placed on the altar as a burnt offering. The rest was given to the priests for food. Two loaves of bread made from new wheat were waved by the priest for all the people. Then the priests, eating the loaves and sacrificial animals, concluded the feast with a communal meal to which the poor, the Levites, and strangers were invited.

It was fitting that God should choose the Day of Pentecost on which to give the fullness of the Spirit to the Church (cf. Acts 1 and 2). As Pentecost was 50 days after the Passover, so the gift of the Spirit came 50 days after Calvary when "Christ our passover" was "sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. 5:7). As on Pentecost the firstfruits of the harvest were given, so the Holy Spirit is the Firstfruit of the abundant blessings which God has in store for His people (Eph. 2:7; 1 Cor. 2:9). And as God gave the law 50 days after delivering Israel from bondage to Pharaoh, so, having delivered believers from bondage to Satan, God, through the gift of the Spirit, writes the law on their hearts (cf. Jer. 31:33; Ezek. 11:19; 36:25-28; 37:1-4; Acts 15:8-9; Heb. 8:10).

Because the Holy Spirit in His fullness was given to the Church on the Day of Pentecost, the word "Pentecost" is used symbolically by some to signify the fullness of the Spirit of God which was promised to believers (Luke 3:16; 24:49; John 14:15-18; Acts 1:4, 8; etc.). Others who use the term confuse the gifts of the Spirit with His fullness, identifying phenomena which attended the original outpouring of the Spirit with the fullness of the Spirit. Yet the same Spirit gives a variety of gifts to His people as He himself chooses (1 Cor. 12:4-11). Therefore, no particular gift is proof of His fullness, nor even of His presence (Matt. 7:22-23).

See FEASTS, BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT, DISPENSATION OF THE SPIRIT, NEW COVENANT.

For Further Reading: Carter, *The Person and Ministry of the Holy Spirit*; Schauss, *The Jewish Festivals from Their Beginning* trans. Jaffe Samuel.

W. RALPH THOMPSON

PENTECOSTALISM. The cluster of religious ideas and practices now called "Pentecostal" and, in their modern extension, "charismatic" are chiefly a 20th-century phenomenon. Their roots, however, lie deep in the evangelical past. The three great spiritual movements of the 18th century—the Wesleyan, the revivalistic Calvinist, and the German Pietist—all sought explicitly to revive as much as possible the primitive Christianity of the Early Church. Central to their evangelism was the declaration that the saving power of the Holy Spirit, given at Pentecost to all who would repent, believe, and be baptized, was available in all times and places.

The leaders of each of these three movements, and especially John Wesley, made a sharp distinction between the "extraordinary" and the "ordinary" gifts of the Spirit at Pentecost; the latter, which they specified as the gift of His "sanctifying graces," was the one they thought was permanently available. They declared that the "extraordinary" gifts of languages, healing, or other miraculous powers were largely, if not wholly, confined to the apostolic generation. During the remainder of the 18th and throughout the 19th century, the doctrine of the new birth, in which the Holy Spirit freed repentant sinners from both the guilt and the power of evil (as Jesus had promised and Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans, had described), steadily triumphed in Protestant consciousness in America, Great Britain, Scandinavia, and Germany.

Meanwhile, however, a tiny minority insisted upon the more radical notion that the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit would be widespread in the "last days," as the apostle Peter's quotation from the prophet Joel at Pentecost seemed to declare. Joseph Smith's Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, popularly known as Mormons, affirmed this view; and a few who claimed power to heal or to speak in "unknown" tongues, known technically as *glossolalia*, appeared among them. The same thing happened in London, in the congregation of radical believers in the Second Coming gathered around Edward Irving, who was briefly influential among a segment of England's high society. Although the phenomenon of tongues disappeared almost entirely, interest in divine healing grew in several evangelical communities, and with it the hope of multiplying miracles in the "last days."

The leaders of the Wesleyan holiness movement in America and, at least until 1903, the Keswick movement in England resisted all of this and excluded from their platforms emphasis upon either divine healing or doctrines of the Second Coming. Moreover, the ancient and apostolic custom that the elders of the church should, on request, anoint and pray for the sick in faith for their healing continued in many denominations. On the other hand, both movements encouraged the use of Pentecostal language to describe the experience of a second work of sanctifying grace. Following John Wesley's beloved theologian, John Fletcher, they called it the "baptism of the Holy Spirit."

On the fringes of the popular revival movements which spread through America, Wales, and, to a much smaller degree, Scandinavia, however, were independent evangelists, Bible schools, city missions, and healing ministries insisting on a more radical restoration of primitive Christianity. This included the miraculous gifts and gift of tongues. The spark that set fire to this conviction and created the Pentecostal movement, however, was the experience of speaking in what the faithful believed was a language they had not learned. A small group of women attending an obscure Bible school in Topeka, Kans., first experienced this on December 31, 1900, under the promptings of Charles F. Parham, an eccentric holiness evangelist who had no formal tie to any organized religious body. Local newspaper reporters appeared in a few days, and a University of Kansas professor established that the young women were not speaking Chinese, as they had originally thought. Soon, they and Parham decided that the "unknown tongues" were usually languages of heaven, unknown on earth. But the movement never formally abandoned the belief that human languages might be miraculously granted also, as at Pentecost, to sustain foreign missions.

Pentecostalism spread but little until 1906, when Charles Seymour, a black man who had attended a tiny Bible school that Parham conducted in Houston, appeared at an interracial holiness mission on Azusa Street, in Los Angeles, and began to proclaim the promise of the gift of tongues. A revival broke out, amidst torrents of emotion and numerous cases of tongues-speaking. These gained almost instant nationwide attention. Within months a Scandinavian mission worker, T. K. Barrett, spread the movement to Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. Others carried the news to England and Germany, and

set Christians to seeking similar experiences there.

The identifying mark of the Pentecostal movement has been from the outset, therefore, speaking in tongues. Its theological corollary emerged very soon, namely, that this experience was the indispensable "sign" that one had received the baptism of the Holy Spirit, whether or not the "sign" was extended in a continuing "gift" of praying or speaking in glossolalia. Pentecostal groups whose backgrounds were Wesleyan sharply distinguished the experience of being baptized or filled with the Spirit from the second work of grace. They continued to call the latter "entire sanctification," and to define it as Wesley did—a work of the Spirit that cleanses believers' hearts from inbred sin. Those whose backgrounds were Calvinist, Disciples of Christ, or Southern Baptist made the Pentecostal experience simply a variant of the Keswick understanding of the second work of grace, namely, a baptism of the Spirit that brought power to triumph over all temptation (including that stemming from the remains of inbred sin) and to witness effectively.

The largest denomination to emerge among non-Wesleyan Pentecostals was the Assemblies of God. Its founders minimized the doctrine of sanctification and eventually embraced that of the "finished work" of Christ on the Cross, teaching that His righteousness was imputed rather than imparted. From this wing of the movement emerged also the United Pentecostal church. The preoccupation of Pentecostals with the name of Jesus and the NT's strong identification of the Holy Spirit with the risen Lord prompted its leaders to develop a unitarian doctrine of God, popularly called "Jesus only." More typical was Aimee Semple McPherson, who in the mid-1920s taught a large following at her Angelus Temple in Los Angeles to honor Christ as Savior, Healer, Baptizer (with the Holy Spirit), and Soon-Coming King. The result was the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel.

Virtually all Pentecostals believed in the pre-millennial return of Jesus, preceded by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the "latter rain" Joel had prophesied. Their doctrine of the Church varied greatly, though the tradition of independence, stemming from the Anabaptist and radical Puritan movements, was the most pervasive one.

Notable has been the appeal of Pentecostal foreign missionaries in Central and South America, among Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking populations. The reasons are complex but seem

to include the mental habits nurtured by the Latin Mass, in which spiritual experience took place as the priest spoke in a language no one understood, and the neglect of the poor by the Catholic governing elite.

While modern Wesleyans acknowledge that new spiritual vitality, together with a fresh discovery of the ministry of the Spirit, has broken into hitherto formalistic settings, they nevertheless have misgivings concerning the Pentecostal movement as a whole. The central issue is whether or not the claims and emphases of modern Pentecostalism are supportable by a sound exegesis of Scripture. Many careful scholars are convinced that there are disparities between Pentecostal practices and biblical teachings, particularly on the question whether the "tongues" spoken at Pentecost were "unknown" or well-known languages. Others believe they see a stress on miraculous and emotional experiences that sometimes outweighs ethical commitment.

See NEO-PENTECOSTALISM, PENTECOST, BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT, TONGUES (GIFT OF), WESLEYANISM, HOLINESS MOVEMENT, GIFTS OF THE SPIRIT.

For Further Reading: Synan, *The Pentecostal-Holiness Movement in the United States*; Carter, *The Person and Ministry of the Holy Spirit*, 191-219, 261-89; Agnew, *The Holy Spirit: Friend and Counselor*, 47-117.

TIMOTHY L. SMITH

PERDITION, SON OF PERDITION. The word is derived from the Latin *perdere*, "to destroy," and is used in the English Bible to translate the Greek word *apōleia*, "destruction." Generally speaking, the term is used to express the fate which awaits the unrepentant, and his loss of eternal salvation. Frequently a contrast is drawn between the state of the believer and the unbeliever by contrasting salvation with destruction (e.g., Phil. 1:28; Heb. 10:39; Rev. 17:8).

There are two references in the NT to the "son of perdition": John 17:12, where it is used of Judas; and 2 Thess. 2:3, where it describes the Antichrist.

A problem arises with its use in John 17:12 as applied to Judas. Here we read that the son of perdition is lost "that the scripture might be fulfilled." The implication of the passage seems to be that Judas was predestined to betray Jesus and therefore could do no other. On this two points should be made: First, there is a play on the words "lost" and "perdition" (in Greek the word for "lost" is *apōleto*, and for "perdition," *apōleia*). Now, it was customary for the Jews at the time to coin a name which expressed the character of an

individual: Barnabas, e.g., means "son of consolation"; Barsabas (Acts 15:22), "son of the Sabbath." Jesus, with this play on words, here coins a name for Judas which characterizes his condition ("lost") and his end which results from it ("destruction").

The second point to be made is that predictive prophecy (Ps. 41:9 is very likely the passage in mind) is in no way deterministic. There is built into the prophetic message a moral condition, which, if it produces repentance, annuls the predicted doom (e.g., Jonah and Nineveh). Judas chose to betray Jesus and in so doing sealed his own fate.

Still, as of old

Man by himself is priced.

For thirty pieces Judas sold

Himself, not Christ.

The comment of John Calvin on this verse is apposite: "It would be wrong for anyone to infer from this that Judas' fall should be imputed to God rather than to himself, in that necessity was laid on him by the prophecy."

See CONTINGENT, PROPHET (PROPHECY), PREDESTINATION, DETERMINISM, FREEDOM.

THOMAS FINDLAY

PERFECT, PERFECTION. The word "perfect" as normally used in English means "having all the properties belonging to it; complete; sound, flawless." It "further implies the soundness, the proportionateness, and excellence of every part, every element, or every quality" (*Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*).

To get at the biblical meaning, one must observe the original words used in the Bible. *Tamim*, the Hebrew word most used, is applied to God (Ps. 18:30), to the law (19:7), and to persons (Job 1:8; 2:3). The other Hebrew word, *shalem*, is used with only one exception to describe persons, such as "perfect heart," or wholly devoted to God (1 Kings 8:61; etc.). The NT word *teleios* means "brought to its end" or "finished." It also indicates "wanting nothing necessary to completeness" or "full-grown, adult, of full age, mature" (Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, 618).

The use of the word "perfect," both in modern English usage, and in understanding the biblical words, cannot be precise. Some want it to mean only the absolute perfection of God, and deny its use for man or things. To do this rejects the common usage of the terms as they should be understood.

Most careful students of the Bible recognize the latitude in the application of these words. When applied to God or His law, there is pre-

cisness and absoluteness about them; but when applied to man, the terms become relative. There is then both absolute perfection and relative perfection.

God's perfection becomes the standard of all other perfections. There is a kind of "perfection . . . ascribed to God's works," and "it is also either ascribed to men or required of them. By this is meant complete conformity to those requirements as to character and conduct which God has appointed. . . . But fidelity to the Scriptures requires us to believe that, in some important sense, Christians may be perfect even in this life, though they still must wait for perfection in a larger sense in the life which is to come" (*Unger's Bible Dictionary*, 843). Such relative perfection is recognized by other writers (see ZPBD, 636; and HBD, 538).

We believe it is biblical to hold that there is a perfection attainable in this life (Matt. 5:48; 1 John 1:7-9; Eph. 4:12; Phil. 3:15). Since to be perfect means to attain the goal God intends, then, when one reaches that goal, he is perfect in this one sense. One can hardly believe God requires a person to be perfect in an area he cannot because of human weakness. God knows man is weak and will be so while in this life. Yet He requires a perfection of love and character that is compatible with human failure.

Thus a Christian may be perfect in his heart while imperfect in his performance. He always aims for a greater maturity in his actions. Only in the resurrection will he attain all the perfection he lost when sin came into the world. Never in this life or the next can man be as perfect as God is in the absolute sense.

See CHRISTIAN PERFECTION, PERFECT LOVE, PERFECTIONISM, HOLINESS, FAILURE.

For Further Reading: Wesley, *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection*; Cox, *John Wesley's Concept of Perfection*; Wiley, CT, 2:496-517; GMS, 479-83; Wood, *Purity and Maturity*.
LEO G. COX

PERFECT LOVE. Perfect love is the experienced reality of a relationship with God in which the believer loves God with all the heart, soul, mind, and strength, and the neighbor as oneself. It is the actualizing of God's purpose that we should be holy (inner holiness) and blameless (outer holiness) before Him in love (Eph. 1:4).

In the OT, love for God is at the heart of the Decalogue (Exod. 20:6) and is consistently enjoined upon God's people throughout their history. It finds its quintessential expression in the extended form of the Shema (Deut. 6:4-5) which, by NT times, had become the foundational creed

of all Jewish worship. Jesus employed this extended form of the Shema as the first of all commandments (Mark 12:29-30). Love for neighbor, while implied in the Decalogue (Exod. 20:12-17) and specifically enjoined in Lev. 19:18, did not have that integral correlation with love for God which Jesus gave it when He quoted Lev. 19:18 as the commandment second only to love for God (Mark 12:31). Instead, in the OT, love for God (inner holiness) is linked with keeping His commandments (Exod. 20:6; Deut. 7:9; 11:1; et al.) and walking in His ways (10:12; 19:9; et al.) (outer holiness).

At the early stages of the OT perception of loving God and keeping His commandments, the condition of the human heart became a focal element. Moses exhorted the people to circumcise their hearts in order to love God and serve Him (Deut. 10:12-16), and then recognized that God would have to perform this act so that they could love Him with all their heart (30:6). In Ezekiel, after exhorting His people to get "a new heart and a new spirit" (18:31), God promised He would give His people a new heart and a new spirit—that He would put His Spirit within them, thus enabling them to walk in His statutes and observe His ordinances (36:25-27). Thus the OT recognized (1) that keeping God's commandments and walking in His ways is a consequence of loving God with all the heart, soul, mind, and strength; and (2) that God must do a transforming work in the human heart to enable persons to love in this manner.

Jesus clearly epitomizes the Decalogue (the base of all other commandments, ordinances, and statutes of the OT) in the commandments to love God (quoting Deut. 6:4-5) and to love the neighbor (quoting Lev. 19:18). His radically new emphasis is that love for neighbor (outer holiness) is the inherent and inseparable corollary of love for God (inner holiness); so much so that even when the neighbor becomes an enemy, love is still the rule if we are to be perfect (*teleios*) as our Heavenly Father (Matt. 5:43-48): *perfect in love*. While Jesus retains the OT affirmation that love for God results in obedience (John 14:15, 21, 23; 15:10), it should be noted that these statements are bracketed by the commandment to love one another (13:34-35; 15:12, 17). Thus the essential obedience of love for God (inner holiness) is love for others (outer holiness).

The NT writers repeatedly highlight this reality (Rom. 13:8-10; Gal. 5:14; Jas. 2:8; 1 John 4:20-21; 5:2-3), further affirming: the love of God is perfected (*teleioō*) in whoever keeps God's Word (2:5—John immediately follows this state-

ment with an exposition of the commandment to love in vv. 7-11); if we love one another, love of God is perfected (*teleiōō*) in us (4:12); the bond of perfection (*teleiōtēs*) is love (Col. 3:14); and the goal (or "perfection," *telos*) of the Christian exhortation is love from a clean heart (1 Tim. 1:5).

The experience of perfect love is the work of the Holy Spirit in the believer's heart which has been cleansed by faith (Acts 15:9; cf. Matt. 5:8; 1 Tim. 1:5; 2 Tim. 2:22; 1 Pet. 1:22 [var.]). The love of God poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit (Rom. 5:5) is the decisive reality of Christian existence (Kittel, 1:49). This love (Gal. 5:22) is the perfect way (*teleios*—1 Cor. 13:10) which supercedes the gifts of the Spirit (1 Corinthians 12) and is greater even than faith and hope (1 Corinthians 13). First John brings all these together when, with his repeated injunctions to love one another (2:7-10; 3:11, 14, 23; 4:7, 11, 21), he notes that love is from God (3:1; 4:7, 9-10, 19); that those who love remain in God and God in them (3:24; 4:7, 12, 16); that this dwelling in God and God's indwelling has the witness of the Spirit (3:24; 4:13); and that those who so yield themselves to loving obedience are perfected in love (2:3-5; 4:12, 17).

See ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION, HOLINESS, PERFECT (PERFECTION), CHRISTIAN PERFECTION, LOVE.

For Further Reading: Wesley, *Plain Account of Christian Perfection*; "The Scripture Way of Salvation," *Works*, 6:43; Quell and Stauffer, "agapaō," Kittel, 1:21-55, esp. 27-35 and 44-55; Wood, *Perfect Love*; Taylor, *Life in the Spirit*.
M. ROBERT MULHOLLAND, JR.

PERFECTIONISM. The term *perfectionism* specifies the view that moral or spiritual perfection is the Christian ideal and is realizable in this life. It also designates a multifaceted movement of great power and interest in 19th-century American church life.

Prior to the Reformation, perfectionism appeared mostly in ascetic, Pelagian, or mystical forms. The Reformers were generally hostile to these forms of perfectionism, but their opposition paved the way for a more genuinely biblical orientation. Christian perfectionism entered the mainstream of Western Protestantism through the Wesleyan revival and received definitive formulation in the writings of John Wesley and John Fletcher.

In America, the merging streams of Wesleyan theology and Scottish common sense philosophy brought into dynamic conjunction the twin themes of free will and free grace. Lit by the fires of Finney revivalism, these conceptual explosives released into the mid-19th century church a per-

fectionistic energy which was to affect every vital nerve center of national life. Educational, social, economic, ecclesiastical, political, physiological, moral, and spiritual aspects of life all came under intense scrutiny as zealous Christians pursued the goal of universal reform.

The movement included various types. Most prominent among them were the community enterprises at Oneida, N.Y., and Oberlin, Ohio. At Oneida, John Humphrey Noyes advocated in the name of Christian perfection a style of living whose biblical underpinnings were suspect and whose ethical principles were scandalous. In his view, a Christian could rise above all need for external light and external authority and could actually become incapable of sinning. Central to the Oneida ethos was the practice of "open marriage," a concept which Noyes somehow derived from the principle of universal benevolence. The term *perfectionism* as such was probably most closely associated in the 19th-century mind with John Humphrey Noyes and Oneida.

In terms of biblical orthodoxy, moral consistency, and widespread influence, however, early Oberlin College stands without peer as the institutional embodiment of American perfectionism. Perfectionistic concern at Oberlin began with the sanctification of individuals. Here it was proclaimed that the new covenant in Christ promised a work of the Holy Spirit which could bring the human heart into perfect conformity with the moral law.

Individual sanctification, however, had social ramifications. Oberlin's president, Asa Mahan, maintained that the Christian Church is a universal reform society. The duty of Christians is to fight sin and wrong wherever it exists and to bring all of life under the sway of biblical principles through the powerful gospel of Christ. For Oberlinites and perfectionists generally, this meant such things as immediate emancipation of slaves, equal educational opportunities for women, temperance in eating and drinking, union among churches, and peace among nations. Benevolent societies were spawned to assist the needy, and moral suasion was brought fearlessly and effectively to bear upon the powerful. Motivating all was the vision of an approaching millennium which would consist primarily in the sanctification of the church.

See CHRISTIAN PERFECTION, PERFECT (PERFECTION), SOCIAL HOLINESS, SOCIAL ETHICS.

For Further Reading: Dayton, *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage*; Handy, *A Christian America: Protestant Hopes and Historical Realities*; Smith, *Revivalism and Social Reform*.
JAMES E. HAMILTON

PERISH. See LOST, LOST SOUL.

PERMISSIVE WILL. See PROVIDENCE.

PERMISSIVENESS. This is a neutral word denoting an attitude of allowance, permission, or enablement, such as *permissive legislation*. It receives negative or positive value from its context.

In the 20th century, permissiveness has acquired a distinctly pejorative connotation, particularly in Christian circles. The term conveys images of antinomianism, indiscipline, and immorality. As such, it is said to be an attitude which pervades society as a whole—a spirit of lawlessness and excessive tolerance (2 Tim. 3:1-5). It affects child-rearing practices, where sentimentality may replace loving correction; adolescent relationships, where self-gratification is called “love”; and adult life, where white-collar crime, infidelity, tax evasion, and lowering of ethical standards are all symptoms of permissiveness. A permissive society is one based upon the hedonistic philosophy of “Do your own thing.”

Theologically, permissiveness has been equated with antinomianism, a problem in some Early Church circles (cf. 1 John), and a label sometimes attached to Paul's doctrines of grace and freedom from the law. But the equation is inaccurate; Paul was neither an antinomian nor a legalist. For Paul, all of life was to be viewed from the dual perspectives of being “in Christ” and being part of the “body of Christ.” Within this context Paul's freedom was remarkable, but his freedom would never extend to practices which were not helpful or uplifting (1 Cor. 10:23).

Jesus' ethical teaching was in a similar vein: He was the fulfilment to the law. In Matthew, He proclaims the higher meaning of the law, summarizing His own teaching in the two commandments: to love God and to love one's neighbor. To lift Jesus' doctrine of love out of its biblical context of responsible action under God and use it as the slogan to justify the hedonism of “the permissive society” is a perversion of the first magnitude.

See FREEDOM, DISCIPLINE, LAW AND GRACE, ANTI-NOMIANISM, LICENSE.
KENT BROWER

PERPETUAL VIRGINITY. This refers to the Roman Catholic teaching that Jesus' mother, Mary, remained a virgin, even after she had become married to Joseph. Protestants understand, on various bases, that Joseph and Mary had normal marital relations. It is implied where we read,

“But he [Joseph] had no union with her until she gave birth to a son” (Matt. 1:25, NIV). It is also implied where we read of Jesus' “brothers” and “sisters,” all children of “the carpenter” and “Mary” (13:55-56, NIV). Actually, Protestants, who do not believe that marriage is a less spiritual state than celibacy, have no interest in trying to show that Jesus' mother was a perpetual virgin.

See MARIOLATRY, MOTHER OF GOD.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

PERSECUTION. See TRIBULATION.

PERSEVERANCE. As a theological term, *perseverance* relates to the persistence of the regenerate believer in running the Christian race (Heb. 12:1), and the certainty of the final outcome. Calvinists understand the concept differently than Arminians. Calvinists believe that the certainty of successful perseverance is inherent in the new birth. Arminians believe that perseverance is contingent. This is to say that the believer bears an obligation to choose continuously to maintain his relationship to God, and that there is real danger that he may fail to do so.

In the Calvinistic schema the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints is a correlative of (1) a concept of divine sovereignty which absolutizes the will of God in determining individual destiny, and (2) a view of the Atonement which sees it as a totally objective transaction, assuring unfailingly the salvation of the elect.

Unquestionably grace for perseverance is the constantly available gift of the Holy Spirit (2 Cor. 9:8). However, the Scriptures clearly warn against the danger of apostatizing. Paul speaks of his own concern: “Lest . . . I myself should be a castaway” (1 Cor. 9:27). The writer of Hebrews reflects this same concern for the Body of Christ when he states: “We want each of you to show this same diligence to the very end, in order to make your hope sure” (6:11, NIV; cf. vv. 4-6). Christ himself warns of the danger of not abiding in Him and of being cast into the fire (John 15:4-6). It is, therefore, perfectly clear that a man as a free moral agent must cooperate with God's grace, and himself persevere. See Col. 1:21-23; 1 Tim. 1:18-20; 6:12; Heb. 3:12; 5:9; 10:26 ff; 12:1-17; Rev. 2:5.

See ETERNAL SECURITY, FREEDOM, CONTINGENT, MONERGISM, SYNERGISM.

For Further Reading: *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 8:469-70; *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 11:447 ff; *Baker's DT*, 403 ff.

FOREST T. BENNER

PERSON, PERSONALITY. A person is a human or suprahuman self, characterized in its normal state by self-consciousness, self-decision, and uniqueness. A person is essentially unitary, not multiple, though he may possess conflicting or variant natures. The "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde" phenomenon reflects two natures, not two persons or individuals. Personality is the sum total of qualities which comprise individual personhood. A fetus is a true person in an embryonic stage of development, therefore without full legal rights as a person. God is the perfect prototype personality, after which all other levels of personhood are patterned. The divine image in man lies supremely in the fact that both God and man are personal beings.

Anthropology, sociology, psychology, and theology all have great concern for the person both individually and corporately. Cultural anthropology seeks to understand both the impact of cultural determinants upon the individual and the impact of the individual upon culture. Sociology considers social structures, power and organizational structures, service and maintenance structures, economic and technological forces as they all affect societal or community matrices. Psychology seeks to understand the individual as a total person.

Theories of personality attempt to understand, depict, and predict the structure of the personality, the development of personality, and the dynamics of personality. Personality, for the psychologist, is more than the connotation afforded by the street phrase "She has a vivacious personality" or "He has no personality at all."

There are several theories of personality. At the risk of semantic distortion or oversimplification we can say that these theories include a mechanistic view of man (behavioristic, Skinner), a genetic or physiological (Sheldon), a psychic determinism (Freud), a teleological or goal oriented (Allport), an environmentally determined (Lewin), or various combinations of source positions. No theory of personality has yet found universal acceptance among scholars in the field. The science is still rather new and imprecise both from the theoretical perspective and from the total validity, reliability, and interactive precision of instruments or designs for empirical research.

Theologically and biblically, the study of man is rather limited, also. OT terms for man include *basar*, *ruach*, and *nephesh*. *Basar*, "flesh," may denote all living creatures, man as a created being by the will of his Creator, or as a frail, powerless

being in God's sight. *Basar* deals far less with the essences of man than with his power.

Ruach is the life-giving power of the breath or Spirit of God that makes man a living soul. *Ruach* is not a substance but a power that is both creative and purposive. It brings wholeness, will, courage, direction, and resource to man as the sign and principle of God's Spirit at work in and upon man.

Nephesh is the life principle or life force which is often viewed as the soul when the context refers to loss or preservation of life. It is the seat of the senses, affections, and emotions of man, seldom referring to the wills and purposes of man. It is the *nephesh* which exhibits the power that the *ruach* provides. The Hebrew sees always the indivisible unity (both biological and psychic life) of the individual and sees him as incomplete apart from his corporate dimension and without meaning apart from the vitalizing power of God. The Hebrew mind deals with the intellectual, affective, and behavioral dimensions of man and metaphorically refers to various organs as the seat of the will, the desire, the emotions, etc., of man. But it always sees man-in-relation-to-God as the whole person.

The NT use of two and sometimes three words to encompass the totality of the person has given rise to a theological debate that has renewed itself periodically throughout the history of the Church, viz., whether man is essentially dual (dichotomous—body and soul/spirit) or threefold (trichotomous—body, soul, and spirit). Today many scholars believe that the intent of such biblical delineations of man is to encapsulate every aspect and vestige of man into one wholistic totality of the corporate man in Christ.

Again, whether man is viewed as *sarx* (akin to the Hebrew *basar*), flesh; *sōma*, biological body; *psuchē* (often translating *nephesh*), the free soul of man; or *pneuma* (translating *ruach*), spirit, he is seen as having no power apart from God's inward redemptive activity. Even his value as a person is linked to his salvability in Christ. Without Christ personhood atrophies and becomes distorted. Personhood finds its normalcy and development through the sanctifying of the Spirit upon and in the life of the believer.

The person, therefore, is a personality involving the dynamics of genetics, life forces, environment, and individual choice, in interaction with the grace of God. He is both unique and corporate, finding his completion only by and in Christ and His Body.

See MAN, DICHOTOMY, TRICHOTOMY, DEVELOPMENT (THEORIES OF), SOUL, SPIRIT, HUMAN NATURE, NATURE,

HUMANISM, PERSONALISM, DIVINE IMAGE, PERSONALITY OF GOD.

For Further Reading: Tournier, *The Whole Person in a Broken World*; Adcock, *Fundamentals of Psychology*; Mavis, *The Psychology of Christian Experience*; Arndt, *Theories of Personality*; Hall and Lindzey, *Theories of Personality*.
CHESTER O. GALLOWAY

PERSONALISM. The philosophy of personalism holds personality to be the key to understanding our world. The concept comes primarily from metaphysics and philosophy of religion.

The term is relatively new in the history of thought, although personalism is largely "a new name for some old ways of thinking." The word has been used for about 200 years, and its roots are found in both Europe and America. Borden Parker Bowne, professor of philosophy at Boston University 1876-1910, was its most systematic and influential exponent.

All who think seriously about Christian theology must have a special interest in the philosophy of personalism. The Bible teaches that a personal God created man in His own image; He created the physical world as a home for man; He loved even sinning persons so much that He sent His Son to redeem them and to provide eternal life for them. The philosophy of personalism offers a reasoned support for these truths.

Personalism is, therefore, usually a theistic world view, though some who use the term have denied the existence of a personal God. Others have been pantheistic. For them God is not a self-conscious spirit. Rather, all conscious persons are parts of Him. Typical personalism, however, supports a scriptural theism.

Personalism affirms the absoluteness of God. It holds the creation of the world to be a free act of the divine will, thus affirming the sacred Record. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" (Gen. 1:1). But nature has no independent reality. It is continuously produced by an intelligently directed power outside of itself.

The reality of the human spirit is the fundamental presupposition of personalism. All personalists hold that the self has a unique character. This human personality includes four fundamental elements: (1) individuality, including unity and identity; (2) self-consciousness—persons know and feel; (3) freedom to choose; and (4) dignity with worth. This high view of human personality owes its origin to Christian influence.

Albert Knudson writes, "The personality of God and the sacredness of human personality express the true genius of the Christian religion

... and ... these beliefs have received their completest philosophical justification in modern personalistic metaphysics. ... Personalism is *par excellence* the Christian philosophy of our day" (*The Philosophy of Personalism*, 80).

See PERSONALITY OF GOD, PERSON (PERSONALITY), METAPHYSICS.

For Further Reading: Knudson, *The Philosophy of Personalism*; Ferre, *A Theology of Christian Education*, chap. 6; Sanner and Harper, eds., *Exploring Christian Education*.
A. F. HARPER

PERSONALITY OF GOD. A person is a conscious, unique, individual entity; identical through the passage of time; permanent amidst change; a unifying agent experiencing itself in privacy; possessing the power of creativity through rationality, imagination, and the anticipation of the future; and an active, free agent, the only carrier of intrinsic value.

H. Rashdall in his analysis of personality singles out five elements: consciousness, permanence, a self-distinguishing identity, individuality, and most important of all, activity. J. W. Buckham finds four: self-consciousness, unity, freedom, and worth. In these respects Christian theism maintains that God is a person, and it is His personality that constitutes His reality. God is a conscious, unified, and individual entity. He is separate from material things; in fact, God is the Creator and Sustainer of matter. He is noumenal while everything else, except other persons, is phenomenal. God is an active, unifying agent and, along with other persons, is a carrier of ultimate, metaphysical value and intrinsic worth.

God, through His personality, is a thinking, feeling, and acting being. He loves, hates, reasons with, warns, communes with, entreats, judges, condemns, rewards, and punishes. All of these activities can be verified by many scriptural references.

See GOD, ATTRIBUTES (DIVINE), PERSONALISM.

For Further Reading: Buckham, *Personality and Psychology*; DeLong, *The Concept of Personality in the Philosophy of Ralph Barton Perry* (Ph.D. diss.); Knudson, *The Philosophy of Personalism*.
RUSSELL V. DELONG

PERSONALITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. The collective faith of the Christian Church gives witness to the personality of the Spirit. In the NT, the Spirit is revealed in such personal concepts as "Counselor" or *Paraclete* (John 14:26; 15:26; 16:7). He possesses the attribute of intelligence ("mind" as in Rom. 8:27). He makes intercession for us and helps us in our weakness (v. 26).

Again, the Spirit as a person may be grieved (Eph. 4:30).

While many have no problem in thinking of the Father and the Son as personal, the Spirit seems more difficult to describe. He seems like the personification of divine motion, not a truly personal member of the divine Trinity. Yet, Scripture attributes the powers of personhood to Him consistently. Thus for Paul the Father elects, the Son redeems, and the Spirit seals in the economy of grace (Eph. 1:4-14).

Full recognition of the Spirit's personhood emerged gradually during the first four Christian centuries. Christian theologians wrestled with the intellectual conflict between monotheism and Trinitarian thought. The Jewish religion was uncompromising in its belief in one God. The Council of Nicea (A.D. 325) defined the godhood of Christ, while Constantinople (A.D. 381) emphasized the personality of the Spirit.

The Early Church described Father, Son, and Spirit as a triunity of persons (Latin, *personae*). The concept "person" connoted the reality of each divine manifestation. In interpreting the Trinity, modalists like Sabellius erred in asserting a unity with an *apparent*, not a real, trinity. Orthodox theology insists that the three *personae* are the fullness of God, whose unity is a triunity, not a diversity of gods or a tritheism. Orthodox Trinitarianism never allows, as does tritheism, that Father, Son, and Spirit exist or function in separateness. There is *one* God, whose fullness is triune.

When we describe the Holy Spirit as personal, we mean that He is possessed of all the attributes known to be in God. There is no *essential* difference. Personhood for the Holy Spirit includes power of choice, self-consciousness, intelligence, and sensibility, even as for Father and Son, and, indeed, for human persons created in His image.

See ESSENTIAL TRINITY, HYPOSTASIS, TRINITY (THE HOLY), SABELLIANISM, PERSON (PERSONALITY), HOLY SPIRIT.

For Further Reading: Berkhof, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*; Thomas, *The Holy Spirit of God*; Carter, *The Person and Ministry of the Holy Spirit*.

LEON O. HYNSON

PHARISAISM. The term is derived from the sect of Pharisees who were one of the three main parties of the Jews at the time of Christ. Though at first this party was strong in religious character and some of its members were some of the best Jews, later generations deteriorated. Jesus was compelled to characterize them as "hypocrites." Of course not all were hypocrites: Paul before his conversion, Gamaliel, and Nicodemus were ex-

amples of the better Pharisees. This sect, more than any other, preserved Judaism and the law.

It was love of display and strict but empty legalism that earned for the Pharisees as a class the epithet "hypocrites." In NT times this term meant "playacting." Such acting led to the concept of *pharisaism*, which is rigid observance of external rules of religious conduct without any genuine piety. The term has come to be applied to all religions that make conformity to the law primary, and promise God's grace only to those who are doers of this law. Rather than religion being a disposition of heart, it becomes the performing of outward acts. Often called legalism, pharisaism bases salvation upon observance of external regulations and neglects the more important aspect of love and mercy.

See LEGALISM, LOVE, PERFECT LOVE, PHARISEES.

For Further Reading: HBD, 544 ff; *New Westminster Dictionary of the Bible*, 741 ff; NBD, 981 ff.

LEO G. COX

PHARISEES. A religious party or sect of Judaism originating in the times of the Maccabees and surviving after A.D. 70 as the dominant Jewish faction. Their new Jewish center at Jamnia provided the foundation for modern rabbinic Judaism.

The Pharisees probably grew out of the *hasidim* or Hasidaeans, the "godly people" who, after the return from exile, gave concerned leadership to practicing the sacred law and opposing Hellenization. Two great Jewish parties emerged in this period, the Sadducees from the priestly class, and the Pharisees from the scribes or students of the law. The name Pharisees, which means "the separated ones," first appears in the record of the king John Hyrcanus (134-104 B.C.) whose policies the Pharisees opposed. They came to favor and great influence in the time of Queen Alexandra (76-67 B.C.), a prestige which continued through the time of Jesus. Josephus estimated their number in Jesus' day at about 6,000. Because of popularity with the people many were chosen to the Sanhedrin. They were generally middle class.

The Pharisees were the orthodox core of Judaism. They held to the whole body of Jewish Scripture. They were the supernaturalists, believing, for example, in the resurrection of the righteous and in angels. In politics and moral philosophy they held mediating views: Most submitted to foreign domination as an expression of God's providence, at the same time holding to free will and the right of resistance to interference with their practice of God's revealed

will. Various schools of Pharisaism developed, such as those founded by Hillel and Shammai.

They passionately believed the written law of Moses, but equally the oral "tradition of the elders" which encased the law. They tried to apply the written law, in terms of the oral law, to every situation with meticulous, sometimes ludicrous, detail. Law keeping, often merely ceremonial, was to them meritorious, the only way to righteousness. They separated themselves from all other Jews, the "sinners," who failed to follow their practices.

Although Jesus maintained friendship with a few Pharisees, in general He clashed with their practices. They, in turn, harassed Him and plotted His death.

At the heart of Jesus' difference with the Pharisees lay His emphasis on love as the inner meaning and implementation of the law's requirements (Matt. 22:34-40). He taught a righteousness surpassing that of the Pharisees (5:20). They tended to see the law as a code sufficient within itself.

Jesus warned against the Pharisees' self-righteousness; their attention to outward ceremonies to the neglect of inward truth and purity; their inclination to trifling questions while neglecting "weightier matters" of judgment, mercy, and faith; their stress on the external "letter of the law" while overlooking the law's higher principle and intent; their pride and ostentation in performance of prayers, fasting, and alms; their imposition of burdens which they themselves could not carry; their censorious, exclusive spirit in place of loving concern. Because of this He called them hypocrites and blind guides (Matthew 23).

See PHARISAISM, LEGALISM, SADDUCEES, MORALISM, LOVE.

For Further Reading: Bruce, *New Testament History*; Barclay, ed., *The Bible and History*; Tenney, *New Testament Times*.

ARNOLD E. AIRHART

PHILANTHROPY. See LIBERALITY.

PHILIA. See BROTHERLY LOVE.

PHILOSOPHY. Philosophy, as the meaning of its Greek original may be interpreted, is the quest for or love of wisdom. The philosopher does not know so much as he seeks to know.

Thus philosophy is basically an attitude or spirit, a method of attaining knowledge, and the knowledge thus attained. As such, philosophy is a spirit of questioning which leaves no "sacred cows" untouched. Authority, convention, and common sense are the constant victims of its in-

terrogations. As individual sciences become absolute, philosophy helps in breaking the myth.

The areas of philosophy's concerns are *epistemology*, *ontology* or metaphysics, and *axiology*. *Epistemology* is an attempt to resolve the question of how we know (q.v. Knowledge). It is a study of the sources of knowledge: sensory experience and perception, intuition, tradition, logic and rational processes (q.v. Reason). It is a search for the test or criterion of truth: Can truth be found in sense perception, intuition, tradition, reason, scientific method, pragmatic method, or elsewhere? It is the function of philosophy to set up the method to determine which evidence is acceptable in progressing to understanding and truth.

Ontology is the attempt to use the methods determined in epistemology in order to know the nature of reality, being, or the ultimate. But since neither epistemology nor ontology can be independent of the other, it is a genuine problem as to which is prior to the other. Metaphysical systems are *idealism* (the ultimately real is of the nature of ideas, persons, or values), *materialism* (the ultimately real is of the nature of material particles, objects, or energy), and *realism* (the real is a many comprising mind, matter, values, etc.; or the real is that which is independent of mind).

Axiology is the study of the worthwhile or the valuable. It is concerned with what men do desire as well as what they ought to desire. This area is subdivided into Ethics, Aesthetics, and Philosophy of Religion. Ethics attempts to deal with such problems as the origin, nature, and truthfulness of conscience; the possibility of freedom and responsibility; as well as specific moral problems: capital punishment, sexual morality, racial relations, war and peace, genetic engineering, experiment on human beings. Aesthetics is primarily concerned with beauty in nature and human productions, principally called the fine arts. It examines the possibility of aesthetic standards, aesthetic truth, and aesthetic greatness. Aesthetics, ethics, and the philosophy of religion look together at the relationship between aesthetic experience, spiritual development, and maturity; and together they examine the problem of censorship. The philosophy of religion deals with proofs or evidence of God's existence, the nature of God, the manner of divine self-disclosure, the problem of evil, and the possibility of an afterlife.

Some ask whether there can truly be a Christian philosophy. Some say that a revelational system excludes all questioning; and if the philosophy-theology relation be regarded as a question-answer relation, then philosophy has

no real role. Others hold that while Christianity is much more than a theoretical system, it is at least this much. Therefore, since philosophy provides the methodology and impetus toward system building, there can certainly be a Christian philosophy: a Christian world view is a Christian philosophy.

The only use of the term "philosophy" in the NT is in Col. 2:8. This passage could refer to philosophy in general or to some particular type of philosophy, or it could refer to the setting aside of faith for some heretical philosophic stance. It is too brief and too unclear to be used as the basis for a wholesale rejection of philosophy. Nevertheless, both philosophy and theology may fear the other due to the possible threat that one may be limited by the other. Philosophy does not wish its questions to be merely secondary to theology's answers and thus return to its subservient status as *ancilla theologiae* (handmaid of theology). Nor is theology willing to accept the severe unsettling of questions which may lead to a rejection of its dogmas (or settled opinions from which it must not deviate). These concerns are common both to Roman Catholics and to Protestants. To these concerns it has been well said that both philosophy and theology are "modes of service of a truth which is always greater than what can be said of it in philosophical or theological propositions" (*Sacramentum Mundi*).

See THEOLOGY, METAPHYSICS, TRUTH, REVELATION (SPECIAL), EPISTEMOLOGY, VALUES, POSITIVISM, AESTHETICS, ETHICS, KNOWLEDGE, AXIOLOGY, REALISM IN THEOLOGY.

For Further Reading: *Sacramentum Mundi*, 5:1-20; *Concise Encyclopedia of Western Philosophy and Philosophers*; Merleau-Ponty, *In Praise of Philosophy*; Wheelwright, *The Way of Philosophy*.

R. DUANE THOMPSON

PIETISM. In the narrow sense, Pietism signifies a movement of spiritual renewal within the Lutheran and Reformed churches in continental Europe in the 17th and 18th centuries, though some beginnings were already discernible in the late 16th century. It is associated with such names as Johann Arndt, Philip Spener, August Hermann Francke, Willem Teelinck, Gerhard Tersteegen, Count Nicolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf, and Johann Albrecht Bengel. In the broader sense it includes these kindred movements of spiritual purification: Puritanism, Methodism, and later evangelical revivalism (which should probably be called neo-Pietism). It also has an affinity to Jansenism and Quietism in the Roman Catholic church, both of which emphasized the religion of the heart.

Pietism is noted for its stress on heart religion (*Herzensreligion*). The heart in this context signifies the center of the personality. True religion must be inward, existential, total, and experiential. Yet the Pietists insisted that our experience is not the source of faith (only the Word of God is that) but the medium of our faith. In this perspective, faith that results in salvation is not just outward or intellectual: it must affect the very center of human being, the "inner man."

Another salient theme in Pietism was the new birth (*Wiedergeburt*). While Luther and orthodox Lutheranism placed the accent on forensic, extrinsic justification, the Pietists, perhaps under a Calvinist influence, underlined the need for regeneration as well. It was not any particular experience of the new birth but the fact of the new birth that was deemed of crucial importance. Neither Spener nor Zinzendorf claimed a special, datable experience of conversion, though in the later Pietism of August Francke increasing significance was attached to a specific or patterned experience of conversion.

The concern for the imitation of Christ (*Nachfolge Christi*) was still another earmark of Pietism. While the Reformation was preoccupied with right doctrine, the Pietists focused upon right life. Attention was given not only to the saving work of Christ but also to His teachings. In their emphasis on a reformation in life they saw themselves as fulfilling the Reformation. At the same time, they regarded Christian practice or discipleship under the Cross not as the basis of our justification but as its cardinal fruit and evidence.

Reacting against the Reformation stress on the total helplessness of man, they insisted that the Christian could make real progress toward perfection in holiness through the grace of God. According to Spener, we cannot fulfill the law, but as Christians we can keep the law.

Whereas both Lutheran and Reformed orthodoxy were fascinated with the Cartesian model of clear and distinct ideas, the Pietists remained closer to the original Reformation in their candid recognition of the limitations of reason. God cannot be comprehended by the mind but can only be felt in experience (Zinzendorf). They did not deny the natural knowledge of God but generally regarded it as sufficient to condemn, not save us. Spener attacked the dependence of theology on the "heathen philosophy" of Aristotle.

The idea of the preparation of the heart was also present in Pietism as in Puritanism. Although Spener held that faith is usually given instantaneously through the hearing of the Word, he did believe that sometimes the Spirit of God

by a prior work of grace prepares people for a more ready acceptance of the Word. Francke was convinced that the law sets the stage for the gospel and that before there can be real faith, there must be a struggle toward repentance (*Busskampf*).

The moral dualism of the Pietists reveals their affinity with the Reformers and their distance from the tradition of mysticism (which was inclined toward monism). Even though the Pietists encouraged the reading of the mystics for personal devotions, they saw the principal cleavage as being not between time and eternity (as with the radical mystics) but between faith and unbelief, salvation and sin, the kingdom of God and the demonic kingdom of darkness.

Pietists have often been accused of subjectivism, and it is true that they emphasized the spirit over the letter of the Bible. They occasionally differentiated between the form and content, the kernel and husk, of Scripture. Yet their concern was not to find a Word beyond the Bible but to discover the treasure of the gospel within the Bible. Above all, the Bible was to be read in a spirit of devotion rather than with academic curiosity. Though acknowledging the possibility of special revelations, they held that these private illuminations must be conformable to Holy Scripture and not conflict with the light that has already been given in Jesus Christ.

Pietism is also noted for the fact that it gave tangible expression to the Reformation doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. Spener advocated the formation of conventicles, private gatherings which usually met on Sunday evenings for Bible readings, prayer, and discussion of the sermon. These meetings came to include hymn singing, meditations, and even sermons, which were given as a supplement to the morning homily. These fellowships became known as the *collegia pietatis*, from which the Pietist movement derives its name.

A final distinguishing feature of Pietism is its emphasis on the urgency of mission. Zinzendorf declared: "My joy until I die: to win souls for the Lamb!" Indeed, Protestant missions can be said to have begun with Pietism. The great missionary societies within Protestantism in the 18th and 19th centuries as well as the Inner Mission of the 19th and 20th centuries have their roots in Pietism. The Reformation generally saw the two practical marks of the true Church as the preaching of the Word and the right administration of the sacraments; to these the Pietists in effect added the fellowship of love (*koinonia*) and a zeal for missions.

The Pietists remind us that Christianity has to do with life as well as doctrine, ethical action and spiritual devotion as well as theology. We need to heed their warning that justification cannot stand by itself but must be fulfilled in sanctification. Even though the righteousness of Christ entitles us to heaven, we are not qualified to enter heaven apart from personal holiness.

We can learn from Pietism that Christian practice is the field in which our sanctification is carried forward. The Pietists sought to hold the practical and mystical dimensions of the faith in balance, though Pietism was more aggressive than contemplative, more practical than theological (John F. Hurst).

Out of the awakenings associated with Pietism came a concern for the oppressed and destitute in society. Besides founding orphanages, homes for unwed mothers, homes for epileptics, and deaconess hospitals, the Pietists and later evangelicals pioneered in the area of social justice. Their efforts played a major role in the abolition of slavery, prison reform, and legislation against child labor abuse, animal cruelty, and prostitution.

A constant danger in Pietism is that its inclination to elevate life and experience over doctrine often promotes doctrinal indifferentism and latitudinarianism. It is an open fact that the University of Halle, founded by the early Pietists, became within two generations a bastion of rationalism.

Subjectivism is another temptation within Pietism. Even though the early Pietists had a high view of the sacraments and preaching, their stress on the immediacy of the Word tended to obscure the mediate role of the Church and the sacraments. The radical Pietists became sectarian and individualistic.

Pietism was also inclined to neglect the doctrine of creation by focusing so intently on personal salvation. We need to remember that redemption does not annul creation but only the sin that distorts creation.

At its best, Pietism sought to penetrate and transform society with the leaven of the gospel. At its worst, Pietism became defensive, cultivating a fortress mentality that regarded the world as totally under the sway of the powers of darkness; the strategy then became that of building citadels of light in a dark world.

See PIETY, EVANGELICAL, PURITAN (PURITANISM), METHODISM, SYNERGISM, PREVENTIVE GRACE, WESLEYANISM, HOLINESS MOVEMENT, DEVOTE (DEVOTION), SOCIAL ETHICS, PIETISM (ENGLISH EVANGELICAL).

For Further Reading: Brown, *Understanding Pietism*; Stoeffler, *German Pietism During the Eighteenth Century*;

The Rise of Evangelical Pietism; Continental Pietism and Early American Christianity; Bloesch, "The Legacy of Pietism," *The Evangelical Renaissance*, 101-55.

DONALD G. BLOESCH

PIETISM, ENGLISH EVANGELICAL. Few religious movements have been so misunderstood and unjustly maligned as Pietism. Until recently the role of English Pietism has gone unchronicled. Springing from the Geneva-Rhineland tradition of Martin Bucer and antedating continental Pietism (Spener), the movement was to profoundly influence Anglicanism, producing the Puritan sector of the British and American church, and creating the ethical and spiritual concerns that were to mark Methodism and the later American holiness movement. Many Wesleyan scholars now recognize the roots of Wesley as being more entwined in English Pietism than in Continental sources.

Following the Bucerian emphasis on "living doctrine," Pietism's interest lay in practical, everyday living rather than doctrine. The Bible, rather than the creeds, became the authority. Christianity is to be lived as well as confessed. In following the rules of biblical interpretation as set down by Thomas Greenham, the movement adopted the principle that not only is sin forbidden but its occasion as well. Thus, the contemporary evangelical's antagonism to the theatre, the dance, and the saloon is rooted in English Pietism. The terms characteristic of this tradition, such as *experiential*, *inward*, or *personal*, reflect a concept of the essence of Christianity as being a personally meaningful new-birth relationship to God. Henry Smith's statement that "an almost Christian is no Christian" discovers the pietistic drive to a Christian perfection which prepared England for Wesley's position. The pietistic insistence on an experiential "I-Thou" relationship, resulting in an inner personal knowledge of divine approbation, was closely related to Wesley's doctrine of assurance. England's 17th-century pietistic conventicle anticipated the Methodist society, the holiness prayer meeting, and the contemporary home Bible study group.

See PIETISM, PURITAN (PURITANISM), WESLEYANISM.

For Further Reading: Stouffler, *The Rise of Evangelical Pietism*.

FOREST T. BENNER

PIETY. *Piety* refers to the attitudes and practices which God demands, requests, and expects of those who place faith in His person and His work. Today, in some circles, the term has bad connotations, being associated with pretensions

and spiritual pride (see Paul's "form of godliness" [2 Tim. 3:5]).

The noun used in the NT is *eusebeia*, mentioned 14 times in the Pastoral and General Epistles, and is usually translated "godliness." Godliness is associated with holy living, as well as performing acts of spiritual worship (1 Tim. 2:2; 5:4; 6:3; 2 Pet. 1:3, 6). Piety is synonymous with "holy and godly lives"—the fruit of faith and hope in the second coming of Christ (Jas. 1:26; 2 Pet. 3:11-12).

Piety is synonymous with the OT "fear of the Lord." Among OT saints a holy and godly life was grounded in reverence, submission, and obedience to God.

Piety is a response to God's revelation of himself and His will. It is equated with holiness (1 Pet. 1:15; 2 Cor. 7:1; 1 Thess. 4:3) and includes separation from the world, overcoming temptations, mortification of sin, and the cultivation of faith, hope, and love.

See PIETISM, GODLINESS.

For Further Reading: Kepler, ed., *The Fellowship of Saints; Law, A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*; Sangster, *The Pure in Heart*, 95-182.

BERT H. HALL

PIGEON. See DOVE.

PILGRIM. A pilgrim is one visiting a sacred place for worship, as the Jews coming to Jerusalem on feast days. Also, a pilgrim is a traveler, dwelling temporarily as a stranger and an alien, but moving toward a specific destination. The term will be considered in the latter sense.

The people of the old covenant were considered strangers and pilgrims. They were on a pilgrimage toward the Promised Land and beyond (Gen. 15:13; Exod. 22:21; Lev. 25:23; 1 Chron. 29:15). This journey was both physical and spiritual, a pilgrimage of revelation plus destination.

Peter describes the people of the new covenant as strangers away from home, and admonishes them to abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul. As aliens, strangers, and pilgrims on earth, their real citizenship is in heaven (1 Pet. 1:1, 17; 2:10-11; Phil. 3:20; 1 Pet. 1:4).

The classic passage which describes the concept of the pilgrimage of the people of God throughout history is Heb. 11:8-16. The patriarchs and those who followed were considered strangers and pilgrims on earth. They were moving towards their permanent home with the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb (Rev. 21:22-26).

This call to the life of a pilgrim, not unlike that of Abraham, is the same for all believers. We are

called from what we are to what we can become in Christ Jesus. We look forward to the eschatological kingdom of God coming in all its glory (1 John 3:1-3).

The Christian is a pilgrim of eternity; a traveler on the way, never wearily giving up the journey, but living in hope and dying in expectation. For this reason alone God is not ashamed to be called his God. He lives as one who is looking beyond the visible and tangible, and through the eye of faith, sees the coming kingdom of God.

Living in the world as a stranger and pilgrim does not mean that the Christian despises the world. Being a member of any community implies responsibility. However, the Christian keeps himself unspotted from the world by nonconformity to its standards. A pilgrim lives by the law of the kingdom of God (Rom. 12:1-2; John 17:12). The world is his stage towards his permanent home, not his goal.

See LIFE-STYLE, WORLD (WORLDLINESS), HEAVEN, VALUES, HOPE.

For Further Reading: Barclay, *New Testament Words*, 142-50; BBC, 10:142-46; Wiley, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 366-70.

ISAAC BALDEO

PITY, PITIFUL. See COMPASSION.

PLATONISM. This refers to the kind of philosophy taught by the great Athenian thinker, Plato, who lived 427-347 B.C.

Unlike the Greek philosophers from Thales onwards, who had been materialists of various sorts, Plato was the first distinguished idealist. The earlier men had believed that such material elements as water, or earth, or air, or fire, or combinations of them, are what ultimate reality is composed of. In distinction from them, Plato taught that materialities of that sort have only shadowy and not-really-real existence. What is real, metaphysically real, for Plato, is ideas, or concepts—the most significant of these concepts being the true, the beautiful, and the good (with the “good” as the very highest).

It is this kind of metaphysics that was in vogue when Christianity was being birthed. Actually, it was in vogue for many centuries in the East and in the West, but much more especially in the East.

Some early Christians such as Justin Martyr, who flourished at around the middle of the second century of the Christian era, had been professional philosophers, of the Platonic sort, before becoming Christians—and they carried that kind of understanding over into their theologizing as Christians. This was not altogether

unfortunate, for metaphysical idealism is much more congenial to Christian faith than metaphysical materialism is—for materialism does not even admit the existence of God.

However, Platonism was so extreme that it tended to deprecate materiality in a wide-scope way. Insofar as materiality has any existence at all, it was conceived of as evil per se, and not as the creation of God.

This extreme antiphysicalism tended, therefore, to depreciate the biblical doctrine that God created the world—some, Gnostic-inclined as well as Platonic, saying that an evil God, the Demiurge, had created matter. The human body was also deprecated because it partakes of materiality—as Origen (185-254) and others taught. If Platonism was not in agreement with the plain teaching of Scripture (as it is not, on the body, and on sexuality expressed in marriage), the Platonic Christians such as Origen viewed Scripture as having a hidden, allegorical meaning; and they taught that that meaning is in agreement with Platonism’s idealism.

While it was customary for OT prophets (such as Isaiah, Hosea, and Ezekiel) to be married, and while NT figures such as the apostle Peter were, it was Platonism, with its deprecating of physicality, that occasioned the refraining from marriage in the hermits—and later among the monks, nuns, and priests of Catholicism.

Biblical teaching, with its doctrine of creation, of incarnation, of the sacraments (with their material elements), of marriage, and of the resurrection of the body (Platonism had taught that only the soul will survive death), locates somewhere between the materialism of the pre-Platonic philosophers, and Platonism.

See METAPHYSICS, THOMISM, REALISM AND NOMINALISM, REALISM, REALISM IN THEOLOGY, NEOPLATONISM.

For Further Reading: Copleston, *A History of Philosophy*; Goeghegan, *Platonism in Recent Religious Thought*; Merlan, *From Platonism to Neo-platonism*.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

PLEASURE. We feel pleasure when physical, mental, or spiritual experiences satisfy us. Certain pleasures accompany the easing of pain, e.g., we feel good when a blanket chases away the cold. Other pleasures accompany the realization of our personal potential, e.g., we feel satisfied after building something or scoring well on an exam. Perhaps “the greatest of all pleasures,” as Thomas Aquinas thought, “consists in the contemplation of truth.”

So pleasures vary widely. Men and women, young people and aged people, illiterate and er-

udite people, all have different criteria for pleasure. Individually, some things please us more at one time in our lives than they do at other times. Thus it is difficult to define pleasure clearly, though all of us prefer pleasure to pain.

Pleasures may ultimately be good or bad. One of life's great pleasures, eating tasty food, becomes gluttony if undisciplined. The healthy pleasure of sex may be perverted into promiscuity and infidelity. The normal pleasure of rest and sleep may slip into sloth and shiftlessness. The positive pleasure of pursuing and finding truth easily leads to intellectual arrogance and pride. The spiritual pleasure of sins' forgiveness can be perverted into a pharisaical pride in one's sinlessness. Good pleasures become bad when pursued or attained contrary to what is Good.

Some thinkers have argued we should seek pleasure itself as life's *summum bonum*. In ancient Greece, Epicurus suggested we should avoid pain and enjoy the peaceful pleasures of home and garden. His Roman interpreter, Lucretius, further advises us to consider good only what physically pleases us. Later English thinkers (Hobbes, Locke, Hume) decided that pleasure gives measurable guidance in ethics, and 19th-century utilitarians such as Jeremy Bentham even sought to devise a "calculus of pleasures" to determine what we ought to do. Sigmund Freud's psychoanalysis rests largely upon his notion that we are happiest when indulging in sensual pleasure. Rather like the ancient preacher of Ecclesiastes, we are told: "A man hath no better thing under the sun, than to eat, and to drink, and to be merry" (8:15).

In contrast, other thinkers have admonished us to resist the pleasure impulse. Ancient Stoics urged us to deny fleshly appetites in order to live the life of reason. Baruch Spinoza counsels us to sacrifice physical for intellectual goods.

Though the ascetic impulse certainly helps cultivate self-discipline and creates vigorous cultural institutions, excessive denial of the goodness of God-given pleasures may lead to psychological frustrations and social cruelties, such as those evident in certain rigorous 17th-century Puritans.

As is true in so much of life, pleasures should be balanced, moderate, and temperate. God's gifts may be properly enjoyed (1 Tim. 6:17); but they also may be improperly enjoyed. The intent with which we seek pleasure, the impact our enjoyment has on us and others, and the ultimate contribution the pleasure makes on our development as disciples of Christ all help determine the moral worth of a given pleasure.

In the final analysis pleasure must be kept subordinate to holiness, as exemplified in Moses, who chose "rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season" (Heb. 11:25). Being "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God" is a mark of the last days (2 Tim. 3:4). The biblical standard for Christians is to favor spiritual pleasures over purely natural ones, not by denouncing the natural as sinful, but by disciplining them to keep their place in a Christian hierarchy of values. The supremacy of Christ in one's life makes pleasing Him the supreme pleasure.

See ASCIOLOGY, VALUES, HAPPINESS, HOLINESS, LIFESTYLE.

For Further Reading: Festigiore, *Epicurus and His Gods*; Lewis, *The Problem of Pain*; Freud, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*.
GERARD REED

PLENARY. This word means "full"; and, in theology, it is used especially of the conservative view of the inspiration of Scripture—that all of Scripture is inspired, and that God helped the Scripture writers so "fully" that what they wrote is altogether trustworthy. It is not a theory of the mode of inspiration, but the view that all of Scripture is inspired. Only conservatives would advocate plenary inspiration—not liberals. Some conservatives who advocate it are verbal inspiration theorists, who understand that each word of Scripture was inspired. Others are dynamic plenary-inspiration theorists, who believe that the Scripture writers were inspired with certain thoughts, but that the choice of words was their own. Some combine both views, affirming that inspiration extended to the words as far as necessary to achieve accuracy, but not in such a way as to constitute dictation, or hamper a writer's own natural style.

See INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

PLURALISM. This usually has to do with a rare kind of metaphysics taught by Harvard's William James, at around our century's turn, in *A Pluralistic Universe*. James taught that ultimate reality is not one, nor two (a good and a bad ultimate being), but many. He says that ultimate reality exists distributively, as numerous qualitatively different ultimate "eaches," only one of which is God.

Pluralism is sometimes a term used to describe a tolerant attitude in which varying views are acceptable within a given group, such as a church denomination.

See MONISM, DUALISM, REALISM.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

POLYGAMY. It is generally assumed in Christian theology that polygamy runs counter to the concept of godly living. Surprisingly, though, there is little written against the practice of polygamy in the Bible. Kings were warned not to "multiply wives" lest they be led to turn away from God (Deut. 17:17), and bishops and deacons were to be "the husband of one wife" (1 Tim. 3:2, cf. 12), but there is no explicit commandment forbidding polygamy. In fact, there was a law to protect the children of the least favored wife when a man had more than one wife (Deut. 21:15-17).

However, the basic presumption of the Bible is that each man will have only one wife. In the creation account, God provided Adam with one helper (Gen. 2:18-24); the Torah seems to assume monogamy in its legal pronouncements (Lev. 18:8; 21:13-14; Deut. 22:22; etc.); the portrait of the good wife in Prov. 31:10-31 suggests only one wife; and the advice Paul gave the Corinthians concerning marriage implies a monogamous relationship (1 Corinthians 7). The indication from the Bible is that the common people generally practiced monogamy, though this may be more reflective of their economic status than their spirituality.

Perhaps it is significant that the first mention of polygamy in the Bible occurs in connection with one of the descendants of Cain (Gen. 4:19), the implication being that the departure from the monogamous standard set in creation occurred in the lineage of one who had gone away from the presence of the Lord.

It is of unquestionable significance that the monogamous relationship of the "two" becoming "one flesh" is utilized by Paul as an analogue of the relationship between Christ and the Church (Eph. 5:31-32). The spiritual dimensions of the analogy absolutizes the Christian conviction that monogamy is God's will for those whom He created in His image.

See MARRIAGE, FAMILY, SEX (SEXUALITY).

For Further Reading: Westermarck, *The History of Marriage*, 2:1-222; Mace, *Hebrew Marriage*, 121-41; Par-rinder, *The Bible and Polygamy*.

WILLIAM B. COKER

POLYTHEISM. Polytheism literally means "many gods." It refers to the belief in and worship of more than one god.

Concerning the origin of polytheism, there is a difference of opinion. Theological liberals tend to believe that it is a stage in the development of

belief towards one supreme God. The conservative view is that it is a corruption of the original revelation of God to man.

The Genesis account teaches that originally man was fully aware of his Creator and worshipped Him only. The Bible is confirmed by scholars such as N. Schmidt who insist that there is historical evidence that polytheism is a corruption of the belief in one God. On Rom. 1:22-23, C. H. Dodd comments: "There is a surprising amount of evidence that among very many peoples . . . a belief in some kind of Creator Spirit subsists along with a more or less obscure sense that this belief belongs to a superior, or a more ancient order" (*Epistle to the Romans*).

Polytheism differs from animism, which is the attribution of living soul to inanimate objects and natural phenomena. It is a higher state of belief than polydaemonism. The gods of polytheism are of a higher order and are more clearly defined. Among the ancients some of the gods were tribal or national heroes, adulated in their lifetime and deified after death.

The Bible roundly condemns polytheism and its close attendant, idolatry. In polytheism man makes "gods" in his own depraved image. He attributes to them not only the virtues which he admires but also unlimited freedom to practice the vices he craves to indulge. This in turn gives him a license to sin. Furthermore, polytheism divides the human race into partisans of different deities instead of uniting it under one Father.

In the realm of science, monotheism is essential for the belief in a *universe*, bearing the imprint of one Mind and sustained by one Almighty Power.

See GOD, RELIGION, MONOTHEISM, IDOL (IDOLATRY).

For Further Reading: *ERE*, 10:112-14; Pope, *A Compendium of Christian Theology*, 1:252, 373-81; *Baker's DT*, 248-52.

JACK FORD

POPE. See CATHOLICISM, ROMAN.

POSITIONAL HOLINESS. As a biblical concept, the term *positional holiness* derives from the truth that because of their spiritual *position* of being in Christ, all believers are holy. A NT example of this objective and inclusive use of holiness is the carnal Corinthian Christians whom Paul said were "sanctified" because they were "in Christ" (1 Cor. 3:1-3; 1:2).

As a theological expression, positional holiness occupies a more central place and is used with greater frequency in the Keswick movement than in Wesleyan-Arminian circles. This fact may be rooted in some underlying presuppositions

which constitute more than semantic and/or apparent differences between these theological systems. For careful analysis reveals that the Keswickian understanding of positional holiness is grounded in the realistic and the federal or immediate imputation theories of the transmission of original sin.

With the realistic theory constituting the context for the federal or immediate imputation theory, the two are fused in Keswickian assumptions and form a nonethical concept of solidarity with Adam. That is, all men are condemned for that which they did not *personally and willfully* do, viz., the committal of Adam's transgression. This concept of nonethical solidarity at the presuppositional level in Keswickian theology carries over into its understanding of sanctification. For when the realistic theory is logically extended to the foundation for holiness in Keswickian thinking, it is necessary to posit that all believers *really* or actually participated in the death and resurrection of Christ, even as all men *really* participated in the sin of Adam. Consequently (and consistently), even as *all men* sinned because of a realistic relationship to Adam, so *all believers* were perfectly sanctified because of their realistic relationship to Christ.

Taking a somewhat different approach, the federal theory centers in the *legal imputation* of Adam's sin to the race. If the antithesis between Adam and Christ in Rom. 5:12-21 is interpreted in terms of this theory, then Christ as the Federal Head of the new humanity legally imputes the benefits of His redemptive deed (which includes holiness) to believers. And if men are regarded as sinners by virtue of their connection with Adam, their federal head, then it logically follows that all believers are to be considered perfectly holy by virtue of their relationship to or "position" in Christ.

Because these theories of original sin, separately and unitedly, make men sinners without ethical response, they set the stage for making believers holy without ethical response. Consequently, positional holiness as a general objective term descriptive of all believers is so radically changed that it displaces subjective, experiential sanctification as the central focus of NT holiness, making it an optional (albeit important) rather than an essential component in the process of salvation.

See IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS, HOLINESS, ORIGINAL SIN, IN CHRIST, IN ADAM.

For Further Reading: Brockett, *Scriptural Freedom from Sin*, 152-55; Chafer, *He That Is Spiritual*; Howard, *Newness of Life*, 96, 203-4; Purkiser, *Conflicting Concepts of Holiness*, 9-21.

JOHN G. MERRITT

POSITIVISM. Positivism is the modern and rather widespread belief that the only knowledge which is possible comes to us through the data provided by sense experience. Real knowledge is said to be limited to scientific description, i.e., to sense objects and the experimental and observable relations between them. Such knowledge is said to be "positive" as over against the claim to knowledge from any other source. Coming from the empiricist tradition, the view represents a dogmatic faith in the assured results of the scientific method.

The French philosopher Auguste Comte (1798-1857) taught that civilized human thought has advanced through three stages: (1) the theological, (2) the metaphysical, and (3) the positive. The latter, the present stage, repudiates all appeal to supernatural or other-than-physical agencies or abstractions which characterized the earlier stages.

Logical positivism is the 20th-century school of thought which sees the task of philosophy as the verification or falsification of truth claims by means of the analysis of language, based on the appeal to experience.

Positivism, professing humility as regards knowledge, is, in relation to knowledge, skeptical, and in relation to religion, agnostic or atheistic. It brushes aside all questions as to ontology or ultimate reality, including a "world view," as meaningless, professing interest only in phenomena, "the given" or sense experience. It affirms that reality is without purpose, and denies the supernatural, divine revelation, and the afterlife.

See PHILOSOPHY, METAPHYSICS, EPISTEMOLOGY, REVELATION (NATURAL), REVELATION (SPECIAL).

For Further Reading: Fern, ed., *A History of Philosophical Systems*; Hutchison, *Living Options in World Philosophy*; Titus, *Living Issues in Philosophy*.

ARNOLD E. AIRHART

POSTMILLENNIALISM. Postmillennialism is the view that Christ will come supernaturally to this earth to establish His kingdom *following* the period of 1,000 years of peace, prosperity, blessing, and grace known as the millennium or the golden era. It stands opposed to premillennialism, which teaches that Christ must come back in glory and power to establish His kingdom in this world, as a political entity, for 1,000 years (Rev. 20:1-7).

Historically, the postmillennial thinker held that the Church is to rule on the earth for 1,000 years. It is a period in the Holy Spirit age when the Church shall be renewed and so conscious

of its spiritual strength that it shall triumph over the powers of evil. This will come about through the conversion of the heathen, the revivals in the culture, the obtaining control of society by Christians, and the transformation of societal forms by believers.

According to some postmillennialists, the period of 1,000 years is figurative, like most figures in Revelation. The era was introduced by Jesus' victory over Satan on Calvary in which the strong man was bound. He can no longer deceive the nations as he did previous to Calvary. He is limited in his activity so that Christian conversions of individuals, transformation of social institutions, and improvement of social, political, and economic conditions will grow apace. Charles G. Finney was a postmillennialist who believed that revivals would ultimately cease because so many people would be converted that the millennium would come. It was to be introduced by the increase of Christians, their assuming places of leadership and power as reigning with Christ, and their preparation for His advent.

A more modern form of postmillennialism is the popular view of naturalistic evolution. By this the upward development of people toward a utopia is inevitable. The golden era will be gained by purposeful development of human effort. History demonstrates this process.

Biblically, the second coming of Christ will usher in the resurrection of and the judgment of all men, the external Kingdom, and the new creation.

Many Christians find postmillennialism difficult to harmonize with the Scriptures.

See REVELATION (BOOK OF), PREMILLENNIALISM, AMILLENNIALISM.

For Further Reading: Ludwigsen, *A Survey of Bible Prophecy*, 94-103; Hills, *Fundamental Christian Theology*, 2:339-60. HAROLD J. OCKENGA

POVERTY. Poverty may be defined as a state of material deprivation, wherein the necessities of life are either inadequate or uncertain. Obviously such a definition permits a large spread of opinion as to the level of need to be labelled the poverty level. That which is so labelled in prosperous Western nations would seem like affluence in the eyes of millions elsewhere.

Concern for the poor is deeply pervasive in the Bible. It runs through the Law, the Wisdom literature, the Prophets, and certainly the NT. Poverty can be said to be a touchstone of character, both of those not poor and of those who are.

Those not poor are commanded to assist the

poor and are promised blessings for so doing. Among the Israelites loans were to be made without interest. If lands had to be sold, they were to be returned in the year of jubilee. Inherited property rights were not to be violated. Crops were to be partially left in the vineyards and fields for the gleaning of the poor. The rights of the poor were to be scrupulously guarded in the courts.

Yet the Bible outlines no foolproof social structure or system guaranteed to prevent poverty. The universal counsels are love and hard work. On the one hand communities are to exercise loving care for those in need (1 Tim. 6:17-19; 1 John 3:17-18), and on the other hand everyone is to find some useful and if possible gainful occupation, in order that he might cease being a receiver and become a giver (Titus 3:14).

The Bible is not very optimistic about the prospect of completely eliminating poverty in this era (Deut. 15:11; Matt. 26:11). This is because the causes of poverty are complex, and there are no simple solutions. Sin, of course, is the root cause, for sin prompts the selfishness, greed, calousness, injustice, and oppression which perpetuates poverty. But sin also must be blamed for much of the indolence, mismanagement, and dissipation often found among the poor themselves, which aggravates their plight. But beyond this are the factors of poor health, unequal intelligence and abilities, and unequal access to resources, factors for which the poor cannot be blamed and which cannot always be changed. In spite of their best efforts some human beings will in the nature of things be dependent. They are entitled by virtue of our common humanity to the love and care which they need. Throughout history care has gladly been given by both devout Jews and true Christians (cf. Gal. 2:10). It was from the Church that society learned how to care.

But poverty is a touchstone of character for the poor as well as others. For in the Bible is also a vein of philosophy which refuses to exaggerate the calamity of poverty. It can be a blessing as well as a curse. It need not be—if the poverty is only moderate—an impediment to a high standard of living (properly defined). For Jesus had no place to lay His head, and when He died He left behind only the clothes He had on. Yet who could have lived a fuller life or in the process made others richer—"that ye through his poverty might be rich" (2 Cor. 8:9).

Furthermore, poverty can be a test of stewardship. Paul was elated to tell of the churches in Macedonia, "how that in a great trial of affliction

the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality" (v. 2; cf. Mark 12:44).

Not only can poverty be a test of stewardship but of one's sense of values. While there are proper ways to improve one's lot in life, an excessive scrambling to get ahead can be spiritually fatal (1 Tim. 6:6-10). Churches also can fall into the snare of chasing after the rich to the neglect of the poor; even in this way poverty is a touchstone of character. But James has some pointed things to say about such churches (Jas. 2:1-9).

See MONEY, HUMILITY, STEWARDSHIP, LABOR.

For Further Reading: *Baker's DCE*, 515 f, 518 f; Wirt, *The Social Conscience of the Evangelical*; DeWolf, *Responsible Freedom*, 257-76. RICHARD S. TAYLOR

POWER. Paul Lehmann's simple dictum claims that "power is the energy and the authority by which whatever happens in the world occurs" (*A Handbook of Christian Theology*, 269).

Runes's *Dictionary of Philosophy* lists at least 10 definitions and uses of *power*. In psychology, for instance, *power* and *faculty* are usually coequal. In ontology, especially Aristotelian, *power* stands for potency. In natural philosophy, *power* is the force which overcomes resistance; whereas in optics, *power* is the measured degree an instrument magnifies.

In living contrast to these natural and measurable *powers* is the spiritual dynamism of God, a Holy Being force motivated and directed by love. Metz says: "The God of the Christian faith is not a metaphysical abstraction, but a God who is personal; who acts, speaks, and becomes involved in man's life" (*Studies in Biblical Holiness*, 24). God's omnipotence consists of an overwhelming adequacy of power. Macquarrie puts it tersely: "God's omnipotence means that he himself, not any factual situation, is the source and also the horizon of all possibilities, and only those are excluded that are inconsistent with the structure and dynamics of God himself" (*PCT*, 189). Conflicts between God's attributes are resolved in the fundamental unity of the whole through holy love. God as Free Being can exercise self-limitation on any, and all, of His natural and moral attributes. On that account, no confrontation need arise between, say, power and goodness or holiness or justice.

"Power," in Christian theology, also relates importantly to an adequacy—especially for witnessing—given to believers when they receive the baptism with the Holy Spirit. Thus we read, "But you will receive power when the Holy Spirit comes on you" (Acts 1:8, NIV).

See GRACE, VICTORY (VICTORIOUS LIVING), ANOINTING, TESTIMONY (WITNESS), OMNIPOTENCE, DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY, ATTRIBUTES (DIVINE).

For Further Reading: Metz, *Studies in Biblical Holiness*; Runes, *Dictionary of Philosophy*; Macquarrie, *Principles of Christian Theology*.

MEL-THOMAS ROTHWELL

POWERS. See PRINCIPALITIES AND POWERS.

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY. Practical theology is that department of study which seeks to apply the truths of the gospel to the hearts and lives of men in daily living. It is theology because it has to do with the things of God and His Word; it is practical because it seeks to apply truth to the various facets of human existence. It is action and performance as opposed to mere ideas, theories, and speculations.

Practical theology includes a vast array of disciplines. Building on exegetical theology, historical theology, and systematic theology, it includes the composition of sermons (homiletics) and their delivery (preaching). It involves all phases of evangelism, counseling, and the administration of the church. It includes the caring for people (shepherding), the rites of the church and the altar (priestly functions), guiding God's people in worship and stewardship, as well as training them for life and service (Christian education). One should be aware that the methods of applying the truths of the gospel to the hearts and lives of men are constantly changing.

So vital is this area of theology that no person, however learned in other branches of knowledge he may be, can be considered well-fitted for the ministry until he is trained in the rules and the art of bringing the gospel in a practical fashion to the homes and hearts of men.

See EVANGELISM, PASTOR, PASTORAL COUNSELING, TEACH (TEACHING, TEACHER), PREACHING, CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, MISSION (MISSIONS, MISSIOLOGY).

For Further Reading: ERE, 12; Turnbull, ed., *Baker's Dictionary of Practical Theology*. C. PAUL GRAY

PRAGMATISM. This is a system of belief especially associated with the names of C. S. Pierce (1839-1914), William James (1842-1910), John Dewey (1859-1952), and others. As the name implies, the pragmatists sought to apply a practical test to the main problems connected with ascertaining the truth of things.

They insisted that definitions should be tested by applying them in various contexts to the things which they were intended to define. Insofar as they proved useful and intelligible, they were valid.

A similar test was applied to truth. On the assumption that "all truths are useful," a statement was considered verified by its practical consequences.

The pragmatists also recognized the place of psychology in the quest of truth. William James emphasized "the will to believe" as an important element in arriving at the truth.

The words of Christ in John 7:17 indicate how important is the will in the quest of truth. And the Bible also applies a pragmatic test to religion: "Faith apart from works is dead" (Jas. 2:26, RSV).

But in applying the test of what is practical and valuable, the pragmatists have tended to rely on contemporary educated opinion, which is equivalent to humanism.

See TRUTH, PHILOSOPHY, POSITIVISM, FAITH, REVELATION (NATURAL), REVELATION (SPECIAL).

For Further Reading: Wiley, CT, 1:277, 283; DCT, 261; *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 9:152; *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Terms*, 151.

JACK FORD

PRAISE. Praise is an act of devotion and adoration offered to God by His creatures for His being and attributes. Thanksgiving is an expression of indebtedness to God for His mercies. Praise is magnifying the person of God; thanksgiving is gratitude for His gifts. Yet the two ideas overlap in the Bible. One of the main root words in Hebrew, *yadah*, is translated almost as many times "thank" as "praise."

Praise rises from every part of the Bible (cf. Psalms 148; 34:1; Isa. 43:21). Yet praise is not mere duty. It is the joyful response of a heart enjoying communion with his God. It is commanded, not merely because it is the right of Deity to receive it, but because praise opens the soul to receive more of that life. The Westminster Catechism states that "man's chief end is to glorify God and enjoy Him forever." C. S. Lewis comments: "In commanding us to glorify Him, God is inviting us to enjoy Him" (*The Joyful Christian*, 120).

How are we to praise? The Psalmist calls us to come into God's house with thanksgiving (Ps. 100:4), to praise Him in song and on musical instruments (149:1-3; 150). Our petitions should always be accompanied by thanksgiving (Phil. 4:6). We should also praise the Lord with our testimony (Psalm 145). Under the Levitical system, when a worshiper offered an animal, he called his family and friends together to eat the sacrifice with him. At that time he told them all the wonderful things God had done for him (Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, 417).

Jesus made animal sacrifices unnecessary, but we are to offer continually "a sacrifice of praise—the fruit of lips that confess his name" (Heb. 13:15, NIV). Such a sacrifice glorifies God (Ps. 50:23).

Paul began his letters with praise to God, and thankfulness was often his theme. He prayed that believers would live a life pleasing to the Lord, characterized by "joyfully giving thanks to the Father" (Col. 1:10-12, NIV; cf. 3:15-17). He was talking about praise as a way of life. This is more than gratitude when things go well. In spite of bleeding backs and frustrated plans, Paul and Silas in the Philippian jail proved it was possible to "give thanks whatever happens" (1 Thess. 5:18, NEB).

Praise then is not an indicator of our feelings nor a response to our circumstances. It is a commitment of the will. In the midst of personal deprivation, Habakkuk willed to rejoice (Hab. 3:17-19). In the same way God's people declare His praises. For this they were called out and made holy (1 Pet. 2:9).

Vocal praise, to be acceptable, must be supported by a life of righteousness. Augustine wrote, "You are His praise, if you live righteously."

No one expressed the importance of praise more concisely than John Wesley: Praying without ceasing, he asserted, "is the fruit of always rejoicing in the Lord." Giving thanks "in everything" is the fruit of both the rejoicing and the praying. "This is Christian perfection. Farther than this we cannot go; and we need not stop short of it" (*Notes*, 1 Thess. 5:16-18).

See TESTIMONY (WITNESS), WORSHIP, REVERENCE.

For Further Reading: Klopfenstein, WBC, 5:540; Wallace, NBD, 1018-19; Wesley, *Notes*, "1 Thessalonians."

MAUREEN H. BOX

PRAYER. Prayer is a conscious turning of a man to God for communication or to seek divine help in time of need. Man may be impelled in his reach for God by inner longings or by the emergencies of life, or by his own daily inadequacies or inability to cope with difficult situations. Hunger and/or danger may also drive him to his knees. Prayer can be a sigh, a moan, or an inarticulate cry.

Man's view of prayer is colored by his view of God. In the Hebraic-Christian approach to prayer God is more than a tradition or even a discovery; He is a Christlike Heavenly Father, who pays attention to the cry of His children, and who is always taking the initiative on their behalf—but on moral terms. Surrendering to God in prayer is one aspect of meeting those

moral terms. Prayer, therefore, must be confessional. The desire for God may be smudged by man's own sins that cause him to dodge the real issues in his dialogue with God. This squirming makes for unreality in prayer.

Jesus himself is our clearest Teacher on prayer. His inner circle asked for guidance in this area of life. He gave them a model prayer that we call the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6:9-13). His own greatest prayers include John 17:1-26 and the agonizing of Gethsemane (Luke 22:39-46); in these prayers He is our Example. Fénelon's advice is apropos: "To pray . . . is to desire; but it is to desire what God would have us desire. He who desires not from the bottom of his heart, offers a deceitful prayer."

Jesus probed His followers when He instructed them in prayer. He insisted on sincerity, transparency before God, even secrecy—always free from bitterness or censoriousness—in prayer. He actually made prayer a Person to Person call. It was one of Dante's angels (*Divine Comedy*) who pointed out, "In His will is our peace." This is the climax of prayer.

Prayer, therefore, is the Christian's primary mode of access both to the divine Person and the divine power. The theology of prayer affords some difficulties as well as challenges. But at the very least, we can say that prayer brings us into the sphere of the divine activity, so that we become real participants in the great drama of redemption.

See INTERCESSION, INTERCESSION (PROBLEM OF), PRAISE.

For Further Reading: Buttrick, *The Power of Prayer Today*; Chambers, *If ye shall ask . . .*; Harkness, *Prayer and the Common Life*; Torrey, *The Power of Prayer*; White, *They Teach Us to Pray*. SAMUEL YOUNG

PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD. Public prayer for the dead in the Christian Church made its appearance only after the Apostolic Fathers. The earliest literature, if we exclude inscriptions in the catacombs, is from Tertullian (third century), who admitted that the practice had no direct biblical sanction. Other literary references include Origen, Cyprian, Cyril of Jerusalem, Eusebius, Chrysostom, and Augustine.

The earlier use of such prayers was not necessarily related to the idea of purgatory, nor to any doctrine of the intermediate state, but rather to the assumption of progress in holiness after death. However, the advocacy of the purgatory concept by leaders such as Augustine produced, by the fifth century, celebration of the Eucharist as a sacrifice for both the living and dead, as well

as the use of memorial Eucharists on anniversaries. Augustine implies that the custom, although then universal, was debated. Some held that it was profitless and that it encouraged a sinful life.

The practice was for neither the very good nor the very bad, inasmuch as it usually excluded the heathen and those who died in wilful sin, as well as the saintly dead, such as martyrs, who were thought to be already with Christ. The main issue, it seems, was postbaptismal sin. Petitions included forgiveness of sins, escape from purgatory, and the felicity of heaven.

Luther did not oppose the practice. The Church of England ritual of 1549 included prayers for the dead, but these were removed from public services in the revision of 1552. Contemporary Anglicans have in their ritual an optional prayer for the dead. The Westminster Confession condemned the practice. Protestants generally are opposed on the grounds that Scripture teaches that death ends moral probation and seals personal spiritual destiny.

See PROBATION, DESTINY (ETERNAL), BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD.

For Further Reading: NIDCC; ERE; BBC, 8:465.

ARNOLD E. AIRHART

PREACHING. Preaching is the oral communication of divine truth through man to men with the purpose of persuasion. Two of the major Hebrew words used in the OT are *basar*, meaning "to bear tidings," and *qara*, meaning "to call, proclaim, read." In the NT, the Greek word most characteristic in references to preaching is *kērussō*, meaning "to proclaim, to herald."

Preaching as a method of presenting divine truth from God to man is as old as the Book of Genesis. Noah is referred to as "a preacher of righteousness" (2 Pet. 2:5). Abraham commanded his household to keep the commandments of the Lord (Gen. 18:19). When the house of Jacob lapsed into idolatry, he exhorted them at Bethel to put away strange gods and repent (35:2). In some powerful and eloquent orations, Moses pled with Israel to keep the covenant (Deuteronomy).

Public preaching does not appear to have been a necessary part of the priesthood. We have many instances of discourses delivered in religious assemblies by men who were not Levites (Ps. 68:11). Joshua, an Ephraimite, gathered the tribes to Shechem and preached to the people of God (Joshua 24). Both Solomon, a prince of the house of Judah, and Amos, a herdsman of Tekoa, were preachers.

Samuel opened a school of the prophets in

Ramah. Here the people went on the Sabbath to receive public lessons (1 Sam. 19:18-20). Later schools flourished at Bethel, Jericho, and Gilgal (2 Kings 2:2, 5; 4:38). The prophets preached in camps, courts, streets, schools, cities, often with visible symbols, such as yokes of slavery, to illustrate their messages.

When the Jews were carried captive into Babylon, the prophets who were with them taught the principles of pure religion and set up standards against idolatry. The success of their preaching was so overwhelming that the Jewish nation has never again lapsed into overt idolatry. The synagogues arose during the captivity and were continued after the return so that the people could come on the Sabbath and at special festivals for the reading and expounding of the Scriptures.

The most celebrated preacher before the appearance of Jesus was John the Baptist. He came in the spirit of Elijah and was much like that prophet in his vehement style, his use of bold images, his solemn deportment, his eager actions, and his strict morals.

Jesus was certainly the Master Preacher. Who can but admire the simplicity and majesty of His style, the beauty of His parables, the alternate gentleness and severity of His address.

The apostles copied their Master. They traveled about proclaiming what Jesus had done and said (cf. Acts 14:1).

The church of Rome had some great preachers. Among them were Francis of Assisi, who moved the multitudes to repent, and Savonarola, who preached like an OT prophet and, due to reproving the pope, was martyred.

The Reformation produced the day of the preacher. Martin Luther lit the lamp of justification by faith and called upon the people to become personally acquainted with Christ. Other preachers committed to doctrinal emphasis followed, among them Zwingli, Calvin, Knox, and, two centuries later, Wesley.

Since the Reformers there have been many preachers who have brought honor to God. All have done so by setting forth the demands of Bible doctrine. The history of revivals shows that doctrinal preaching, not ethical preaching alone, has brought reform. Among the British pulpit giants of the 18th and 19th centuries were, in addition to Wesley, George Whitefield, John Fletcher, Adam Clarke, Robert Hall, Thomas Chalmers, R. W. Dale, Joseph Parker, and, of course, the illustrious Charles Haddon Spurgeon. Great preachers in America have included Jonathan Edwards, Charles G. Finney, Henry Ward Beecher, Phillips Brooks, and Dwight L. Moody, plus a

host of Methodist and Wesleyan masters such as John Inskip and Bishop Matthew Simpson. These were men who magnified their calling by the total devotion of their giant intellects and personal talents to the task of effectively and powerfully proclaiming the gospel. They were not triflers or dilettantes.

Preaching differs from public speaking. Preaching is communicating divine truth given through the power of the Holy Spirit. The minister has experienced, believes, and feels what he preaches. Yet preaching involves more than personal conviction. It is obedience to a divine commission to proclaim a revealed message. The preacher stands as a major source of communication between God and man.

Not only is the content of the message preached foolishness to the natural man (1 Cor. 1:18, 21), but preaching itself as a means of communication is an affront. For this reason many shrink from this role, even as pastors; it seems to them unseemly and authoritarian for one fallible man to stand before a congregation and presume to "tell them what to do." This mood reflects a loss of confidence in the divine authority of the Scriptures, a vitiated faith in the validity of the gospel itself, and a misconception of the nature of their divine calling. Needed is a recovery of a sense of God's authority and the awesome wonder and responsibility of being chosen, not by ourselves, but by God himself to be His spokesman. Needed also is a renewed conviction that God has ordained preaching as a method and is pleased to flow through it into the hearts of listeners. Great preaching cannot be matched as an effective agent of change; God sees to it that this is true. A God-called and -anointed man in the pulpit has authority, but it is not authoritarianism.

While all Christians are to be witnesses, and many will occasionally have the gift of prophecy in the sense of delivering a message from the Lord, the vocation of preaching is not to be self-chosen but is to be undertaken only upon a profound, inescapable conviction that this is the call of God. A preacher needs to be able to say with Paul, "Woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel!" (1 Cor. 9:16).

See EVANGELISM, KERYGMA, TEACH (TEACHER, TEACHING).

For Further Reading: Burns, *Revivals: Their Laws and Leaders*; Miller, *The Way to Biblical Preaching*; Pattison, *The History of Christian Preaching*.

LEON CHAMBERS

PREDESTINATION. The word for "predestinate" occurs six times in the Greek NT: Acts 4:28; Rom.

8:29-30; 1 Cor. 2:7; Eph. 1:5, 11. It is a combination of two words, *pro*, meaning "before," and *horizō*, meaning "to mark out definitely," thus conveying the idea of limiting in advance or marking out beforehand. All six references set forth various facets of the divine scheme of redemption and its unfolding. The EGT favors "foreordain" as the best translation (3:251). In the KJV it is translated "predestinate" in four verses: Rom. 8:29-30 and Eph. 1:5, 11.

These verses have primary significance since they relate to God's redemptive plan for those who are "in Christ," that is, believers. Thus, predestination is primarily a doctrine for the saints, not for sinners. As Hermann Cremer points out, the question "is not *who* are the objects of this predestination, but *what* they are predestinated to" (*Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek*, 462).

This is precisely the import of the verses in Romans and Ephesians, where, first of all, we observe that God has predestinated believers "to be his sons" (Eph. 1:5, RSV). He has also determined that those "in Christ" should be "conformed to the image of his Son" (Rom. 8:29)—Christlike in character. In addition, the successive steps leading to glorification are divinely assured to those who, in steadfast faith, entrust themselves to God (v. 30). Finally, with their destiny in focus, God has "predestinated" His Christlike children to obtain an inheritance "at the coming of the climax of the ages" (Eph. 1:10, Williams). The "crown" awaits those who are ready in the last time (cf. 1 Pet. 1:3-5; 5:1, 4; 2 Tim. 4:8). Thus, the divine plan, marked out beforehand, is a glorious provision and prospect for those who are "in Christ."

Much controversy has arisen in church history over this term, particularly in Calvinist and Arminian circles. Calvinists have strongly emphasized the absolute sovereignty of God, His predetermine counsels, the divine decrees, and double predestination God's decrees, including predestination, are the eternal purpose of His will concerning everything that is to be and is to occur. Predestination is the eternal counsel of God whereby He has determined the eternal destiny of every individual. For a biblical basis, Calvinists cite such scriptures as Eph. 1:4-5; 2 Tim. 1:9; Rom. 8:28-30; 9:11-13, 15.

For Arminians, predestination is based on the divine foreknowledge (Rom. 8:29), with emphasis on universal grace and conditional election; i.e., salvation is contingent on human response to the divine call to repentance and faith (Acts 20:21; John 3:14-17; 5:40; 2 Cor. 5:14-15; Gal.

1:4; 1 Tim. 2:4, 6; 1 John 2:2; 4:14; Heb. 2:9; etc.). Salvation is divinely initiated, as in Calvinism; but the human will, awakened by prevent grace and the continuing ministry of the Holy Spirit, must cooperate with divine grace and receive by faith the gift of God. God has sovereignly predetermined the conditions upon which He will save us eternally. The *power* to believe is of God; the *act* of believing necessarily belongs to man.

See FOREKNOWLEDGE, DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY, DETERMINISM, MONERGISM, SYNERGISM, CONTINGENT, DIVINE DECREES, CALVINISM.

For Further Reading: Boettner, *The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination*; GMS, 424-35; "The Debate over Divine Election," *Christianity Today*, Oct. 12, 1959; Wiley, *CT*, 2:335-57.

WILLIAM M. ARNETT

PREEMINENCE. This is the quality of being supreme, of paramount importance, of superlative rank. The Scriptures apply the term to Jesus Christ in light of His Headship in creation and in the Church (Col. 1:18).

In relation to the universe, Jesus Christ is the "firstborn" (*prōtōtokos*, a term indicating paramount rank rather than procession). He is the Creator who antedated all things and who sustains all things now existing (v. 17). Such activity gives Him superlative importance among celestial beings. He is "Lord of Creation."

In relation to the Church, Jesus Christ is the Head of the Body, the Beginning (originator of the believers), and the first to be raised from the dead (v. 18). Such activity gives Him supreme dignity among spiritual Saviors. Indeed, all the fullness of the Godhead dwells in Him, making Him the Savior of Saviors. His preeminence places Him far above the angelic beings worshipped by the Colossian heretics.

Preeminence is a quality sometimes usurped by man. Diotrephes was one "who loveth to have the preeminence" (3 John 9), and consequently rejected the admonitions of the apostle John. This carnal expression of pride is the antithesis of Jesus' words, "And whoever would be *first* among you must be your slave; even as the Son of man came not to be served but to serve" (Matt. 20:27-28, RSV, italics added). When man exalts self above God and Christ, he falls into the most deceptive form of idolatry.

The Christian's goal is to make Jesus Christ preeminent in thought, life, and conduct. As John the Baptist said, "He must increase, but I must decrease" (John 3:30). Jesus Christ is Lord; I am His love-slave (servant).

See CHRIST, FIRSTBORN, EXALTATION OF CHRIST, PRIDE.

For Further Reading: Liddon, *The Divinity of Our Lord*.
BERT H. HALL

PREEXISTENCE OF CHRIST. By the preexistence of Christ is meant that before He was born of His mother, Mary, He already existed, not as a created being, or as an ideal, impersonal principle, but as the Eternal Son, one of the infinite Persons of the Triune Godhead.

The doctrine is explicit in the Nicene Creed (A.D. 325): "I believe in . . . one Lord Jesus Christ . . . begotten of His Father before all worlds . . . by whom all things were made; who for us men and our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary."

Jesus' own claims to preexistence are clear (e.g., John 8:58; 17:5; 3:13). Whether or not Jesus inferred His preexistence in His repeated use of the title "Son of man" is less clear. The term probably connoted for contemporary Jews a pre-existent heavenly being who would appear on earth. For Jesus' followers His preexistence could only come into clear focus after the Resurrection and Ascension.

For the apostolic writers this truth was foundational to a true doctrine of the Incarnation and thus to their concepts of divine condescending love, revelation, creation, and redemption and atonement.

In Paul the most explicit statement is Phil. 2:5-11 (cf. Gal. 4:4; Col. 1:15 ff; and 2 Cor. 8:9). The writer to the Hebrews sees Jesus as the pre-existent, glorious Son, Creator of all, and Revealer of God (1:1-14). In John, Jesus is the Eternal Word, the Creator, the Source of life and light, who became a man (John 1:1-15).

See ARIANISM, CHRISTOLOGY, TRINITY (THE HOLY).

For Further Reading: Lehman, *Biblical Theology*, vol. 2; GMS, 303-56; Wiley, CT, 2:169-75.

ARNOLD E. AIRHART

PREEXISTENCE OF SOULS. This term refers to the belief that every soul had a career prior to its present incarnation in the body with which it is now united. It is of ancient and obscure origin, and is found in various lands. The Buddhists, the Hindus, ancient Egyptians, the Pythagorean philosophers, and many primitive animistic religions taught it in conjunction with another doctrine known as transmigration of souls. The doctrine appears frequently in the Jewish Talmud.

The philosopher Plato thought of the soul as part of the ideal world which existed previously and independently as an unembodied spirit.

Among early Christian theologians, Origen, in the third century, embraced this doctrine as he attempted to account for human depravity as the result of sin in a previous state. Origen's position was immediately rejected by the Early Church as heretical.

Since then, in modern times, certain other philosophers and theologians have embraced it, arguing that inborn depravity can be explained only by a self-determined act in a previous state of being. Plato argued for it on the basis of man's possession of innate ideas. These he thought remained in the soul and mind of man as reminiscences of a prior learning and a previous existence.

Among the religions of the 20th century the Mormons are the chief exponents of the theory of preexistence of souls. There is no scriptural basis for a belief in the preexistence of souls. The Scriptures teach that souls depart this life either to be with God or to eternal retribution, and not to either a higher or lower animal reincarnation.

See THEOSOPHY, TRADUCIANISM, CREATIONISM, RE-INCARNATION.

For Further Reading: DeWolf, "Pre-existence," *ER*, 604-5; Harvey, *Handbook of Theological Terms*, 189; Stanton, "Pre-existence of Souls," *Baker's DT*, 148; Wiley, CT, 2:26 ff.
ROSS E. PRICE

PREJUDICE. The term is usually associated with *partiality*. Derived from the Latin *prejudicare*, *prejudice* means prejudgment without sufficient evidence either for or against people, places, or things. Discussing Christianity as theological science, Karl Barth calls for freedom from prejudice of any type. Gordon H. Clark cautions that if prejudice be misunderstood as presupposition, neither science nor theology can accept such a restriction (*Karl Barth's Theological Method*, 66). There is a proper discrimination in making value judgments.

John Wesley notes how partiality beset early Christians, in his sermon "The Mystery of Iniquity" (*Works*, 6:257). Those who made distribution had respect of persons, supplying those of their own nation, while the other widows, who were not Hebrews, "were being overlooked in the daily distribution of food" (Acts 6:1, NIV).

Elsewhere the Scripture decries partiality. God declares, "So I have caused you to be despised and humiliated . . . because you have not followed my ways but have shown partiality in matters of the law" (Mal. 2:9, NIV). James forbids favoritism, asking, "Have you not discriminated among yourselves and become judges with evil thoughts?" (2:4, NIV).

We are all equal before God, "for God does not show favoritism" (Rom. 2:11, NIV; cf. Col. 3:25; Eph. 6:9). The Lord clearly discerns between those who are sincere and those who do wrong (cf. Jas. 3:16-17).

William Barclay says *diekrithēte*, translated "discriminated" in Jas. 2:4 (NIV), can have two meanings. (1) "You are wavering, vacillating, hesitating in your judgments. . . . If you pay special honour to the rich, you are torn between the standards of the world and the standards of God." (2) "You are guilty of setting up distinctions between man and man which in the Christian fellowship should not exist" (*Daily Study Bible*, 77). This breaks Jesus' commandment: "Do not judge lest you be judged yourselves" (Matt. 7:1, NASB).

See DISCRIMINATION, RACISM, JUDGE (JUDGMENT), DISCERNMENT, AESTHETICS.

For Further Reading: Wiley, CT, 3:51-79; Purkiser, ed., *Exploring Our Christian Faith*, 462-80.

IVAN A. BEALS

PREMILLENNIALISM. The English term was coined from three Latin terms (*prae, mille, annus*), meaning, "before the thousand years." Premillennialism has also been called chiliasm and millenarianism. It identifies a type of Christian eschatology notably distinguished by an emphasis upon the personal return of Christ to earth before the millennium (mentioned only in Rev. 20:1-10), i.e., a 1,000-year interim reign of Christ and certain of His saints, itself preceding the final consummation.

It exists in two basic forms, each with characteristic theological and hermeneutical assumptions and conclusions: historic, and dispensational premillennialism. Great differences in detail appear within as well as between the two forms.

Historic premillennialism is historic in two senses: (1) Some early (pre- and/or post-Christian) noncanonical, Jewish apocalyptic literature predicted an interim, sometimes Messianic Kingdom (cf. 1 Enoch 91:12-17; 93:1-14; 2 Enoch 32:3-33:1; Sibylline Oracles 3, 652-60; 2 Esdras 5:2-7:29; 2 Baruch 29:3; 30:1-5, 39-40). A variety of beliefs in some form of literal millennium is also attested in certain early Christian writers (Letter of Barnabas 15:3-9; Papias, cf. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 5:32-36; Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho*, 81; anonymous Christian interpolations in the Testament of Isaac 8:11, 19-20; 10:11-12; Tertullian, during his Montanist period, *Against Marcion* 3, 24; 4, 31; and the Gnostic Cerinthus, cf. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 3, 28). Signifi-

cantly, however, modern adherents often reach their conclusions apart from these predecessors. (2) Advocates characteristically reach their conclusions on the basis of the so-called historical interpretation of the Book of Revelation. George Eldon Ladd (in numerous publications, including *Theology of the New Testament*, 624-32) is the most articulate recent proponent of historic premillennialism.

Dispensational premillennialism arose in the early 19th century largely through the influence of J. N. Darby and the Plymouth Brethren. It forms the substance and structure of the *Scofield Reference Bible* (1909), whose subtle but powerful influence is largely responsible for its popularization in evangelical circles. Distinctive of the view is: (1) the division of history into dispensations or eras (usually seven); (2) the division of the Second Coming into two events, the secret Rapture and the public revelation, normally separated by seven years, during which time the earth experiences the Great Tribulation and raptured saints celebrate the marriage supper of the Lamb in heaven; (3) the division of the elect into two bodies: the (Gentile) Church, saved by faith, and Jews, saved during the millennium by divine fiat; and (4) a literalistic interpretation of prophecy.

See MILLENNIUM, DISPENSATIONALISM, RAPTURE.

For Further Reading: Boettner, *The Millennium*, 139-384; Clouse, ed., *The Meaning of the Millennium: Four Views*; Hoekema, *The Bible and the Future*, 173-238 (an amillennial critique); Ladd, *Theology of the New Testament*, 624-32; GMS, 642-48; Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism* (a history); Wiley, CT, 3:243-319. GEORGE LYONS

PRESBYTER. See ELDER.

PRESENCE, DIVINE. In the Bible, God's presence is revealed to persons ("face" is a common term); He is made known in particular places (Temple, Tabernacle, etc.); and He is communicated to the race (the Jews, humanity).

Face. A personal communication, the "face" of God connotes His presence in both blessing and judgment. Moses saw God "face to face" (Exod. 33:11); the righteous shall "behold [his] face" (Ps. 11:7, NASB); He hides His face (13:1; 27:9; 51:9); the Lord's face "is against those who do evil" (1 Pet. 3:12, NASB).

Place. God graces places with His presence; thus, Shechem (Gen. 12:6-7), Beersheba (21:33), Bethel (28:10 ff), and Peniel (32:24 ff) were worship cities. Horeb and Sinai were sacred places, too (note hills and mountains as representations

of presence—e.g., Psalm 48). The ark, Tabernacle, and Temple became presence places; in the NT the believer's heart becomes God's temple (1 Cor. 3:16). In the history of the church consecrated sanctuaries are also God's dwellings. In the Lord's Supper He is present (see references below for interpretations).

Race. God's presence is revealed to the Jews (e.g., Ps. 22:3). He also promises His presence to go with the Jews (Exod. 33:14; 40:34-38; Isa. 63:9). The NT reveals that God came to the whole human race—Jesus is "God with us" (Emmanuel—Isa. 7:14; Matt. 1:23; John 1:14). The Holy Spirit is Christ's continuing presence (Matt. 28:20; John 14:16). Heaven, the place of God's unclouded presence, is His goal for the race (Rev. 21:3).

See PAROUSIA, IMMANENCE, GLORY, PARACLETE, HOLY COMMUNION, TRANSUBSTANTIATION, CONSUBSTANTIATION.

For Further Reading: Brockington, "Presence," *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, 172 ff; For views on Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper: Berkhof, *Manual of Christian Doctrine*, 325 ff; A mystical conception: Julian of Norwich, *Showings*. DONALD E. DEMARAY

PRESUMPTION. When this word is descriptive of sin, it means sin that is open, defiant, and deliberate. Such sin in the OT theocracy merited radical, even capital, punishment (Exod. 21:14; Num. 15:30; Deut. 17:12). The Psalmist prayed earnestly to be kept from such sins (Ps. 19:13).

The word also describes the bold arrogance of the religious charlatan. This person brazenly intrudes himself where he does not belong, presumes liberties which are not his and knowledge which he does not possess. Of such persons Peter says that they "walk after the flesh . . . despise government. . . selfwilled, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities" (2 Pet. 2:10). This is the egomaniac.

However, good people may also be presumptuous, in less culpable ways. Mary and Joseph exhibited this kind of presumption; they, "supposing him [Jesus] to have been in the company, went a day's journey" (Luke 2:44). This is the presumption of carelessness—of taking for granted things which ought not to be taken for granted. This is a common fault of parents and administrators. Such carelessness may spell disaster in one's personal spiritual life also, when one presumes on divine grace to compensate for prayerlessness, or assumes spiritual well-being without honest self-examination.

When related to Christian work, presumption is akin to fanaticism, one definition of which is to

expect results without giving due attention to adequate means. A preacher is being presumptuous when he habitually enters the pulpit without careful preparation, under the guise of relying on the Spirit. This is a self-deceptive, affected, and misguided piety.

Similar is the distinction between presumption and faith. An action may be taken in true faith; the same action at another time or by another person may be presumptuous. The difference is the difference between obedience and self-will. For the Israelites to have entered Canaan at Kadesh when exhorted to would have been a demonstration of faith which God would have honored. When they self-willfully attempted the conquest two days later, it was presumption, and they fell before their enemies. Faith is responding to divine order; presumption is plunging ahead on one's own. Often ambitious Christians assay to imitate the exploits for God of others, supposing that whatever others have done they can do too; but this is presumption.

This kind of presumption reflects an inordinate confidence in one's own judgment and abilities. Such error may occasionally slip up on truly devout persons. Joshua and his associates were guilty of such presumption when, in respect to the Gibeonites, they "took of their victuals, and asked not counsel at the mouth of the Lord" (Josh. 9:14). It is to be feared that many church building or other projects are prime examples of this kind of presumption.

See FANATICISM, GUIDE (GUIDANCE), OBEDIENCE, FAITH. RICHARD S. TAYLOR

PREVENIENT GRACE. This has to do with the many ways in which God favors us prior to our conversion. It means that God takes the initiative in the matter of our conversion, inclining us to turn to Him, wooing us, breaking down the barriers to our repenting and believing. It includes also, as taught by Arminius, Wesley, Wiley, and others, the alleviation of guilt for Adam's sin (but not, of course, of the depravity stemming from Adam). It is different from the common grace as taught by Calvinists, which consists of restraining the wickedness of the nonelect.

Due to original sin, which resulted from Adam's bad representation of the whole human race, we are born with a condition that inclines us toward a life of sin acts. Scripture thus speaks of our being enslaved to sin (Rom. 6:16-17). It shows that in ourselves we are incapable of doing what we know we ought to do (7:15, 18). Jesus says, "You brood of vipers, how can you who are evil say anything good?" (Matt. 12:34,

NIV). He also said that "a bad tree cannot bear good fruit" (7:18, NIV); also, that "apart from me you can do nothing" (John 15:5, NIV). All these passages of scripture suggest fallen man's inability to do any good thing unless he receives God's special help—i.e., *prevenient grace*.

Yet Scripture also shows us that God, in His graciousness, strikes out after us, to help us towards himself. "We love because he first loved us" (1 John 4:19, NIV), it reads. Also, "No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws him" (John 6:44, NIV). This is why it was said of Cornelius and his household that "God granted repentance unto life" (Acts 11:18, ASV)—where the word for "granted" (used also in KJV, RSV, NEB, NIV) is from the usual Greek word for "to give, bestow, present." The rebel must respond to God's offer of salvation; but still, his repentance is called a gift that is bestowed upon him. This, because he cannot repent unless he is aided by *prevenient grace*.

In the OT, also, it is clear that God initiates our salvation. While some passages, there, simply urge people to turn to God, as in Ezek. 18:32: "Turn yourselves, and live" (ASV); others make it clear that we must be helped, if we do turn. Thus we read in Ps. 80:3, "Turn us again, O God . . . and we shall be saved" (ASV). And in Ps. 85:4 we read, "Turn us, O God of our salvation" (ASV). The most vivid OT passage, on this need for *prevenient grace* to help us to turn, is in Jer. 31:18-19: "Turn thou me, and I shall be turned; for thou art Jehovah my God. Surely after that I was turned, I repented" (ASV).

While both Pelagians and the semi-Pelagians denied *prevenient grace*, the need of it has usually been recognized. It was a particular emphasis of both James Arminius and John Wesley. Arminius said that "the free will of man towards the true good is . . . maimed, . . . destroyed, and lost" (*Works*, 1:526-27). Wesley said, "We [he and John Fletcher] both steadily assert that the will of fallen man is by nature free only to evil" (Burtner and Chiles, *Compend of Wesley's Theology*, 132-33).

Christian hymn writers have often extolled *prevenient grace*. One of them, Lewis Hartsough, has us singing:

*I hear Thy welcome voice,
That calls me, Lord, to Thee.*

Charles Wesley has us singing:

*Saviour, Prince of Israel's race, . . .
Give me sweet, relenting grace.*

Charlotte Elliott's great invitation hymn also points up the place of *prevenient grace*:

*Just as I am! Thy love unknown
Hath broken every barrier down.*

One thing this doctrine means is that God does not meet us halfway, but instead comes all the way to where we are and initiates in us the first desires to be saved. Thus the importance of *intercessory prayer* for unsaved persons.

See GRACE, MONERGISM, SYNERGISM, FREEDOM, CALVINISM, ARMINIANISM, WESLEYANISM, FEDERAL THEOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Grider, *Repentance unto Life*; Chamberlain, *The Meaning of Repentance*; Wiley, "Prevenient Grace," CT, 2:344-57.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

PRIDE. Synonyms of pride are *ostentation, haughtiness, swaggering, imposture, bragging, vaunting, vain boasting, "puffed up."* The word "pride" is from the word meaning "smoke or cloud" (Westcott; see Jas. 4:16; Rom. 1:30; 2 Tim. 3:2; 1 Cor. 13:4).

Jesus includes pride in His list of heinous sins (Mark 7:22). It comes from within a person, expressed or not. It is a spirit of self-sufficiency and superiority (see Dan. 4:25; 5:20-22).

John makes pride one of three marks of worldliness (1 John 2:16). It relates not so much to life as existence, as to the manner of living. A pride-filled person trusts his own resources, lives according to this present world system (see Gen. 3:6; Col. 2:8).

Good pride is boasting wholly in the Lord (1 Cor. 1:31; Phil. 3:3). Paul boasts about some Christians (2 Cor. 9:2; see also Phil. 2:6).

Evil pride glories in praise to self. It yearns for applause from man instead of from God (but see Acts 14:27). It reveals itself when earthly advantages make one feel superior to him who lacks these things. The proud forget that all is of God. Pride may be expressed in at least two ways: (1) in speech—vain boastings (Jas. 4:6, 16); and (2) in thought—arrogance, independence, repression (1 Pet. 5:5; Jas. 4:6; 1 Cor. 4:6; 8:1).

Pride is the root sin. It consists of enmity against the rule of God in the soul. It is a disease in human nature which only grace can cure. It is idolatry. Pride seeks the recognition of men rather than of God alone.

Pride may exist even in the heart of the believer (Rom. 12:3; 1 Cor. 4:6).

It tends to backsliding, even from the grace of entire sanctification. Pride goes before failure (Prov. 11:2; 13:10; 16:18; 1 Tim. 3:6). One of Wesley's warnings to the sanctified was, "Beware of pride" (*Plain Account*).

It is opposed to the Christian grace of love for

God and all men, which is pride's only remedy (1 Cor. 13:4).

See HUMILITY, SEVEN DEADLY SINS.

For Further Reading: HDNT; Murray, *Humility*.

JOHN B. NIELSON

PRIEST, PRIESTHOOD. "Priest" in Hebrew is *kohen*; in Greek, *hierus*. It is a term applying to a person set aside to serve as a mediator between the worshiper and his God. "Priesthood" applies to the order of hierarchy of persons who serve as priests and to the rituals or ceremonies priests conduct in their mediating role.

Priest, a Theological Necessity. The Bible presents "priest" and "priesthood" and all related redemptive aspects from the perspective of special revelation. Man, although a creature in the image of God, has sinned; and therefore, as unholy and estranged from God, is unable of himself to come effectively before God, who is holy, for forgiveness and reconciliation. The priest became a gracious divine provision who in his holy office served as mediator between God and man to the end that man might know forgiveness, cleansing, and reconciliation with God. Thus "priest" may be understood as both a theological necessity and a merciful provision.

Priesthood of the Believer in Full Cycle. The "priesthood of the believer" emphasis, important for Protestants (from the Reformation), went full cycle across the span of biblical times. In very early and patriarchal times, persons offering blood sacrifices to God acted without a mediating priest. Individual worshipers were apparently exercising their individual priesthood. (Melchisedek, a one-time officiant for Abraham, was later considered a type for the "forever" priesthood of Jesus—Gen. 14:18; cf. Ps. 110:4; Heb. 5:6, 10).

The OT priesthood hierarchy from Moses consisted in the high priest, ordinary priests, and Levites. The high priest, of the greatest importance, officiated as the mediator between God and those who offered sacrifices for sin. The priesthood of the OT, while emphasizing essentials of salvation, nevertheless precluded the individual priesthood of the worshiper. In the NT, especially in Hebrews, Jesus is presented as Founder of the new covenant from the standpoint of being the High Priest who supersedes the earlier Aaronic priesthood as the Mediator and Intercessor on behalf of the sinner before God the Father, and of being the Sacrifice who died on the Cross and whose atoning blood is a once-for-all atonement for sin (Heb. 8:6—10:25). It was from this standpoint that early Christians

readily understood that the older priesthood and sacrifices were no longer necessary; they could come without the assistance of priest and sacrifice through Christ, to God the Father. Thus the priesthood of the believer had come around full cycle.

See MEDIATOR, PRIESTHOOD OF BELIEVERS.

For Further Reading: IDB, K-G:711-27, 877-91; *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 248-54.

HARVEY E. FINLEY

PRIESTHOOD OF BELIEVERS. The biblical doctrine of the priesthood of believers is an expression of the ministry of the community of believers to the world through its immediacy to God in Christ.

The OT roots are found in Exod. 19:4-6. At Sinai God promised, "And you shall be to Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (v. 6, NASB). The primary meaning is that Israel should be the representative of God to the outside world (cf. Isa. 61:6).

The whole NT reflects the influence of these ideas. In 1 Pet. 2:5 the community of believers is called a "spiritual house for a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (NASB). In verse 9 a chain of OT references is applied to the new Israel: "a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession" (NASB). Again the primary purpose is to witness "the excellencies of Him who has called you."

In Revelation (1:6; 5:10; 20:6) the members of the Kingdom are designated as priests of God. The emphasis here lies on the ministry of individuals to God as a form of priestly service.

The whole NT is replete with sacrificial language. Technical terms for service such as "presenting an offering," "firstfruits," and "sacrificial" are used regularly. In Rom. 12:1-2 believers are exhorted to offer themselves as living sacrifices, which is designated as a rational priestly service.

The priesthood of believers is not a special caste of ministry, but involves every member of the Body of Christ both in individual and corporate responsibility. Each person is indeed his own priest through immediate access to God through Christ, but each man shares as well in the mediation of Christ to the world.

See PRIEST (PRIESTHOOD), MEDIATOR, PROTESTANTISM.

For Further Reading: Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*, 301 ff.

MORRIS A. WEIGELT

PRIMAL HISTORY. Some OT scholars prefer to designate Genesis 1—11 as primal history, because they believe the contents of these chapters have no historical validity. This creates a contradiction, for if Genesis 1—11 contains no history, why use the term in the title? Nevertheless, it is a common phrase.

This position holds that the creation of the world, the great Flood, and the tower of Babel never happened as told. Nor were there such individuals as Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel, or Noah and his family. Instead, the materials in the first 11 chapters of the Bible are understood to be based on ancient Near Eastern creation and flood stories. Various writers in the 10th, 9th, and 6th centuries B.C. reworked the non-Israelite stories and gave them distinctly Israelitish understandings about creation, God, man, sin, and judgment. Emphasis is placed on the themes which permeate these chapters. The stories are often re-labeled as myths, sagas, and legends.

Conservative scholars have recognized Genesis 1—11 as containing accounts of events that really happened and people who really lived. These accounts are not based on pagan myths, but constitute a God-given and God-preserved revelation—which either existed in writing before Moses' time or was put into writing by him.

The analysis that conservatives make of the themes and doctrines found in these chapters does not differ greatly from that made by liberal scholars. Their estimates of the historical reliability of the material, however, are diametrically opposed to each other.

Traditionally, the material has been understood as historical.

See INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE, BIBLICAL INERRANCY, HEILSGESCHICHTE.

For Further Reading: Harrelson, *Interpreting the Old Testament*, 45-58; Fohrer, *History of Israelite History*, 176-84; Livingston, *The Pentateuch in Its Cultural Environment*, 137-50; Williams, *Understanding the Old Testament*, 74-84. GEORGE HERBERT LIVINGSTON

PRIMITIVE HOLINESS. See DIVINE IMAGE.

PRINCIPALITIES AND POWERS. Five NT words refer to the hierarchy of angelic beings (both holy and fallen): *archai*—principalities; *exousiai*—powers; *dynameis*—powers; *kuriotētes*—dominions; and *thronoi*—thrones. These seem to be ranks of heavenly beings. The most common terms are "principalities and powers."

All were created by and for Christ (Col. 1:16). All must recognize His supreme Lordship (Eph. 1:20-22; Col. 2:10; Heb. 1:4-14; 1 Pet. 3:22). Fall-

en angels seem temporarily permitted to retain under Satan (Eph. 2:2; 2 Cor. 4:4) their former ranks. They are part of Satan's dark host (Luke 22:53). The Christian need not fear them (Rom. 8:38-39), for Christ has rescued us from their dominion (Acts 26:18; Col. 1:13). Christ defeated them on the Cross (2:15), disarming them, and making public a spectacle of them (John 12:31; Eph. 4:8). Col. 2:15 pictures a Roman emperor who conquers his foes, strips them of their armor, and compels them to march in chains behind his chariot in his triumphal procession.

Their doom is sure (John 12:31; Rev. 12:9), for hellfire is prepared for them (Matt. 25:41; Rev. 20:10).

The Christian wrestles with this host, including the demons, in his service and prayer (Eph. 6:12). They are hostile to God and man, and sometimes hinder Kingdom advance (1 Thess. 2:18). God limits their authority (Job 1:12; 2:6); the Christian through prayer has victory in Christ's name over them (Eph. 6:18). Hades' gates cannot prevail (Matt. 16:18). From Calvary's viewpoint they are weak and beggarly (Gal. 4:9). Demons know they are defeated and doomed (Matt. 8:29; Mark 1:24; Luke 4:34). We have no fear, for the Conqueror, Christ, is with us (2 Chron. 32:7-8), and His hosts far exceed Satan's (2 Kings 6:16; Rom. 8:31).

See SATAN, DEMONS, ANGELS.

For Further Reading: HDNT, 4:273.

WESLEY L. DUEWEL

PRINCIPLES. This term carries two meanings in theology. First, it denotes the underlying elements of a system, the primary ideas or postulates. (The first systematic theology, by Origen, was called *De Principiis*, "First Principles.") Second, principles are the standards and policies which govern action.

The first meaning is expressed in the NT by *stoicheion*, translated by "element" (Gal. 4:3, 9; 2 Pet. 3:10, 12); by "rudiment" (Col. 2:8, 20); and by "principle" (Heb. 5:12). The Galatians and Colossians passages warn against returning to the systems either of Moses or paganism. The Christians addressed in Hebrews are shamed for not having progressed beyond the "elementary principles of the oracles of God" (NASB). The idea is continued in 6:1 with the word *archē*, "beginning." Vine says the word is used "in its relative significance, of the beginning of the thing spoken of; here 'the first principles of Christ'" (ED).

The passage does not leave to guesswork the sort of truth which the writer classifies as fundamental principles: "repentance from dead works

and of faith toward God" (NASB). These are among the ABCs of the Christian faith, which, while never outmoded or displaced, are not expected to mark the limits of spiritual knowledge and progress. The need for believers to go on to Christian perfection both in thought and experience, and to continue to grow thereafter, is itself a fundamental Christian principle.

Doctrinal principles need to be translated into personal norms of conduct—the second meaning of the term. In this sense, principles are needed to bring into life direction, system, and stability. To live by self-accepted moral standards is the opposite of impulse or random living. An unprincipled person has no moral guidelines, which means that he is ruthless, opportunistic, and capricious. He is without a trained conscience. In contrast the person who lives by principle is predictable. He strives to make everyday decisions compatible with his principles.

A principled person may have rules also, but principles differ from rules in that they lie back of rules as their reasons. Honesty may be with a person a basic life principle. The practice of honesty will therefore be his policy. To aid him in holding to his principle and practicing his policy, he may impose on himself certain rules, such as to pay bills on the first day of the month.

A mark of maturity is the ability to acquire and live by a set of clearly thought-out and biblically supportable principles.

See DOCTRINE, MORALITY, CHRISTIAN ETHICS, MATURITY.

For Further Reading: "Elements," "Principles," "Rudiments," Vine, ED; *Baker's DCE*, 530.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

PRIORITY. See VALUES.

PRISCILLIANISM. This is a movement which arose in Spain at the end of the fourth century. Named for Priscillian, bishop of Avila, its supposed founder, it taught a kind of Sabellianism on the doctrine of the Trinity; a Manichaean dualism; and Docetic views.

See SABELLIANISM, DUALISM, DOCETISM.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

PROBABILISM. This is the ethical theory that, since it is all right to hold a probable opinion, it is also all right to do things that are only probably right. It was first taught by Bartolome Medina (1528-80), and was agreed to by many; but it was condemned by Pope Alexander VII (1667) and by Innocent XI (1679).

See ETHICS, MORALITY, EXPEDIENCY.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

PROBATION. Probation is a period or method of trial to determine one's fitness or unfitness for projected privileges. Not only is the element of testing present, but the element of training and preparation.

The fact that all of life is probation permeates the entire Bible. It begins with probation in the Garden of Eden (Gen. 2:15-17) and concludes in the last chapter of Revelation with the promise of rewards or punishment (Rev. 22:11-19).

Probation presupposes that man was highly created and endowed by God (Gen. 1:27; 2:7). Saints are not made by divine fiat, but through man's deliberate choices in the presence of the possibility of choosing contrary to divine law or requirements. As created, his inclinations were toward God and righteousness, for he was "created in righteousness and true holiness" (Eph. 4:24) with the added presence of the Holy Spirit. His love and loyalty to God must be tested, however, and temptation in some form was a necessity. Man fell into sin (Rom. 5:12), and all history has been under the terms and conditions of the Fall. The Scriptures teach, however, that men are free agents (e.g., John 7:17; 5:40; Luke 15:18, 20), with moral responsibility (Eccles. 12:13-14; Acts 17:30-31; Rom. 2:16; 14:12; 2 Cor. 5:10), while at the same time God is sovereign and works "all things after the counsel of his own will" (Eph. 1:11).

Is man's probation limited by death, or is the probation of some continued beyond the grave? Some believe that 1 Pet. 3:18-20 favors this possibility. Beyond this moot passage is the clear teaching of Scripture that this life is probationary (Matt. 7:24-29; Rom. 2:6-16) and is followed by divine judgment (Heb. 9:27; Rev. 20:12-13).

Probation is also used as a trial or test of suitability for church office or membership (1 Tim. 3:10; cf. 1 Cor. 16:3).

See TEMPTATION, FREEDOM, FREE WILL, ACCOUNTABILITY, FUTURE PROBATION, DESTINY (ETERNAL).

For Further Reading: *GMS*, 529-30, 627-28; Wiley, CT, 2:58.

WILLIAM M. ARNETT

PROCESS THEOLOGY. This is a theological movement primarily influenced by the process philosophies of Alfred N. Whitehead (1861-1947) and Charles Hartshorne (1897-). Largely Anglo-American and Protestant in background, process rather than timeless being is regarded as the ultimate metaphysical insight. As a form of philosophical theology this movement

reinterprets the Christian faith in terms of a developing, changing, dynamic understanding of reality. This marks a return to speculative philosophy in a theological context and provides a new basis for natural theology in the 20th century. A list of process theologians would include John Cobb, Schubert Ogden, Daniel D. Williams, Norman Pittenger.

For Whitehead "the Church gave unto God the attributes which belonged exclusively to Caesar." God was fashioned in the image of an all-powerful oriental despot. God suffers not, is unaffected by time, and is absolute. Hartshorne calls this view classical theism: God is immutable, omnipotent, *a se*, impassible. For process theology classical theism fails to relate an unchanging God to a changing world. Therefore God's nature and relation to the world are reinterpreted through process categories. A dipolar view of God's primordial and consequent natures recognizes temporality in God's being, with His relation to the world now defined in terms of panentheism.

During the 1970s process theologians systematically began to explore many traditional doctrinal themes, including Christology, theological anthropology, ecclesiology, the Trinity, and eschatology. With their roots in 19th-century liberalism, evolutionary thinking is emphasized, but without the old liberal identification of process with progress. Although individual differences exist between these theologians, they tend to be optimistic with respect to human existence, confident of love as the primary quality of God, and convinced of the illuminating power of the Whiteheadian vision of reality for Christian thinking.

Evangelical reception of this movement is mixed. On the one hand process theology suggests the inevitability of philosophical currents in theological work, fosters appreciation of the humanity of Jesus, overcomes the modern dualistic split between history and nature, and stresses the reality of freedom. On the other hand, evangelical criticism is forthright on the processive interpretation of theism, the denial of *creatio ex nihilo*, an apparent "finite God," a questionable basis for subjective immortality, and the tendency to adjust biblical theology to fit the Whiteheadian scheme of thought.

See PANENTHEISM, IMMUTABILITY, ATTRIBUTES (DIVINE), MORAL ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

For Further Reading: Cobb and Griffin, *Process Theology: An Introductory Exposition*; Cousins, ed., *Process Theology: Basic Writings*; Mellert, *What Is Process Theology?*; Williams, *The Spirit and the Forms of Love*; Kantzer and Gundry, eds., *Perspectives on Evangelical Theology*,

15-42; Peterson, "Orthodox Christianity, Wesleyanism, and Process Theology," *WTJ*, Fall, 1980, 45-58.

HERBERT L. PRINCE

PROCESSION OF THE SPIRIT. This term refers to the relationship of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son. In the early centuries of the church considerable energy was given to a clear and careful definition of the Trinity. God is one substance in three Persons; Christ's humanity and deity are kept in balance; and the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit are affirmed.

The attention of the church was directed next to a clarification of the relative place of each of the three Persons. God the Son was "begotten of the Father" (eternally begotten) and bore a filial relationship with the Father as the Second Person of the Trinity. The Holy Spirit as the Third Person of the Trinity was "breathed out" (spirated). The Nicene Creed (A.D. 325) referred to the Holy Spirit "which proceedeth from the Father." This wording seemed to support a "subordination" of God the Son. To counter any such thought and in keeping with the total context of the Scripture (John 14:26; 15:26; 16:7), the church moved from a "single procession" to a "double procession" of the Spirit. The phrase "and of the Son" (the *filioque*) was added to the Nicene Creed at the Council of Toledo (A.D. 589). The Council at Aix la Chapelle (Synod of Aachen, A.D. 809) officially sanctioned the *filioque*.

The church in the West early contended for the inclusion of the *filioque*, while the Eastern branch of Christendom vehemently opposed it. So significant was the issue that it became a contributing factor in the final break (A.D. 1054) which divided Christianity into Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox branches.

See HOLY SPIRIT, TRINITY (THE HOLY).

For Further Reading: Neve, *History of Christian Doctrine*, 1:121 ff, 177; Wiley, *CT*, 1:414-44.

RONALD E. WILSON

PROFANE, PROFANITY. This is the opposite of "holy" in Scripture. The profane person is one who is purely secular and evidences a disregard for things that are sacred. Profanity, popularly, relates to taking God's name in vain and to the use of words which only slightly miss, and are substitutes for, any of the names of Deity.

See SECULARISM.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

PROGRESSIVE REVELATION. This term first appeared in liberal circles; it means something entirely different for evangelical Christians. The concept is crucial if one hopes to interpret Scripture correctly.

Evangelical Perspective. Progressive revelation means that God has spoken by word and sign over a large span of time, rooted in such solid historical events as the Exodus, conquest, kingdom, Exile and return, life-death-resurrection of Jesus, outpouring of the Holy Spirit, and the expansion of the Church (Packer, "An Evangelical View of Progressive Revelation," *Evangelical Roots*, 149). "Progressive" speaks of the steady advance that God's self-disclosure took from its first faint beginnings to its glorious completion in Jesus Christ. It recognizes that in the historical process one word, one event, one epoch followed another until the climax came (Heb. 1:1-2). It notes that God first revealed himself to select individuals, then progressively to a family, a tribe, a nation, and finally in "the fulness of the time" (Gal. 4:4) to the whole world in the Word made flesh and the Word written.

Progressive revelation suggests that God's disclosure in both Testaments is an organic whole. But in that whole there is progressive development of understanding as former revelation lays the foundation for later revelation; the law prepares the way for the prophets; "each promise fulfilled brings the sense of a larger promise" (Westcott, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 482); finally the Jesus of history in the Gospels makes possible the Christ of faith in the Epistles until at last the whole of God's self-revelation is fully seen and understood. Evangelicals resist such views as C. H. Dodd's that all stages of the revelatory process except the last involved beliefs that were partly wrong (Dodd, *Authority of the Bible*, 255).

Liberal Views. All forms of liberalism adhere to belief in natural evolutionary development. When applied to "progressive" revelation, liberal views believe that the revelatory process was a natural religious development which slowly advanced by human insight and discovery into the true character of God and the moral nature of man. This evolutionary process applies to both the theological and literary development of Scripture.

The "history of religion" theory about the emergence of monotheism illustrates well the concept of *theological evolution*. Rather than monotheism being a God-given revelation from the outset of OT history, it is assumed that Israel began with a polytheistic religion like her ancient neighbors. Only gradually did she progress from a crude patriarchal polytheism to the ethical monotheism of the prophets and of Jesus of Nazareth.

Progressive revelation, according to liberal views, also involved *literary evolution*. One ex-

ample is the Graf-Wellhausen documentary hypothesis which postulates a long and gradual development of the Pentateuch. Rather than Genesis through Deuteronomy being authentically the work of Moses as writer, they comprise instead many centuries of oral and literary evolution with various editors forming and shaping its theology as late as the Exile and placing it in the historical framework of the idealized past.

A similar literary evolution is seen in the Gospels. Form criticism, for example, suggests that Gospel materials first circulated orally in small, independent units of teaching. The Early Church developed and embellished the material during its many decades of oral transmission and usage. Some form critics (e.g., Dibelius and Bultmann) believe that many parables, miracle stories, and episodes attributed to Jesus are actually fictional literary creations by the Early Church as the meaning of her faith and the character of her Lord were being formulated.

These and other liberal views of progressive revelation supposedly account for the "faulty" and "wrong" conceptions of God, man, and the world in Scripture and for the "primitive" elements which embarrass the modern mind. All such concepts of progressive revelation err, however, since revelation concerns not what man *discovers* but what God *discloses*.

Implications for Scripture Interpretation. Progressive revelation, evangelically understood, implies that the Old and New Testaments are two parts of one continuum of revelation; in both parts it is God himself who is revealing His character and redemptive purposes by words and deeds. But progressive revelation acknowledges a distinction between the two Testaments: the OT records an incomplete progressive revelation, while the NT records God's revelation in its full and completed form. Each part of the OT is incomplete, though not incorrect, and looks forward to the time of fullness and fulfillment in Jesus Christ.

Furthermore, progressive revelation means that to interpret Scripture accurately, one must "interpret a passage in its revelatory progress. This means that we recognize the Old Testament as always pointing toward a more full Word which came in the New Testament" (Augsburger, *Principles of Biblical Interpretation*, 17). This is true both theologically and ethically. Theologically, for example, the sacrificial system of atonement in the OT was fulfilled in Jesus' once-for-all offering of himself for sin's atonement, thereby making obsolete the OT method (see Heb. 8:13-10:18). Ethically, certain OT practices such

as polygamy proved to be sub-Christian. Although God through Moses instructed against polygamy (Deut. 17:17), the practice of it continued, undoubtedly because of the hardness of their hearts (cf. Matt. 19:8 on divorce). When the moral conduct and holiness required of God's people became the object of more and more precise revelations, the practice of polygamy disappeared, as in the NT.

Progressive revelation implies, therefore, that in Scripture interpretation, "the authority of certain portions of the Bible may not be, in detail or application, the same for us as it was for those to whom those portions were originally addressed" (Taylor, *Biblical Authority and Christian Faith*, 66). Consequently, the incomplete progressive revelation must be interpreted and applied always in the light of the fullness of God's revelation in His Son.

See REVELATION (SPECIAL), BIBLE, BIBLICAL AUTHORITY, COMPARATIVE RELIGION, HERMENEUTICS, BIBLE: THE TWO TESTAMENTS.

For Further Reading: Baker, *Two Testaments: One Bible*, 59-87; Pache, *The Inspiration and Authority of Scripture*, 102-10; Packer, "An Evangelical View of Progressive Revelation," *Evangelical Roots*, 143-58; Ramm, *Special Revelation and the Word of God*; Taylor, *Biblical Authority and Christian Faith*, 64-68, 81-83.

J. WESLEY ADAMS

PROGRESSIVE SANCTIFICATION. The use of the term *progressive* with reference to sanctification suggests that there is a process of time in which the instantaneous experience of entire sanctification is realized. This second work of grace, entire sanctification, comes in successive stages, each of which has a gradual approach and an instantaneous consummation. Three things should be noted in this respect.

First, sanctification, in its larger meaning, is both initial and entire. In conversion the repentant sinner is justified, regenerated, and adopted into the family of God. But, in addition, he is initially sanctified: cleansed from the acquired depravity which is a result of the sinner's actual sinning. But initial sanctification has not affected his inherited depravity. In a second crisis he is sanctified wholly: delivered from the presence of inbred sin or inherited depravity.

Second, sanctification is both gradual and instantaneous. Every act which brings God's grace to the being of man is the result of faith, and faith for entire sanctification must be preceded by a recognition of inner sin and a confession of that sin. This renunciation of sin is only possible by the convicting power of the Holy Spirit. This sense of awareness of inbred sin is progressive or

gradual. But when this gradual aspect of entire sanctification brings the child of God, through the Holy Spirit, to a complete renunciation of inbred sin, simple faith in Jesus Christ will result in an instantaneous cleansing from inbred sin.

Third, sanctification is both instantaneous and continuous. It has already been stated that while there is a gradual approach to entire sanctification, the actual cleansing from inbred sin is done in an instant. While this cleansing from inbred sin is a definite act completed in a moment, the retention of the freedom from sin is the result of a continuous cleansing by the Holy Spirit. Thus the cleansing from inbred sin which was completed in an instant in answer to faith, is retained by the sanctified Christian only as he walks in the light and trusts the blood of Jesus Christ to keep him cleansed from all sin (1 John 1:7).

Sometimes "progressive sanctification" is used in reference to growth in Christlikeness and to the deepening of holy character after the crisis of entire sanctification. Great care must be exercised in such a use of the term, lest "progressive" be understood as a gradual cleansing from sin.

See SANCTIFICATION, ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION.

For Further Reading: Wiley, CT, 2:479-86; Curtis, *The Christian Faith*, 373-93; GMS, 268-302, 462-507.

NORMAN R. OKE

PROMISE. Although possessing certain factors in common, a *promise* (Gr. *epaggelma*) and a *covenant* (Heb. *berith*; Gr. *diathēke*) possess certain essential differences. A promise is "a declaration that something will or will not be done, given by one" (*Random House Dictionary*). A covenant is "a compact or agreement between two [or more] parties binding them mutually to undertakings on each other's behalf" (*Baker's DT*, 142).

The assurance of the fulfillment of a promise rests exclusively upon the veracity of the promisor, whereas the fulfillment of the terms of a covenant rests upon the fidelity of each party to the agreement. Violation of those terms by either party abrogates the provisions of the covenant. God's redemptive promises are unconditional: "For when God made the promise to Abraham, since He could swear by no one greater, He swore by Himself" (Heb. 6:13, NASB; cf. 14-20; Gal. 3:10-18; Gen. 22:15-18; Luke 1:73-79).

God's covenants are many, and each is included, like a concentric circle, within the larger circle of His promises. God's great redemptive promises are three, and consist, first, of Christ the Redeemer, which appears first in Gen. 3:15 and continues progressively throughout both Testaments, including His virgin birth, death on the

Cross, resurrection, and ascension. The Father's promise of the Gift of the Holy Spirit constitutes the second great redemptive promise to man (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4-5), which was fulfilled with the Spirit's effusion at Pentecost (2:1-4). The third is God's promise of Christ's second coming (Acts 1:11; 3:19-21; 1 Thess. 1:10; 4:13-18; Titus 2:13; see also John Fletcher, *Works*, 3:166-69).

See COVENANT, NEW COVENANT, PENTECOST, PROMISES (DAVIDIC).

For Further Reading: Walker, "Promise," *ISBE*, 4:2459; Smith, "Promise," *Baker's DT*, 422-23; Miner, "Promise," *IDB*, K-Q:893-96.

CHARLES W. CARTER

PROMISES, DAVIDIC. The promises made by God to King David, found in 2 Samuel 7, assure David that the throne of his offspring will be established forever. The occasion for these promises was David's intention to build a house in which the Lord would dwell (the Jerusalem Temple). God refuses David's offer and instead, employing a play on words, promises to build a house (dynasty) for David. This meant that for Judah there would be but one ruling dynasty in their national history of over 400 years. (Compare this with Northern Israel's nine dynasties in approximately 200 years.) The promises are regarded as a binding covenant (see the last words of David in 2 Sam. 23:1-7; also Jer. 33:20-21) and form an important aspect in Israel's covenant history.

Some scholars see a vital historical connection between the Abrahamic and Davidic promises. Promises made to Abraham (Gen. 12:1-3) of land and a great nation are seen as fulfilled in David. It is also noted that David began his reign in Hebron, the general area where Abraham had settled and where traditions surrounding the patriarch would be kept alive (see Clements, *Abraham and David*). This approach provides continuity in the covenantal purposes of God in the OT.

Based on the promises to David, Israel developed a royal theology which said that as long as a son (descendant) of David was enthroned, they were under the special favor and protection of God. This interpretation of the Davidic promises became the basis of hope in times of national adversity (Ps. 89:20-52; Isa. 37:35), but gave rise to a false sense of unconditional security. Closely coupled with this thought was the belief that God's choice of Zion as His dwelling place on earth insured the political and spiritual security of the nation. Typical prophetic reaction to this misunderstanding is seen in Jeremiah's Temple sermon (chap. 7).

With the passing of time the promises made to David were used to refer to Israel's future restoration under God, and the expectation of an ideal king took root. The following prophetic references indicate this: Amos 9:11-12; Hos. 3:5; Isa. 9:7; 16:5; Jer. 23:5-6; 33:15-16; Ezek. 34:23-24; 37:24. No human king ever fulfilled these hopes and aspirations, but the NT recognizes our Lord, the Son of David, as fulfillment of the ideal King.

See MESSIAH, SON OF MAN, PROPHET (PROPHECY).

For Further Reading: Clements, *Abraham and David*; Bright, *A History of Israel*, 203-7; Mowinkel, *He That Cometh*, 165-69.

ALVIN S. LAWHEAD

PROPERTY RIGHTS. There is no biblical "blueprint" for a Christian approach to property. There are, however, scriptural ethical principles relating to property and its use.

All property belongs to God. He created all things, and all things belong to Him. He alone has absolute ownership (Ps. 24:1; Isa. 66:2). Use of the land, air, water, and even of other living creatures have been freely given to man by God (Gen. 1:26-29), but the ultimate right is God's.

Ownership of property by man, then, is secondary, not absolute. As a gift from God, it is to be held in trust by man and used for human need (Job 31:16-34; Isa. 58:7-8). Man's response is not only one of gratitude and thanksgiving, but of stewardship (Matt. 20:1-16; Luke 19:11-27). Property is to be used in accordance with the will of the One who is sovereign over all. Ownership implies a duty as well as a privilege. Property rights are, therefore, to be subordinated to human need.

Within the framework of the absolute ownership by God alone, biblical faith assumes the necessity of some measure of individual ownership of property. The OT injunction "You shall not steal" presupposes the right of individual ownership. The communal sharing of goods by the Jerusalem church following Pentecost (Acts 2:44-45; 5:1-15) presupposes the freedom to place or not to place property at the disposal of the community.

George Thomas believes that "historical facts make it clear that the Church has usually recognized the right of property as *legitimate*, but has been keenly aware of the moral and social dangers of property and has imposed *limitations* upon it to protect the welfare of the less fortunate" (*Christian Ethics and Moral Philosophy*, 310). He does not believe that this justifies a person in claiming an unconditional right to acquire property and dispose of it without regard for the consequences to others (312).

From the standpoint of the Christian ethic, absolute equality of property distribution and ownership is not demanded. Individual differences between persons cannot be ignored. What is called for is "equality of consideration" or equality of opportunity, which means "that each person should be effectively taken into account in the distribution of social benefits and that each should be helped to develop his capacities and fulfill his needs to the greatest extent possible" (Gardner, *Biblical Faith and Social Ethics*, 291).

The apostle Paul provides some guiding principles for economic life. Christians are urged to earn their living by honest work (Eph. 4:28), not only to support themselves, but in order to have something to share with the needy. Christians are to share their possessions "with simplicity"; and to distribute to the necessity of the saints (Rom. 12:8, 13). Men of wealth are "not to be arrogant nor to put their hope in wealth, which is so uncertain, but to put their hope in God, who richly provides us with everything for our enjoyment" (1 Tim. 6:17, NIV). Paul personally has little concern for money (Phil. 4:11).

For the apostle, possessions, including property, "are to be acquired honestly, and restitution must be made when wrongly appropriated; and riches must always be under the rule of God—otherwise, they prove to be deceitful and dangerous" (Barnett, *Introducing Christian Ethics*, 147).

See STEWARDSHIP, COVETOUSNESS, CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM, RIGHTS, RICHES, LABOR, POVERTY.

For Further Reading: Thomas, *Christian Ethics and Moral Philosophy*; Gardner, *Biblical Faith and Social Ethics*; Barnett, *Introducing Christian Ethics*.

LEBRON FAIRBANKS

PROPHET, PROPHECY. A prophet (from Gr. *prophētēs*, to speak for or before) is one called to discern God's purpose and action in history and to proclaim the divine word of judgment and grace. The Hebrew term in the OT is applied to a broad range of persons including Abraham, Moses, Aaron, Deborah, Samuel, Nathan, and Elijah, as well as those whose writings are labeled major and minor prophets. In the NT, Jesus, John the Baptist, and Silas are among those thus designated, and Paul sees prophecy as an essential function continuing in the life of the Church. Broadly speaking, most biblical writings are prophetic in that they convey the divinely inspired interpretation of human history.

The heyday of prophecy, however, is the era of the Israelite kingdoms, particularly times of national crisis from the ninth to the mid-sixth centuries B.C. Although these crises were precip-

itated by the invasion of foreign powers, the classical prophets saw the deepest crisis of the people in their pervasive unfaithfulness to the covenant with Yahweh, upon whom their peace ultimately depended. Yahweh's spokesmen proclaimed that worship of the "other gods" of nature and state—evidenced by widespread social injustice, political and religious corruption—was the essence of their evil and reason for their doom.

The popular tendency to narrow prophecy to apocalypticism and prediction of the future should be checked by the biblical stress upon prophetic proclamation of "the word of the Lord" to the present. Moreover, the challenge to kings, priests, and people to radical obedience and faith gets its meaning and demand from the mighty acts of God in Israel's past—preeminently the deliverance from Egyptian bondage and establishment of the Mosaic Covenant at Sinai.

To be sure, this inspired "retelling" and "forth-telling" of God's purpose and action, in terse and graphic language, issues often in bold "forth-telling" of His future acts of judgment and redemption. Prophetic NT writers see in the whole pattern of OT history, as well as specific statements, God's promise of and preparation for His climactic saving revelation in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus as the Christ. The spokesmen of the Lord in both Testaments are eschatological because, in the biblical story and the larger historical process, they discern telling signs of the ultimate goal and triumph of the kingdom of God.

The task of theology today, as in every age, involves a twofold interpretation: to understand the prophetic literature in its own terms and times, and to expound the meaning of prophetic faith in our terms and times. Sensitive theology thus respects the distance and appreciates the profound relevance of the prophets' words for the issues of life, death, and destiny today.

See HERMENEUTICS.

For Further Reading: IDB, 3:896-920; Richardson, ed., *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, 178-82; Sanders, *Radical Voices in the Wilderness*.

WILFRED L. WINGET

PROPIATION. The Greek word is *hilasterion*. To propitiate is to "appease and render favorable" or to "conciliate." Propitiation is "that which propitiates; atoning sacrifice." By this term Christ's death is viewed as appeasing divine justice and effecting reconciliation between God and man.

The word in the OT was applied to the mercy seat in the holy of holies. On the lid of the mercy

seat was sprinkled blood once a year by the priest. This act made an atonement for Israel's sin and was viewed as the "propitiation" for sins.

Sin separates from God; man is estranged from God because of his rebellion. God is offended and man separated and guilty. To effect reconciliation the holy God must be satisfied in His justice, and man's guilt must be removed or "expiated." The original word has both the idea of propitiation and expiation, which latter term is used in translating 1 John 2:2 in the RSV. Actually, God's wrath is propitiated and man's guilt is expiated.

In order for God to justly forgive men, as the Bible teaches, a sacrifice for sin is essential. "Paradoxically, the God who is propitiated also lovingly provides the propitiation" (NIDB, 807). No man is able to appease God's wrath on his own. It is only through the death of Jesus that God's anger against sin can be set aside. The God who was angry is also the God who "so loved the world, that he gave" (John 3:16). He provided the propitiation that removed the barrier to the giving of His free mercy.

However, this objective provision for the reconciling of God to man was not enough; man must be reconciled to God. In that same act of atonement, God provided for the expiation of man's guilt and proclaims the forgiveness of his sins. Thus the act of propitiation is both Godward and manward (see 2 Cor. 5:18-20). "God's righteousness which makes sin a barrier to fellowship, and God's love, which would destroy the barrier, are revealed and satisfied in one and the same means, the gift of Christ to be the Mediator between Himself and men" (HBD, 586).

One must never look upon the death of Christ as an act of vengeance on God's part to enable Him to be merciful. Christ's death is God's love expressing itself in glad removal of the barrier to the showing of His mercy to guilty man. He wanted to show mercy but could not justly do so until divine justice was fully satisfied. This was done in the provision for the removal of guilt by Christ becoming the propitiation for man's sins.

Now man only needs to bring his broken and contrite spirit to the "mercy seat" and there plead for forgiveness on the basis of what Christ did on the Cross.

See ATONEMENT, SACRIFICE, EXPIATION, SATISFACTION.

For Further Reading: Crawford, *The Doctrine of the Atonement*; ZPBD; ISBE; Wiley, CT, 2:229 ff, 283-86.

LEO G. COX

PROPOSITIONAL THEOLOGY. Propositional theology is a form of theological reflection that

begins with a conviction that revelation is essentially the divine communication of rationally comprehensible truths to humanity. Being rationally comprehensible, because they are revealed in language or in events which can be put into language, these truths are said to be propositional. In form, these truths are of the same kind as any other, though their aim may be quite different from the aim or objective of, say, mathematical truths or propositions. The method by which such truths come is, of course, very different. God sends revealed truths or propositions to us on His own initiative. We may intuit or rationally deduce mathematical truths.

Propositional theology takes these revealed propositions or truths, all of which are stated as information that can be intellectually grasped, and analyses, synthesizes, and deduces implications from them. While Christ is recognized as the ultimate revelation of truth, and as the Truth, the Bible is often referred to as "inscripturated revelation," i.e., revelation in written form. The purpose of the Bible, then, is to give us intellectual or cognitive information about God and about the nature of reality. The Bible is seen as essentially a collection of propositions or declarations about God, given by God himself.

A basic presupposition operating in propositional theology is confidence that Christian faith is essentially rational, resting on revealed facts and revealed propositions. Christ is the Foundation of Christian faith because He is the ultimate reason or rationality and the ultimate reality. He is the ultimate proposition. He is rationally comprehensible.

While propositional theology seeks to be thoroughly orthodox and claims to be the ancient faith of the Church, it is a recent offspring of the Reformed tradition. Its principal categories and chosen issues reflect a concern to counteract the more subjective views of revelation and of theology developed by classical liberalism, Barthianism, and existentialism. Thus, it is a very precisely aimed theology.

Classical liberalism reduced the idea of the divine revelation in Scripture to a notion of some sort of spiritual sensitivity on the part of a collection of very fallible people who were deeply immersed in their cultures as they wrote. Propositional theology wants to restore the idea that the Bible is God's very own thoughts, that human fallibility entered only at the point of reproducing God's words, and that cultural accretion in no way covers the essential point being made.

Barthianism and existentialism insist that God

reveals only himself, not knowledge about himself, and that this self-revelation can be believed only as we are personally confronted by it and decide to act upon it as true. Such belief, then, will radically change us. For Barthianism and existentialism, then, the Bible is not a book of propositions but a book meant to invoke an encounter between God and ourselves. Our intellects, with their demand for rationality, are believed to be either too self-serving and fallen (Barthianism) or too narrow and abstract (existentialism) to be recipient of saving revelation. Propositional theology agrees that the Bible invokes divine-human encounter. But propositional theology insists that this encounter, engendered by the Holy Spirit, is dependent for its outcome upon our consent to propositions that God has stated about himself and about us and our world. These propositions are objective and true regardless of our decision concerning them or the God who gives them.

Propositional theology views Barthianism and existentialism as having hung the truth and authority of Scripture on human decision in that both speak of the inspiration and authority of Scripture depending upon a response, positive or negative, by the hearer or reader. Propositional theology insists that such a procedure makes the human being the determiner of the truth and value of Scripture.

Conflict between propositional theology and other theologies has generally been primarily located at the point of the meaning and content of the Bible itself. But, of course, this implicates a number of other doctrines, issues, and concerns. So, the propositionalists have usually insisted on the correctness of the decision of the older fundamentalists concerning the absolutely non-negotiable, unchanging, and essential character of Christian faith. To be Christian, one must hold to the "fundamentals": verbal inerrancy of Scripture, the deity of Jesus, the virgin birth of Jesus, substitutionary atonement, and the physical resurrection and bodily return of Christ. All of these are believed to be stated as propositions in Scripture, as propositions to be taken as literally as any scientific description. And denial of any one of them is finally seen as denial of all of them, for they are interdependent and biblical.

Theology for the propositionalist, then, is not simply reflection on the Christian faith. It is analysis, synthesis, and deduction of truth itself. Theology or dogmatic statement thus has an authority for the propositionalist that it does not have for most other sorts of contemporary theologians.

See REVELATION (SPECIAL), BIBLICAL AUTHORITY, BIBLICAL REALISM, TRUTH, DOCTRINE, DOGMA, FUNDAMENTALISM, FIDEISM.

For Further Reading: Henry, ed., *Revelation and the Bible*; Ridderbos, *Studies in Scripture and Its Authority*; Taylor, *Biblical Authority and Christian Faith*, 38-50.

PAUL M. BASSETT

PROSELYTE. The word "proselyte" is the equivalent of the Hebrew word *ger*, meaning a resident alien, "a stranger and sojourner" (Lev. 25:23; Deut. 14:21). The word later described a convert to Judaism and finally to Christianity (Matt. 23:15; Acts 2:5, 10; 6:5; 13:43).

The NT opens with Judaism making proselytes (Matt. 23:15; Luke 3:7-15). On the Day of Pentecost both Jews and proselytes were present in Jerusalem from every nation under heaven (Acts 2:5, 10). One of the chosen deacons was a Gentile and proselyte of Antioch (6:5). Paul and Barnabas found some "devout proselytes" at Antioch in Pisidia (13:43, 50). Paul addressed both Jews and Gentiles in the synagogue as "men of Israel, and ye that fear God" (vv. 16, 26, 43). These were Jews and religious proselytes. In Thessalonica and Athens, there were "devout Greeks" and "devout persons" in the synagogue (17:4, 17).

In summary: Proselytes were (1) non-Jews living among the covenant people and adopting their life-style partially and/or wholly; (2) Israelites born and living outside Palestine; and finally, (3) Gentiles converting to Judaism and to Christianity (13:26-52; 18:7-8; Matt. 23:15).

See PROSELYTISM.

ISAAC BALDEO

PROSELYTISM. Proselytism is the practice of making proselytes, a practice which is highly offensive in some circles. This offensiveness is at two levels: first, the attempt to make Christian converts from adherents of other religions is objectionable; second, even more objectionable is the attempt to make converts from other branches of Christendom, as for instance, missionaries working with populations claimed by the Greek Orthodox church.

Authority for seeking converts from other religions is rooted in the nature of the Christian religion itself, and in the specific command of Jesus (Matt. 28:19-20). Christianity declares the exclusiveness and solitariness of Christ as Savior (e.g., John 14:6; Acts 4:12; 1 Tim. 1:15; 2:5-6; 1 John 5:11-12; et al.).

Proselytism among different branches of Christendom is more delicate and complex. It is to be deplored that some workers, both in the

home field and on foreign fields, become flagrant "sheep stealers," sometimes without any valid doctrinal basis, at other times without an adequate doctrinal basis. Minor differences in doctrine should not be pressed into major ones in order to enlarge one's own congregation, if basic spiritual needs are being met. On the other hand evangelicals who believe that the new birth is essential for salvation will have a guilty conscience if they ignore real spiritual needs. It cannot be denied that some branches of Christendom are so nominal or doctrinally derelict that their effectiveness in leading their own people to Christ is slight if not completely nonexistent. In a real sense, therefore, these people become a needy mission field, toward which a Spirit-filled missionary or pastor cannot but feel some sense of obligation.

See MISSION (MISSIONS, MISSIOLOGY), EVANGELISM, CHRISTIANITY, EVANGELICAL, PROSELYTE.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

PROTESTANTISM. The term *Protestantism* is applied both to the sum of the ecclesiastical fellowships and bodies which emerged from the 16th-century Reformation movement, and to the principles which are held in common by such groups.

The term originated in 1529 when the German Reichstag met at Speier. The princes and cities loyal to Roman Catholicism were in the majority and voted for a virtual abolition of Lutheran territorial churches and the perpetuation of the ecclesiastical status quo. Those forces which had already joined in the movement to reform the church responded with a strong *Protestatio*. The document was not solely negative, but rather positive. For both in the derivation of the title and the intention of its authors, the word was not limited to the raising of an objection; but rather, it indicated the witness or confession of that which was believed. From the title of the document, its supporters were called Protestants; and eventually the movement by which they were the vanguard was called Protestantism.

In its proper sense, Protestantism depends upon certain characteristic views. Perhaps the most important one of these is the belief that the Bible is the only totally reliable Source of authority in religion; tradition is only an aid in understanding the Bible. Closely tied with this is the concept of the right of private judgment, that in the absolute sense the individual is responsible to God alone and not to the visible church. Justification is by faith alone, and good works are the result of salvation rather than contributors toward it. The

church is found where there are believers united in Christ as their Head—it is an organism more than an organization. The ministry is not spiritually different from the laity but only functionally distinct; each person has direct access to God through Christ but can also fill a priestly role toward his brother. The sacraments are limited to those established by Christ in the Bible; they are two in number (baptism and the Lord's Supper) and are visible proclamations of the Word.

In its broader sense, Protestantism is sometimes applied to all Christians who are neither Roman Catholics nor members of one of the Eastern churches. The term can be applied in a limited sense to groups which antedate the Reformation but which came wholly or partially to accept Protestant views. But it cannot properly be applied to groups with marked differences from the views summarized above, including the modern cults. Furthermore, there are those who reject their inclusion within Protestantism, such as some Anglicans (especially the Anglo-Catholic or high church party), the spiritual heirs of the Anabaptists, some Baptists, and some modern Pentecostals.

See LUTHERANISM, CALVINISM, ARMINIANISM, ANGLO-CATHOLICISM.

For Further Reading: Cobb, *Varieties of Protestantism*; Marty, *Protestantism*; Van de Pol, *World Protestantism*; Ritter, "Protestantism," in *Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 2:914-20; Steinmetz, "Protestantism," NIDCC, 808-9; Tillich, *The Protestant Era*; Whale, *The Protestant Tradition*. LEE M. HAINES

PROVIDENCE. The doctrine of divine providence is eminently scriptural, even though the word *providence* does not appear in Scripture. Christian faith is opposed to pantheistic confusion of God with the world, to deistic separation of God apart from the world, to fatalistic resignation of an impersonal God over the world, and to naturalistic exclusion of God from the world.

Divine providence may be defined as that activity of God by which He conserves and preserves His creation and cares for and directs all things to their final destiny. This definition indicates that there are three elements in divine providence, namely conservation, preservation, and government.

Conservation. Conservation is God's sustaining providence in the realm of the physical universe, i.e., in inanimate, or lifeless, nature. While rejecting pantheism, deism, fatalism, and naturalism, Christian faith affirms the immediate presence and agency of God in the physical world. The Scriptures are explicit in claiming the immanent power of God in upholding all things

with His word (Acts 17:25, 28; Col. 1:17; Rom. 11:36). A strong statement from John Wesley illustrates the general evangelical position regarding conservation: "God acts in heaven, in earth, and under the earth, throughout the whole compass of His creation; by sustaining all things, without which everything would in an instant sink into its primitive nothing; by governing all, every moment superintending everything that He has made" (*Works*, 7:240). Even the so-called laws of nature may be regarded as principles of the divine activity.

Preservation. Preservation relates to God's work of providence in the animate realm, i.e., in the area of living things. Admittedly there is a mystery of life from the lowest cell structure to the most complex of all living creatures, man. There is the additional problem of past and potential extinction of specific forms of life. Yet the overarching activity of God in living organisms remains a biblical and Christian belief. The Bible is emphatic at the point of God's involvement in the totality of life (Prov. 30:25; Jer. 8:7; Ps. 145:15-16; Matt. 5:45; Acts 17:28; Col. 1:17; Heb. 1:3). Without the preserving will of God, the world would fall into nothingness in a flash (Brunner, *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption*, 152).

Government. In passing from the existence and development of lower forms of life to man, a change in the activity of divine providence is noted. Here God's relationship is not causative, as in conservation and preservation. Rather, God's providential care and government is moral. Providence is exerted in the form of motive rather than compulsion.

Because God has given the power of freedom to man and permitted freedom's exercise, neither a sinful act nor its consequences may be said to be God's act. In exercising His providential care, God may permit certain acts (2 Chron. 32:31; Ps. 81:12-13; Hos. 4:17; Acts 14:16; Rom. 1:24, 28); He may restrain or prevent particular deeds (Hos. 2:6; Gen. 20:6; Ps. 19:13); He may overrule the acts of men (Gen. 50:20; Isa. 10:5; John 13:27; Acts 4:27-28); He may establish the extent or boundaries of sin (Job 1:12; Ps. 124:2; 2 Thess. 2:7; 1 Cor. 10:13).

On the positive side the root idea of divine providence is that God rules over all in love (Rom. 8:28). The notion that within the Christian dispensation the idea of God's sovereignty is replaced by His Fatherhood is not valid. God is truly Father. God is also Sovereign, the Eternal Ruler of the universe.

See DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY, GUIDANCE, EVIL, CHANCE, DEISM, PANTHEISM, FATALISM, CONTINGENCY.

For Further Reading: Brunner, *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption*, 148-85; Bruce, *The Providential Order*, 231-310; Berkouwer, *The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth*, 163-65; Wiley, CT, 1:477-87.

DONALD S. METZ

PRUDENCE. Prudence is caution, care, and wise foresight in the face of only partially seen contingencies. This quality of mature character needs to be exercised in delicate social tensions, in the care of one's health and that of those for whom one is responsible, and also in matters of finance and business. Paul practiced prudence several times in quietly going elsewhere when violence against him was threatened. It was prudent for Jesus to send Peter fishing to get the tax money, rather than stand their ground in refusing to pay. While Jesus was not intending to encourage dishonesty, He nevertheless commended the unjust steward for his prudence in looking ahead. Jesus himself fulfilled the prediction: "My servant shall deal prudently" (Isa. 52:13). And certainly prudence was highly praised in the Wisdom literature, especially in Proverbs and Ecclesiastes; as, for instance, Prov. 14:15—"A prudent man gives thought to his steps" (NIV).

But the question of prudence can create personal tension, even become a theological problem. Jesus seemed to unchristianize prudence in the Sermon on the Mount (esp. Matt. 6:25-34). After warning against anxiety, He concluded: "Therefore do not worry about tomorrow, for tomorrow will worry about itself. Each day has enough trouble of its own" (v. 34, NIV). Is it not very imprudent to give tomorrow no thought at all?

While the basic principle enunciated in v. 33 applies to all, the passage as a whole has special relevance to those called to full-time Christian work, who will often be compelled to make choice between a prudent and secure life-style, and daring, even risky, adventuring for God. There is an abandonment to the work of God in total consecration which places security on the altar and literally lives by faith. Yet faith does not require foolhardiness or presumptuous carelessness—only the sober, calculated risks inherent in utter obedience. Harmon Schmelzenbach subordinated prudence to the need of souls, when he responded to the vision and went into the malaria-infested lowlands of Swaziland. That obedience cost his life. But is it not greater and higher prudence to gather sheaves at any cost than to

protect self at any cost? Some are prudent only for time; God's people must learn to be prudent for eternity. This is really Jesus' point concerning the unjust steward: "I tell you, use worldly wealth to gain friends for yourselves, so that when it is gone, you will be welcomed into eternal dwellings" (Luke 16:9, NIV).

See WISDOM, SERVICE, FAITH, CONSECRATION.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

PSEUDEPIGRAPHIA. This term refers to a group of books not included in the biblical canon or the Apocrypha and written under assumed names, e.g., Abraham, Enoch, Moses, Isaiah, Job. They are of the Jewish origin and are generally dated between 200 B.C. and A.D. 100. A few oriental Christian groups have included them either in the Bible or among special writings thought to have importance for an understanding of the roots of the faith. The pseudepigrapha, however, have not achieved an acceptance anything like the Apocrypha. Not all of these writings are pseudonymous, but since most of them can be so classified, it is appropriate to employ the term *pseudepigrapha*.

The books included in the pseudepigrapha are: *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Psalms of Solomon*, *Lives of the Prophets*, *Jubilees*, *Testament of Job*, *Enoch*, *Martyrdom of Isaiah*, *Paralipomena of Jeremiah*, *The Life of Adam and Eve*, *The Assumption of Moses*, *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*, *Apocalypse of Abraham*, *Letter of Aristeas*, *Sibylline Oracles 3-5*, *3 and 4 Maccabees*, *Slavonic Enoch (2 Enoch)*, *Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch)*. At Qumran, the following books were found and should be included in the pseudepigrapha: *Apocryphon of Genesis*, *Pseudo-Jeremianic work*, *War Scroll*, *Description of the New Jerusalem*, *Liturgy of Three Tongues of Fire*, *Book of Mysteries*, *Hodayoth*, *Psalms of Joshua*. Besides these writings there are numerous manuscripts or fragments with commentaries on biblical books, works on liturgical and legal matters, and wisdom pieces.

Categorization of these books, most of which exist in fragmentary form, is extremely difficult. They can be grouped, somewhat superficially, into Hebrew-Aramaic Palestinian and Greek Alexandrian writings, with language being the basic determinant. However, literary genre provides a more helpful classification, such as apocalypses, legendary histories, testaments, liturgies, and wisdom works.

The value of these writings lies in the insight they provide into the thought life of the Jews during the intertestamental period, and in the light they shed on the Jewish background of the

NT. With the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, which are dated in the first and second centuries B.C., information concerning the period immediately preceding the Christian era has been radically increased.

See APOCRYPHA, HAGIOGRAPHIA, CANON.

For Further Reading: Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*; Fritsch, "Pseudepigrapha," *IDB*, vol. 3; Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times*.

WILLARD H. TAYLOR

PSEUDO-ISADORIAN DECRETALS. See FALSE DECRETALS.

PSYCHOANALYSIS. Strictly speaking, psychoanalysis involves an investigation of the nature, structure, and dynamics of the psychic dimension of personality. The best-known architect and proponent of psychoanalysis was Sigmund Freud, an early 20th-century Viennese neurologist.

Some of the basic assumptions for psychoanalysis are: (1) all behavior is determined; (2) all behavior is meaningful behavior; (3) there is an interpenetration of biological and psychological dimensions of personality at the conscious, subconscious, and unconscious levels; (4) psychic energies are either locked or cathected by need objects of the person through drives, desires, or defenses; (5) there is psychodynamic growth from infancy to maturity, but this growth may be hampered or halted at any stage. Therefore, analysis attempts to take into account all personal history including origins, antecedent-subsequent behaviors and relationships, and repetitions; (6) the role of the analyst includes: listening, associating, and interpreting as a participant-observer; and (7) the purpose of psychoanalysis is to discover, define, and interpret psychodynamic processes of growth (descriptively, organizationally, and analytically) in all their uniqueness in order to facilitate more personally and/or socially acceptable behavior.

As in other fields, the term *psychoanalysis* has been broadened to include variant basic assumptions and consequent systems and procedures. Freudian psychoanalysis was antithetical to evangelical Christian theology. Any psychoanalysis should be investigated to determine its theological presuppositions before Christians seek to engage in it either as patients or analysts.

See REALITY THERAPY, ROGERIAN COUNSELING, PASTORAL COUNSELING, DEVELOPMENT (THEORIES OF).

For Further Reading: Bromberg, *The Mind of Man: A History of Psychotherapy and Psychoanalysis*; Schneck, *History of Psychiatry*, vol. 6; Wolman, ed., *International*

Encyclopedia of Psychiatry, Psychology, Psychoanalysis, and Neurology.
CHESTER O. GALLOWAY

PSYCHOLOGY. Psychology is a disciplined attempt to explain, evaluate, and control behavior.

To explain behavior is to relate it to motive; the "why" of personal conduct. It is important to understand motive, since problem behavior will not be changed until causative factors are identified. Those factors generally include a combination of heredity, environment, and experience. However, one should not expect a given set of factors to produce the same behavior in all instances. That would be the kind of determinism which holds that certain parents are likely to produce children with criminal tendencies, that some environments foster problem conduct, that many people act wrongly because they do not know better. The problem here is an abject surrender to extrinsic and uncontrollable factors, a surrender which makes redemption unlikely if not, in fact, unnecessary.

To evaluate behavior is to relate it to values; judgments must be made about the acceptability of conduct in a prescribed context. Obviously, a moral order depends upon a discernible system of absolutes. Similarly, an ordered society survives by the definition and communication of behavioral standards whereby membership and acceptance are achieved in that society. And each individual must achieve that level of conduct where he gains self-esteem. "Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth" (Rom. 14:22). This "triad of morality," so described by David Belgium (*Guilt, Where Psychology and Religion Meet*, 17-34) is jeopardized by psychology's eagerness to replace God's immutable values with society's transient ones. Karl Menninger perceived this tendency in asking, "Whatever became of sin?"

Rejecting the biblical concept of sin, sinners have denied the wrongness of their deeds. Emboldened by false security of numbers, they have next pronounced their behavior normative and have accepted new justificatory terms for their conduct. So sin has evolved into situationism and hierarchalism. The former refuses to pronounce any evaluative judgment upon behavior apart from the situation in which the act occurred. It is left to the individual to defend as "right" his response to the demands of the situation. Hierarchalism goes one step further by supposing situations in which a traditionally "right" act could actually be the wrong thing to do.

In either case, the absolutes of God have been

replaced by the judgments of man. And so there is no way to know God's approval, society's approbation, or a positive self-acceptance. To control behavior is to change it, caused by the introduction of prophylactic or therapeutic procedures intended to produce acceptable behavior. Most of us have faced the need to change our behavior in order to function in society. Functionality is always relational; the way we live unavoidably involves people. And the need to function in all three of the worlds Belgium describes—cosmic, social, and personal—requires a right relationship with God as well as our fellowman.

This concept of mental health is, however, one of bilateral relationships. Any technique which proposes to control behavior unilaterally is dangerous and immoral. Manipulation of this sort is common in totalitarian states, e.g., exercises in brainwashing and even some attempts to propagandize.

The biblical teaching on behavioral control is well stated in Rom. 12:2 where the Christian's surrender of his will to that of God produces a reciprocal and inestimable benefit—a total transformation (change) in life-style.

Psychology can be constructive in helping us identify the many causes which contribute to our behavior. It is helpful in requiring qualitative measures of conduct. It is useful in demanding functionality. But to change all that psychology may reveal as needing to be changed is the special province of the grace of God (2 Cor. 5:17; Phil. 1:6).

See MAN, HUMAN NATURE, GRACE, COUNSELING, PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION, PSYCHOANALYSIS, PSYCHOTHERAPY.

For Further Reading: Belgium, *Guilt, Where Psychology and Religion Meet*; Lutzer, *The Morality Gap*; Menninger, *Whatever Became of Sin?* MERNE A. HARRIS

PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION. Any study of religion is larger than just the Christian religion. To understand religious behavior, special research into the religious experiences of men has been made. This research results in the psychology of religion.

Often these studies have resulted in humanizing religious ideas, and making the supernatural to be only secular statements of distinctly personal interpretations of religion. Harold Kuhn sees most of the writers on psychology of religion at the end of the 19th century and the early part of the 20th century to be philosophers rather than true psychologists; "their systems elaborate deeply embedded assumptions." In them the ob-

jective quality of miracles, faith, and incarnation evaporated. Some struck at the supernatural origin of conversion and the reality of the divine origin of Scripture. Regeneration became merely a human, natural change (*Contemporary Evangelical Thought*, 224-26).

Psychology in religion is the study of the behavior and experiences of religious people. It is used in the two major subdivisions of psychology, namely, experimental and applied. "Applied" becomes pastoral psychology, while "experimental" is psychology of religion. The values of psychology in recent years are more readily seen. Some of the hostility felt earlier is disappearing (*Baker's DT*, 427-30).

Wayne Oates sees psychology of religion as "a concerted effort to bring these sacred and secular definitions of human life into dialogue with each other and to speak of God in both a sacred and secular manner." He further writes, "As such, the Psychology of Religion is a combined effort to appreciate the idea of the holy in human life and to keep the experiences of religious consciousness down to earth" (*The Psychology of Religion*, 15).

Great strides have been made in understanding the human mind, the emotions, and the reactions of persons under stress and when in real religious experiences. If the psychologists can keep an open mind, be faithful to the empirical method without assuming preconceived positions, and give critical evaluation of evidences discovered, then helpful conditions do result in such studies.

It is well to remember that observations of outward behavior of a person may be studied, catalogued, and analyzed. But it may be impossible to determine whether that outward action is prompted by the supernatural or arises only from human nature. A true biblical view will hold that the Holy Spirit does have a special place in touching the human heart in a distinct way.

See PSYCHOLOGY, SIN, REDEMPTION, GOSPEL, PASTORAL COUNSELING.

For Further Reading: Kuhn, *Contemporary Evangelical Thought*; Oates, *The Psychology of Religion*.

LEO G. COX

PSYCHOTHERAPY. Semantically speaking, psychotherapy is any healing of the psychic dimension of personality. Psychotherapy as a specific art or science seems to have begun most significantly with Sigmund Freud early in the 20th century. Because of the contributions made by Freud and his disciples to the psychoanalytic field of

study and practice, many still tend to equate psychotherapy with "healing" of the unconscious part of the person's personality.

The field of psychotherapy has expanded to include such approaches as rational or cognitive, existential, perceptual, social-learning, and behavior modification in addition to the earlier psychoanalytic approach. Despite the approach employed or the basic assumptions held by the practitioner, there seem to be certain common elements involved which help to identify psychotherapy. Some of these elements are: (1) therapist has had some medical and/or clinical training; (2) the patient or client seeks relief from real or perceived disorder through the assistance of a therapist via interpersonal communication; (3) the disorder involved is perceived to be psychic rather than physical in both source and presentation; (4) there is a series of specified and circumscribed contacts between the sufferer and therapist; (5) there is at least one goal which results in enduring modification of assumption or behavior agreed upon and sought by both therapist and patient or client; (6) all behavior is meaningful behavior; (7) there is an undeniable respect for persons.

There appears to be general agreement that psychotherapy is one dimension of, or one approach to, the broader field of counseling. Psychotherapy is not necessarily antithetical to the Christian faith. However, for the Christian therapist there must be harmony between the basic assumptions underlying his/her theory and practice of psychotherapy and his/her theology of Christian ministry.

See COUNSELING, PASTORAL COUNSELING, MAN, REALITY THERAPY, PSYCHOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Frank, *Persuasion and Healing: A Comparative Study of Psychotherapy*; Oden, *Contemporary Theology and Psychotherapy*; Outler, *Psychotherapy and the Christian Message*; Roberts, *Psychotherapy and a Christian View of Man*.

CHESTER O. GALLOWAY

PUBLIC PRAYER. At its lowest acceptable level public prayer is group recognition of divine authority. This religious exercise may be despoiled by such evil motives as vengeance, pride, or unholy ambition. A newspaper reporting on a part of a religious service, said: "It was the most eloquent prayer ever delivered to a Boston audience." If such was the intention of the one who prayed, his purpose was evidently achieved.

Public prayer is appropriate in a thousand places such as grace before meals, dedication of buildings, formal or informal ceremonies, official

gatherings, or other solemn or sublime occasions, as the reverent recognition of Deity. Either clergy or laity may offer such prayer.

Public prayer achieves its highest and holiest purpose in the biblical sense as one redeemed soul, most often the pastor of a congregation of believers, in his priestly function speaks to God for and with the people. In those moments of *koinonia* the one voice, speaking for all, pleads the merciful favor of God, offers reverential praise, reaffirms the congregation's loving commitment, and rejoices in the blessed warmth of God's surrounding love and grace. Only when the pastor has thus spoken to God for the people may he speak effectively to the people for God.

The language of public prayer need not be restricted to the classic "Thee" and "Thou." However, it certainly will avoid the excessive familiarity of folksy colloquialisms. And it must always be remembered that it is directed to God and must never refer to God in the third person.

The communion of the soul with God may permeate all of life and express itself in sighs, songs, groans, cries of distress, whispers of adoration, or well-remembered phrases from the Scriptures. But when one prays to God in and for a group, whether large or small, one should reverently and sincerely seek so to speak as to bring the eternal God and those immortal souls together in high and holy fellowship.

See WORSHIP, PRAYER, CHURCH.

For Further Reading: *The Book of Common Prayer*; *Baker's Dictionary of Practical Theology*, 385 ff, 400, 406.

JOHN E. RILEY

PUNISHMENT. This term indicates a penalty imposed for transgression of law. It commonly specifies any ill suffered in consequence of wrongdoing. The verb refers to the act of inflicting pain or chastisement for crime or fault. In the strict sense of the term we may discern a definite expression of public indignation, whereby the offender suffers pain or loss of honor. He suffers because he has perpetrated a wrong against another person, or society as a whole. Punishment implies a forfeiture in some sense and degree of personal rights.

Punishment is usually one of three kinds: corporal, pecuniary, or capital. The first involves suffering to one's body, the second involves the paying of a fine, and the third, loss of one's life. In ancient times punishment was only twofold and took the nature of either retaliation or restitution, i.e., compensation to the injured party for the wrong done by the offender.

Retribution for sin is a cardinal point in the

teaching of both Testaments of the Christian Scriptures. There the primary object of punishment is to maintain, or restore, righteousness in keeping with the will of both God and the social order. In an ultimate sense, God will see to the punishment of sins, taking vengeance upon the ungodly and rendering to every man according to his deeds (Rom. 2:5-11).

The removal of sin's punishment is brought about by repentance and confession of one's sin (1 John 1:9), and personal trust in and commitment to the saving work and atoning blood of Jesus Christ, as the only basis for one's forgiveness.

On the civil level three justifications may be set forth for punishment: (1) as a deterrent to wrongdoing; (2) as a means of inducing repentance and rehabilitating the wrongdoer; and (3) as a guarantee against the repetition of the crime (in the case of capital punishment or life imprisonment).

See ETERNAL PUNISHMENT, RETRIBUTION (RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE).

For Further Reading: DeWolf, "Rewards and Punishments," *ER*, 661-62; Greenberg, "Crimes and Punishments," *IDB*, A-D:733-44; Kennedy and Roberts, "Crime and Punishments," *HDB* (rev.), 189-90; Munsey, *Eternal Retribution*; Orr, "Punishment, Everlasting," *ISBE*, 4:2501-4.

ROSS E. PRICE

PURGATORY. This term means literally "a place of, or means of, purification." In Roman Catholic theology, it designates an intermediate state between death and eternal bliss where souls are made fit for heaven by means of expiatory sufferings. It is reserved only for penitent souls who, after departing this life, are cleansed from venial sins and the temporal punishment due their remitted mortal sins. Contrary to popular thinking, it is not a period of probation, but rather a cleansing process for those who are already partakers of divine grace, yet who, by reason of imperfection, are not qualified to enter heaven directly. It is for that mass of partially sanctified Catholics who have died in fellowship with the church. These, though their time of probation is past, and they are assured of heaven eventually, are not sufficiently pure and holy to be in the presence of God.

Such souls may be aided in their intermediate penance and suffering by the prayers of their brothers and sisters on earth, both lay and priestly. Hence, there have arisen in that church purgatorial societies—confraternities which have for their main purpose the assistance in every possible way—through gifts, services rendered to the

church, masses provided for, and prayers by members of the priesthood—of these poor souls in purgatory.

The doctrine of purgatory was taught by such Catholic divines as Gregory the Great, Bonaventura, and Aquinas. It was professed at the Council of Lyons (1274), the Union of Florence (1445), and reaffirmed against Protestant denials at the Council of Trent (1545-63).

Although Gregory contended that this purgatorial punishment consisted of both absence from God and burning by fire, it was the contention of St. Catherine of Genoa that the fire of purgatory was nothing other than God's love, burning away whatever in us had not been cleansed away prior to death.

Protestant thinkers have raised four strong objections to the doctrine of purgatory: (1) It is without true scriptural basis, since 2 Macc. 12:39-45 is not accepted as inspired; (2) if Christ's gospel promises full forgiveness, then there is no need for purgatory; (3) moreover, the doctrine retains the necessity of punishment after forgiveness; and (4) it implies that the atoning death of Christ was not sufficient to purchase man's full justification and cleansing from sin. To these, the Wesleyan theologian would add a fifth objection on the basis of his belief in instantaneous sanctification by faith following regeneration and occurring during the believer's lifetime.

See HEAVEN, HOLINESS, PROBATION, CATHOLICISM (ROMAN).

For Further Reading: Bigham, "Purgatory," *ER*, 628; Boettner, "Purgatory," *Baker's DT*, 430; Harvey, *Handbook of Theological Terms*, 200; Wiley, *CT*, 3:230.

ROSS E. PRICE

PURIFICATION, CEREMONIAL. Basic to this fundamental religious concept is the belief that man must rid himself of any defilement which hinders his fellowship with God. It is necessary to determine the sources of defilement and the proper means of purification. In the OT this is largely a ceremonial consideration, but in the NT it becomes moral and personal.

In the OT any contact with that which is unclean results in defilement and requires purification. The following are sources of defilement: (1) unclean animals; (2) dead bodies; (3) leprosy; (4) bodily secretions associated with reproduction, and (5) idol worship in all of its forms.

The need for purification preceded the giving of Mosaic law (Gen. 35:2; Exod. 19:14); but a strong emphasis on ceremonial purification be-

gan with the establishment of Israel as the covenant people of God. The covenant ceremonial law provided for purification, including the idea of expiation for certain sins. This ceremonial law sets the standard for purification in the OT. While some religions regarded purification as being completely ceremonial and nonethical in character, for Israel purification had both ceremonial and ethical significance. These two considerations grew side by side in the OT. It is true that in the Psalms, Prophets, and Wisdom literature of the OT there is a tendency to emphasize moral purity; but the ceremonial aspect is not denied.

However, it is not until after the Exile that the Jews developed an elaborate system of rules for ceremonial purification deduced from those stated in the OT. Significantly, the largest of the six sections of the *Mishnah* deals with purification. Such a ballooning of ceremonial purification led Jesus to declare, "You have a fine way of rejecting the commandment of God, in order to keep your tradition!" (Mark 7:9, RSV).

An important principle of biblical theological thought is that God's people should reflect His character. This includes personal moral purity in response to the holiness of God (Lev. 19:2; 1 Pet. 1:15). The NT emphasizes moral and spiritual purification with little interest in ceremonial considerations. Likewise in the NT, impurity does not come from external sources, but is moral and from within. Purity then begins in the heart of man and extends outward to encompass the entire life. This moral purification is part of the redeeming work of Christ (1 John 1:7). Jesus' teachings on moral purification are well summarized in Matt. 5:8, where purity of heart is a prerequisite to seeing God.

In the NT, purification is thus personal and evangelical, completing the development of the concept begun in the prophetic and devotional writings of the OT. The external and ceremonial emphasis recedes into the background, and purification becomes the work of God in human hearts, so that man becomes partaker of the divine nature (2 Pet. 1:4). To deny the objective reality and impartation of this nature of holiness in favor of a mere imputation of holiness as our standing or position in Christ is to deny NT purification and to return to the OT concept of external ceremonial purification.

See TALMUD, CLEANSING, HOLINESS, IMPARTED RIGHTEOUSNESS, ERADICATION, HEART PURITY, PROGRESSIVE REVELATION.

For Further Reading: *IDB*, 1:641-48; *The New Schaff-*

Herzog *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 3:386-90; *Encyclopedia Judaica*, 8:1406-14.

ALVIN S. LAWHEAD

PURIFICATION FROM SIN. See HEART PURITY.

PURITAN, PURITANISM. Under Queen Elizabeth I the place of the Church of England was established and clarified politically through the power of the English throne and doctrinally by the famous 39 Articles of Faith. However, the Church of England was still threatened from two sides. On the one hand was the faction that looked toward Rome, and on the other were the earnest Reformers who wished to go further in purifying the church from its Catholic overtones and leanings. By 1564 these were popularly nicknamed Puritans.

Many who had been exiled under Queen Mary had come under the influence of Swiss Protestantism and had returned filled with admiration for its thoroughgoing commitments. They were men with deep religious earnestness upon whom Elizabeth had to depend in her conflict with Rome. However, they drove hard to purge from the worship services what they believed to be remnants of the Roman church. In particular, the Puritans objected to the prescribed clerical dress, to kneeling at the reception of the Lord's Supper, the use of the ring in marriage as continuing the view of matrimony as a sacrament; and they strongly disliked using the sign of the Cross in baptism, believing it to be superstitious. Doctrinally, the Puritans were (for the most part) Calvinistic and insisted on the primacy of the Bible as the basis of authority.

Furthermore, the Puritans saw in the NT a definite pattern of church government quite unlike the Church of England. They came to believe in effective discipline maintained by elders. And they wanted ministers in office with the consent of the congregation.

By the end of Queen Elizabeth's reign all of the Separatists, or radical Puritans, had been driven underground or had gone into exile in places like Leyden in Holland, from which the Pilgrims sailed to the New World.

See PROTESTANTISM, WESLEYANISM, PIETISM (ENGLISH EVANGELICAL), WORSHIP, METHODISM, CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

For Further Reading: Sweet, *Religion in Colonial America*; Faughan, ed., *The Puritan Tradition in America*; Walker, *A History of the Christian Church*.

LESLIE PARROTT

PURITY AND MATURITY. The distinction between purity and maturity has been a basic postulate of

the holiness movement. Failure to make this distinction, says Wiley, "lies at the base of practically every objection to entire sanctification" (CT, 2:506).

Purity is a matter of the heart, of present soundness, integrity, and rectitude; maturity is a matter of growth and development, in knowledge, strength, and skill. Purity is a condition of freedom from sin, of singleness of mind, of entire devotion to God. As soon as a believer becomes convicted of his remaining double-mindedness, the correction of the condition is both his privilege and obligation. His self-cleansing should be immediate (2 Cor. 7:1; Heb. 12:1, 12-15; 1 John 3:3), and his appropriation of the inner cleansing of the Spirit must be, and can only be, by faith (Acts 15:8-9; 26:18; Gal. 3:2-3). Time is not the purifying agent. But maturity and growth are correlates, both dependent upon time and process. Maturity is an advanced degree of understanding and establishment in spiritual things.

"No Christian is cleansed into maturity, nor do any grow into purity," writes J. A. Wood (*Perfect Love*, 85). Wood is typical of the leading authorities of the last century, who carefully insisted on the preservation of the distinction between purity and maturity.

Some ambiguity appears in the writings of Wesley, who often seemed to associate Christian perfection with spiritual adulthood. However, this is a relative stage of attainment, which, while beyond spiritual infancy, is only the threshold of what shall be. When tracing the stages of spiritual progress, he reaches entire sanctification with the words, "in another instant, the heart is cleansed from all sin, and filled with pure love for God and man." Then immediately he adds: "But even that love increases more and more . . . till we attain 'the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ'" (*Works*, 6:509). In his sermon "On a Single Eye" he declares that those with a single eye, who walk in all the light they have, "cannot but 'grow in grace.'" Such persons will "continually advance in all holiness, and in the whole image of God" (*Works*, 7:299).

Even more serious confusion is introduced by the substitution of "mature" for "perfect" as the translation of *teleios* by modern versions (e.g., NIV has "mature" at 1 Cor. 2:6; Eph. 4:13; Phil. 3:15; Col. 4:12; and Heb. 6:1 [*teleiotes*]). Since *teleios* is more qualitative than quantitative in import, such substitution is at least questionable. Doubtless it is justified in Eph. 4:13 since maturity is the obvious goal. It is less certain in the oth-

er passages, especially Phil. 3:15, where it is more likely Paul is saying, "Let us therefore as many as are complete in our devotion to God be thus minded," rather than "Let all of us who have reached a level of advancement called maturity." Who is likely to step forward and assert, "I am among the mature"? The context describes the normal attitude of a Spirit-filled person, no matter how inexperienced and immature.

To confuse purity with maturity is to confuse

things which are qualitatively different. To expect a young, inexperienced Christian, clearly sanctified wholly, to demonstrate full maturity, is to lay the groundwork for his frustration, discouragement, and perhaps defeat.

See HOLINESS, MATURITY, GROWTH, HEART PURITY.

For Further Reading: Rose, *A Theology of Christian Experience*, 230-35; Jessup, *Foundations of Doctrine*, 130-34; Wood, *Purity and Maturity*.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

Q R

QUIETISM. Historically Quietism has been an understanding of Christian perfection which emphasizes union with God not by asceticism and aggressive personal devotion but by passive surrender of the senses, intellect, and will to the divine. As a result God, not oneself, is responsible for one's life and actions. Avid espousal of this theory often led to both an antinomianism which disclaimed moral responsibility and an interior kind of holiness which separated one from concern for sin in any social sense.

Specifically the term may be applied to a school of Catholic mystics in France and Italy in the late 17th century. Miguel de Molinos emphasized passivity of the soul to such an extent that his enemies had his doctrines condemned by the church. The same fate fell on the French Quietist, Madame Guyon, whose emphasis was more on "surrender" than "passivity." Later Catholic scholars have largely exonerated the Quietists of any major doctrinal error.

Although their influence upon Roman Catholicism has not been great, the Quietists have had an enduring influence upon revivalism and Wesleyanism in particular. Molinos and Guyon together with other Catholic mystics have become strong witnesses to the experience of perfection in love in the American holiness tradition, especially through the writings of Thomas C. Upham.

See MYSTICISM, PERFECT (PERFECTION), PERFECT LOVE, PERFECTIONISM.

For Further Reading: Daniel-Rops, *The Church in the 17th Century*, 367-93; Upham, *Life of Madame de la Mothe Guyon*; Dieter, *The Holiness Revival of the 19th Century*, 53-56. MELVIN EASTERDAY DIETER

RABBINIC THEOLOGY. Basically, rabbinic theology is the orthodox system of doctrine which Jewish people of pious nature have held from ancient times. The Maccabean revolt of 160 B.C. was led by priests known as Hasidim, "pious ones," who rejected Greek culture. In NT times, the proponents of keeping the ancient laws and customs were the Pharisees. Their spiritual heirs were the Rabbinites of the 8th—10th centuries A.D. and the Hasidim of the 18th century.

All these groups held to doctrines that were based on the OT and elaborated in the Talmud. Yet, rabbinic theology was more than doctrine; it was also a way of life. It was more than doctrine believed in by individuals, for doctrine and life were tied to national customs that were retained even during the dispersal of Jewish people around the world.

The basic doctrine of rabbinic theology is the existence of God as the Creator of the universe and all its creatures. All things were created out of nothing as an act of God's will. God is also the Ruler of the world and of the history of mankind. Extending from this doctrine is the belief in God as eternal and spiritual, omnipresent and omniscient. He is one God, and besides Him is none other. His resolutions are unchangeable, and His will is constant.

This theology also holds that God's will includes His intent both to punish the wicked and to provide merciful forgiveness for those who repent of their sins. He also wills to hear and answer the prayers of the penitent.

A second basic doctrine is the genuineness of the revelation of God through the Torah, i.e., the

first five books of the Bible, known as the Pentateuch. The Torah was given to Moses at Mount Sinai and has been preserved intact. It is to be obeyed by applying its regulations to every aspect of life. Man must obey the law in freedom of choice and with wholehearted commitment.

After death, man continues to exist and will know punishment or reward for his deeds. A belief in the resurrection is common.

Rabbinic theology also believes that the Jewish people are the Chosen People and will be restored to their land by a Messiah who will come when the people are ready for him.

See JUDAISM, JUDAISTIC CONTROVERSY.

For Further Reading: Cohen, *Judaism: A Way of Life*; Markowitz, *Jewish Religion, History, Ethics, and Culture*; Heschel, *God in Search for Man*; "Theology," *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, 128-37.

GEORGE HERBERT LIVINGSTON

RACIAL SIN. See ORIGINAL SIN.

RACISM. This is the belief that some races are inherently superior to others, and the attitudes, policies, and practices which express this belief. Hitlerism with its doctrine of the Aryan super-race is a glaring modern example. The belief in the inferiority of the black races is an equally odious form of racism.

Yet not all adverse value judgments can be labeled racism. Distinctions can be made between advanced or primitive cultures which acknowledge a sociological retardation without the implication that the backwardness is due to inherent racial inferiority.

While racism has been a sociological phenomenon throughout human history, it has been encouraged by Darwinism, with its doctrine of the survival of the fittest. It has also provided a rationale for war. Arlie J. Hoover says: "Racism asserts that struggle, not cooperation, is the normal, yea even the desirable, state of race relations and that competition proves some races superior to others in intelligence, creativity, and cultural capacity."

Racism is not biblical. Over and over God reminds the Israelites that His choice of them was not due to any superiority in them, but that all nations might be blessed through them. The destruction of the Canaanites was not on racist principles but on moral grounds: their decimation was a divine judgment on them for their sins. While separatism was demanded, the purpose was not to safeguard them from inferior peoples but to prevent their religious corruption.

However, the Jews did tend to become infected with a racist mentality, contrary to God's inten-

tion. An example might be Peter's reluctance to eat with Cornelius. However, on the other hand, perhaps a purely ceremonial connotation should be seen in his "common or unclean" (Acts 10:14), rather than racism as such. At least Peter sincerely, though mistakenly, believed such social separation from the Gentiles to be a divine requirement; so his reluctance was prompted by a desire to obey God, not necessarily by a belief in his personal superiority.

According to the NT, the gospel levels all men, assuming for all races equal need and equal access to all the benefits of the Atonement, including the fullness of the Holy Spirit (Matt. 25:31-46; 28:19; John 1:9; Acts 2:17; 10:28, 34-35; Rom. 3:9-30; 11:16-23; 1 Cor. 1:24; Gal. 3:28; Eph. 2:11-17; 1 Tim. 2:1-6; Rev. 7:9-10).

Christian love alone is the antidote for the disease of racism. Love acknowledges all men as human beings created by God, all as the subjects of God's love and the objects of redemption. Yet love does not extinguish cultural differences, nor does love condemn them. While love creates a kindred feeling, and prompts equal respect to all regardless of race, it does not demand external uniformity. Furthermore, a very natural preference for one's own kind on a social plane is not in itself proof of either prejudice or racism; though love will gladly transcend this preference in the interests of community or evangelism.

See JUDAISM, MISSION (MISSIONS, MISSIOLOGY), MAN, GOSPEL, REDEMPTION.

For Further Reading: Hoover, *Fallacies of Evolution*, 70-72; Henry, *Christian Personal Ethics*, 397; Geiger, ed., *The Word and the Doctrine*, 413-18; DeWolf, *Responsible Freedom*, 203-8.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

RANSOM. To ransom (verb) is to set free from captivity, slavery, or sin. The price paid or means of release is the ransom (noun). In the OT, ransom describes (1) payment to free a slave (Lev. 25:47-48); (2) restitution for injury or damages (Exod. 22:10-12); (3) redemption (buying back) of family property (Lev. 25:24-28); (4) assessments substituted for a man's life (Exod. 21:30); (5) God's deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage (Deut. 7:8; Isa. 51:11).

NT usage reflects a centering of focus on Jesus' death. The key text is Mark 10:45 (cf. Matt. 20:28). Here Jesus describes the offering of His life as "a ransom [lutron] for many" (similarly, 1 Tim. 2:6 and Titus 2:14). Word for word, this description echoes Isa. 53:10-11. A substitution is implied: God's Servant gave himself (as a guilt offering), He died for us (as sinners), in our place.

Through His death, we have been brought back to God, set free from servitude to sin.

To whom did Christ pay the ransom for our redemption? The Early Church fathers (especially the Greeks) were much exercised over this question. They interpreted the Cross as a stratagem by which God hoodwinked Satan in bargaining for the souls of men. Some theologians today (e.g., Kittel) argue the opposite conclusion: God was the recipient of the ransom. Most scholars dismiss the question as unbiblical. Certainly there is no hint that Christ's life was paid to Satan. We are reminded, however, that our ransom was costly (1 Cor. 6:20; 7:23; cf. Acts 20:28). The biblical emphasis is on the deliverance itself, from the thralldom of sin, not on a "deal" or transaction with a third party.

See REDEEMER (REDEMPTION), ATONEMENT.

For Further Reading: Jeremias, *NT Theology*, 1:292-94; Richardson, *Theology of NT*, 218-23; Kittel, 4:340-56.

WAYNE G. MCCOWN

RAPTURE. The term *Rapture* is used to refer to Paul's teaching concerning what shall happen to living believers at the second coming of Christ. In 1 Thess. 4:14-17, he explains that, in addition to the resurrection of the righteous dead, "we who are still alive and remain on the earth will be caught up with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air" (TLB). The Vulgate (Latin version) rendered the word translated "caught up" as *rapio*, hence *Rapture*. Two other passages are directly related to this idea, since they describe the change which will take place in believers at the Second Coming (Parousia): 1 Cor. 15:51-53 and Phil. 3:20-21. According to 1 Cor. 15:51 the Rapture is a mystery—that is, a divine truth which has previously been hidden but is now made known. Since OT writers did not envision a *second* coming, they spoke only of a resurrection of the dead. The fate of the living did not come within their purview.

In recent times, dispensationalist theology has developed the idea of a "secret Rapture." This relates to their view that there will be a definable seven-year period of intense persecution of the Jews, called "the time of Jacob's trouble" (Jer. 30:7). In order for this to occur, the Church must be removed from the earthly scene; consequently dispensationalists structure their eschatology to include a "pretribulation Rapture" which is secret in nature and separated, by the "Tribulation," from the Parousia. That this is a presupposition not explicitly taught in Scripture, honest dispensationalists freely admit.

All that one can legitimately affirm from Scrip-

ture itself is that the righteous, both living and dead, will be transformed at Jesus' parousia; and as a result of the transformation, they will be caught up to meet the Lord in the air and so be ever with Him.

See SECOND COMING OF CHRIST, TRIBULATION, DISPENSATIONALISM, PREMILLENNIALISM.

For Further Reading: Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*; Erickson, *Contemporary Options in Eschatology*.

H. RAY DUNNING

RATIONALISM. Rationalism holds to the supremacy of reason (*ratio* = "reason"). This means human reason is sufficient to solve solvable problems. Rationalistic attempts at discovering truth are often associated with the philosophies of such thinkers as Descartes, Leibnitz, and Spinoza. The common base from which all rationalists operate is just this: the self-sufficiency of reason; in other words, that reason is the source of all knowledge.

The school of empirical rationalism leans on sensory data for knowledge, and men like Francis Bacon, John Locke, John Stuart Mill, to name but three pioneers, built the foundation for what today we know as the scientific method. Without that method modern technology would be impossible. The scientist's laboratory is the most obvious symbol in our society of the empirical methodology used in the verification of truth.

Theological rationalism means dependence on what man's natural abilities teach him. Revelation is an impossibility; that is, no outside source can inform us. Naturalism, humanism, and liberalism share this with rationalism: man's native abilities constitute the one single instrument for arriving at truth and the structure of belief. We are here dealing with the doctrine of the full competence of human reason. The province for gathering data, then, is exclusively that of ordinary or so-called verifiable experience.

This leaves little place for any such otherworldly phenomenon as mysticism, not to speak of miracles or anything at all connected with the Bible's supernatural religion. Rationalism explains biblical religion developmentally; indeed, all religious experience is seen to grow from primordial beginnings to maturation, from superstition and animism to a sane and balanced grasp of reality.

Great men and movements in the history of the church have challenged naturalistically oriented authority. The 18th-century evangelical revival was one such thrust. Our own day is another such period: the advent of the Billy Graham movement; before that, the theology of

Barth and Brunner (their mission: to show the validity of revelation); the current dissatisfaction of man with his own ability to solve his problems; and the accompanying move toward biblical religion.

See REASON, REVELATION (NATURAL AND SPECIAL), HUMANISM, SUPERNATURAL (SUPERNATURALISM), RATIONALITY.

For Further Reading: James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, 73-74, 428; Lewis, *A Philosophy of the Christian Revelation*, see "Rationalism" in Index; Loomer, "Reason," *A Handbook of Christian Theology*, 293 ff.

DONALD E. DEMARAY

RATIONALITY. Man, like God, is a rational being (cf. Gen. 1:26). Rationality is the ability to reason, to know and communicate logically organized truth through the higher cognitive powers of the mind.

It is important to distinguish between rationalism and rationality. Rationalism regards human reason as the ultimate judge and only reliable means of ascertaining truth. It places reason above Scripture. Evangelicals believe biblical revelation must necessarily precede and supercede human reason. Since the Fall affected the mind (as all other faculties), man cannot know God rightly by the "unaided exercise of reason" (cf. 1 Cor. 2:4-16; 3:20).

We affirm rationality while rejecting rationalism. Man should love God with all the vigor of a redeemed mind. He should train the mind and be reasonable in all things. He should endeavor to interpret Scripture accurately, while refusing to permit reason to sit in judgment on Scripture as a higher authority.

Human rationality is limited: "I know in part" (1 Cor. 13:12). Some mysteries of life remain (Rom. 11:33) and await the unfolding of life yet future when we "shall know fully" (1 Cor. 13:12). The complexity of truth may appear self-contradictory to finite rationality (e.g., paradox). We must avoid being "wise in our own eyes" (cf. Prov. 3:7), and heed the command to bring "into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ" (2 Cor. 10:5).

See REASON, RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE, FAITH, RATIONALISM.

For Further Reading: Baker's *DT*, 435-36; *ERE*, 7:370-73; Trueblood, *Philosophy of Religion*, 17-32.

J. WESLEY ADAMS

REAL PRESENCE. There are in general three doctrinal views concerning the Lord's Supper. The Roman Catholic view is known as transubstantiation, the view that the substance of the bread and wine are literally transformed into the

body and blood of Christ. Luther's view is that of consubstantiation, viz., that the elements when consecrated remain substantially unchanged, but that the real body and blood of Christ are *present in, with, and under* the consecrated bread and wine. The unbelievers who take the elements are taking into their mouths Christ, but unto their condemnation, not their consolation. Thus, it is in the use of the elements by faith, and not in the elements per se, that Christ is present.

The view held most commonly among Protestants is that Christ is present in the Lord's Supper spiritually through the Holy Spirit, not in any sense physically. The elements of bread and wine are symbolic and the ritual is memorial in purpose and nature. This does no injustice to the confidence that the observance, when sincere and contrite, is also a means of grace.

See LORD'S SUPPER, SACRAMENTS, SACRAMENTARIANISM, MEANS OF GRACE.

For Further Reading: Baker's *DT*, "Lord's Supper," 330-32; Burtner and Chiles, *A Compend of Wesley's Theology*, 262-68; Wiley, *CT*, 3:189-208; ZPEB, 3:978-86; Augsburg Confession; *Formula of Concord*.

CHARLES W. CARTER

REALISM. Realism denotes the doctrine that *universals* (general concepts) have an existence which is in some sense independent of the *particular* things (individuals) that appear to the senses. The term has its origin in philosophical speculation but takes on technical meanings in such areas as politics, law, morality, education, and theology. The question whether universals have real and transcendent existence is especially important for the two main fields of philosophy known as *ontology* (the study of being and existence), and *epistemology* (the study of thought and knowledge). In philosophy, metaphysics and epistemology are logically interdependent.

Realism had early beginnings in Hindu thought many centuries before its appearance in the Platonic Academy and the Aristotelian Lyceum in Athens. The idea of Brahman as the neuter world soul, a monistic world view, and a pantheistic conclusion are its main features.

Greek speculation came under the influence of this thinking and with modifications found statement in the writings of Plato and his student, Aristotle. Plato's doctrine of real transcendent universals stems from the Socratic view that only through the concept, or universal idea, is it possible to obtain real knowledge. Thus *Platonic realism* is the doctrine that universals have in some sense an independent existence to their particular individuations which appear to us in sense

perception. These universals are the *real forms*, and appearances are merely imperfect, transitory, and inadequate representations.

Aristotle, on the other hand, contended that these universal forms found their reality only in the case of concrete individuals and partook of no real substantial being apart from them. The objects of nature are but loci of determinate potentialities that become actualized through the activity of these forms. In short, the concept of "horseness" in general can only become real in the individual horse, such as "Old Dobbin" or "Old Paint."

Until medieval times the position of Plato, and more especially Neoplatonism as set forth by Plotinus, was the influential philosophy for Christianity through the writings of Augustine and others. But with the rediscovery of Aristotle's complete works and their influence upon the thinking of Thomas Aquinas, Aristotelianism became primary in Christian teaching. Not without considerable debate, however. For the speculations passed from transcendent ontology into dialectics and theology, touching off a grand controversy during the Scholastic period over the essential character of *genera* and *species*, as to whether they are corporeal or incorporeal, and whether they are separable from particulars or existent only in perception. This argument concerning the nature of *universals* divided thinkers into hostile camps and led to passionate controversies, throwing all society into intellectual and religious turmoil.

At this juncture most of us wish to raise the question, So what? But we must remember that these metaphysical (*ontological*) stances have marked implications for such theological problems as creation, God, man, faith, reason, the Trinity, the Incarnation, original sin, redemption, and Christian holiness. Space limitations do not allow explanations of its implication for each. The apostle Paul seemed to believe that the *unseen* behind things transient and visible is what partakes of eternal reality (2 Cor. 4:18).

So: *Realism* is the belief that a general idea in the human mind refers to something beyond the mind as real as things individual. It is the contention that the realm of *essence* (possible universals) is every bit as real as the realm of *existence* (actualities); and that the former is prior to the latter (versus modern existentialism).

See PLATONISM, THOMISM, REALISM AND NOMINALISM, MODERN REALISM, REALISM IN THEOLOGY, REPRESENTATIVE THEORY.

For Further Reading: "Hinduism," ER, 337 ff; Brightman, *An Introduction to Philosophy* (rev.), 271-88; Person

and Reality, 190-98; Cornford, *Plato's Theory of Knowledge*.

ROSS E. PRICE

REALISM AND NOMINALISM. These terms represent an apparently endless debate going back to Plato (realism) and Aristotle (nominalism) over principles of theological discourse generally, and specifically over the nature of *universals*—by which are meant general ideas or class terms, the opposite of *particulars*. Only the context of the debate changes.

Medieval or classical realism was akin to modern metaphysical idealism, while nominalism corresponds to modern realism.

For theology, these terms became prominent in medieval Scholasticism, roughly A.D. 1000-1350, among scholars and schools struggling with concepts of faith and reason (or knowledge), seeking to interpret all of life in terms of theology. The presuppositions of Platonic realism (universal forms or ideas) had largely dominated theology, including Augustine's, until the revival of Aristotle in the 12th century, a fact which led in turn to the revival of nominalism in the church.

Realism held that universals, which transcend space and time, have real existence apart from all particulars—which are mere transient things expressing the universal form. Indeed, universals are the foundation of individual existence. They are *ante rem*: before the particulars; e.g., humanity subsists as an essence quite apart from individual persons.

Nominalism stated that universals are merely names or symbols describing individuals. They are *post rem*: after the particulars. Only particulars are real; e.g., humanity does not exist, but only individual persons.

There was a moderate realism; e.g., humanity exists as a structure embodied in particular human beings, but not independently. It is *in re*: in the particulars.

In connection with realism the contributions of John Scotus Erigena (c. 810-77) and Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109), both in the Platonic tradition, were important. Roscellinus (1070-1125) was a thorough nominalist, while William of Ockham (1300-1350), 200 years later, espoused nominalism in connection with valid claims to knowledge on empirical grounds. Peter Abelard (1079-1142), Thomas Aquinas (1225-74) who attempted to synthesize Aristotle with Christian faith, and Duns Scotus (1265-1308) each represent different forms of moderate realism.

Certain tendencies or trends may be observed. Realism, inasmuch as reality transcends space-

time experience, was congenial to the idea that "faith leads to understanding," rather than the opposite view. In doctrine, the idea of humanity as a single reality with each individual within the universal essence, made possible certain views of the origin of souls and of original sin in Adam. On the other hand, nominalism questioned the view of a universal church deriving its reality from the hierarchy, and opposed transubstantiation (that the real body and blood of Christ are present in the Eucharist) among other controversies. Nominalism stressed individual development rather than community or collectives. The emphasis on the data of sense experience gave impetus to the scientific method. Starting from particulars to solve problems tended to a loss of absolutes and to humanistic answers. In Ockham there was a separation of "valid" knowledge from matters of faith.

The extreme forms of either position tend to be destructive of rational thought and thus call for some mediating position.

See PHILOSOPHY, THEOLOGY, THOMISM, PLATONISM, REALISM IN THEOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Burkill, *The Evolution of Christian Thought*; Tillich, *A History of Christian Thought*; Gonzales, *A History of Christian Thought*, vol. 2.

ARNOLD E. AIRHART

REALISM IN THEOLOGY. As related to theology, the exponents of realism may be separated into three classifications.

Extreme Realism. Hinduism's speculation as to the nature of reality suggested that it is one single generic nature, partaking throughout of one common life-principle. With its idea of Brahman as the neuter world soul, it set forth a monistic world view and resulted in a sort of dynamic pantheism in both philosophy and theology. Brahman is the life principle and source whence all things proceed, by which all things are sustained, and to which all things return. Material existence in nature and man (individuals in matter) is a movement away from true reality. Concrete existence is therefore evil and illusory.

Salvation was deemed possible through knowledge of the identity of the finite self with the self of the universe. To this must be added knowledge of the total unreality of material existence. All is sheer illusion.

This salvation through acquired understanding called for a process of highly disciplined meditation under the most favorable physical conditions possible. Thus one might achieve the highest religious state when all desire for existence is gone and the finite soul is reabsorbed

into the absolute real being of the infinite world soul. Later, Buddhism would refer to this re-absorption as *Nirvana*, using the Sanskrit term indicating "a blowing out, or extinction."

Holding as it does to a single generic nature in which individuals have no real (only illusory) separate existence, and are mere modes or manifestations of the one neutral world substance, extreme realism amounts to pantheism. Therefore it can have no place in *Christian* theology, and most Christian theologians dismiss its consideration with but a sentence or two. Yet we must acknowledge it as one of the three forms of theological realism. Shades of such realism reappear in the Scholastic period in the teachings of Amalric and John Scotus, who suggest that as the world of phenomena has come from God, so it will return to Him and abide in Him as one unchangeable individual eventually. We might surmise that neorealism's conception of *neutral entities* may be borrowed from Hinduism and its neutral world soul.

The Christian theologian will argue that substance is more than that which takes its stance in a subway below experience in the form or classification of neutral entities. Substance is "experienced efficient cause." It is what endures and what acts; it is not a blind abstraction; it has potentiality, and though it may be either simple or complex, it is dynamic reality. This is its basic essence.

Moderate, or Higher Realism. One of the chief exponents of this type of realism is the Calvinistic theologian William G. T. Shedd. He holds that species are individualized by propagation but partake of one unitary generic nature. He would allow that nominalism is true for non-propagatable entities such as inkstands, which, though making up a general concept, have no common nature. Species, he contends, have a specific nature, an invisible dynamic principle, which is a real entity, not a mere concept.

It is the belief of this type of realism that the species has inlaid (inherent) in it all that evolves from it. It contains all the individuals that may come from it by propagation. Its specific nature has a real, not nominal, existence. When a specific vital substance is in view, then realism is true. When a nonspecific (inorganic substance) is in view, then nominalism is correct. Inkstands are not propagated from a common nature. The concept is but a general term partaking of no transcendent reality. Its only reality is in some particular model.

On the other hand a species contains a primitive, invisible, and propagatable substance. It is

created as a single nature and exists as such prior to its distribution by means of propagation.

The chief concerns of theological realism are to explain: (1) the racial nature of mankind; (2) the racial nature of human depravity; (3) the racial nature of death as sin's penalty; and (4) the racial nature of mankind's redemption through Christ.

1. *Human nature is racial.* Man is the manifestation of the general principle of humanity in union with a given corporeal organization. Human nature as a general principle existed antecedently (chronologically and logically) to individual men. It is a *res*, an essence, a substance, with a real objective existence in time and space. John and Mary are the revelation and individualizations of this general substance which is the species or genus. Each is only a subsequent *modus existendi*, human nature being the essence of each.

What God created was not an individual man, but the species *homo*, generic humanity—an intelligent, rational, and voluntary essence. As such it manifests itself in a multitude of individuals. Thus each human is an individualized portion of the race. The species as a single nature was created and existed prior to its distribution by means of propagation.

2. *Human sin is corporate.* The sin of Adam and his generic complement, Eve, was the sin of this generic substance which thus became the subject and bearer of guilt and depravity. Numerically it was the same substance which constitutes each of us individual men and women.

Thus all men have sinned in Adam. "In Adam's fall, we sinned all." God contemplates all men as actually one with Adam in his sin. And since the whole race was involved in Adam's sin, the whole race is punished for that disobedience so that all must die. Furthermore, hereditary depravity in each human is truly and properly sin, involving guilt as well as pollution. These are passed on to successive generations through propagation. Shedd affirms that the soul is originated by psychical propagation even as the body is by physical propagation. So each man "received and inherited the corruption that was now in human nature, and subsequently acted it out in individual transgressions" (*Dogmatic Theology*, 2:89). "The individual man derives and inherits his sinful disposition from his immediate ancestors but originated it in his first ancestors" (94).

With the exception of C. A. Strong, not many theologians have subscribed to this higher realism.

Lower Realism. According to this theory indi-

vidualizations always characterize seminal and germinal essences of their species, as they exist in aggregate in their progenitors. They have their germinal existence in a racial progenitor. So the contention is that the human race had its germinal existence in Adam. It therefore identifies Adam's posterity with himself in the one original (first act of) sin. This rudimentary existence of all men in Adam included the soul as well as the body.

The aim of lower realism is the same as that of higher realism, i.e., so to identify the offspring of Adam in a real oneness with him in the primitive transgression that they may be justifiably charged with a guilty participation in that sin. Thus the common guilt is charged to the account of seminal existence in Adam when he committed the first sin.

This lower realism is open to the doctrine of seminal guilt, guilt for all ancestral sins; and the denial of any share in Adam's personal repentance on the part of his offspring.

Whether the *souls* of all his offspring so existed in Adam is open to question by many theologians. Augustine was in serious doubt of it. Calvin rejected it, and in his rejection was followed by most of the Reformed thinkers. If in the nature of Adam there existed such an aggregate of individuals, then he must have lacked the unitary essence of a single personality. It must also be remembered that sin can be predicated only of persons.

The common reaction to this realistic involvement of all of Adam's descendants in his personal guilt is twofold: (1) No one believes that he acted thousands of years before he was born. To act before one exists is impossible. So unless one adopts the theory of multiple incarnations and the transmigration of souls, and the *karma* of one or many previous existences, he wants to reject guilt for Adam's transgression. (2) One wishes to ask why the descendants of Adam are responsible for, and guilty because of, his first act of sin and not for his subsequent sins. Shedd's answer is that his postlapsarian sins were mere violations of the moral law, not of the human race's probationary law (2:88).

Against theological realism it may be argued that the human race has no such cohesion in entity. Mankind is not to be regarded as a racial *thing*. It has no actual coalescence like that of a body of water where the individual drop is swallowed out of meaning and existence. This is not to deny that the race originated in one human pair, and carries a common human nature in all of its individuals. Nor is it to deny the basic fact

of racial nexus and the disordered state of man's moral nature. Nor is it to deny the dictum of John Donne: "No man is an island."

The critics of theological realism contend there are better and more valid ways to explain: (1) the racial nature of mankind; (2) the racial fact of human depravity; (3) the racial meaning of death; (4) the racial work of Christ's redemption; and (5) the realization of the new race of those born from above by grace through faith.

See REALISM, REPRESENTATIVE THEORY, REALISM AND NOMINALISM, ORIGINAL SIN, TOTAL DEPRAVITY, BUDHISM, TRANSCENDENTAL MEDITATION, NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS, IN ADAM, MAN, NATURE, PLATONISM.

For Further Reading: Miley, *Systematic Theology*, 2:474-92; Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, 2:64-94; Tennant, *Philosophical Theology*, 1:219-56; Wiley, *CT*, 2:109-14.

ROSS E. PRICE

REALITY THERAPY. Reality therapy is a counseling theory which emphasizes responsible behavior. The leading exponent of the theory is William Glasser. In his book *Reality Therapy* he assumes that it is impossible to maintain self-esteem if one is living irresponsibly. He declares, "Morals, standards, values, or right or wrong behavior are all intimately related to the fulfillment of our needs for self-worth" (11). Thus he aims at teaching counselees to maintain a satisfactory standard of behavior, to correct themselves when they do wrong, and to credit themselves when they do right. Self-respect comes through self-discipline and loving closeness to others.

Glasser maintains that persons have only two essential personality needs—to love and to be loved, and to feel that one is worthwhile to oneself and to others. This may be reduced to a single indispensable need—to experience authentic love in a dependable relationship.

Responsibility is defined by Glasser as the ability to fulfill one's needs, and to do so in a way that does not deprive others of the ability to fulfill their needs (xv).

While there is much about reality therapy which may be useful to the Christian minister, the redemptive dimension is missing. Fallen man is not able to merit salvation apart from the grace of God (Rom. 3:10-18, 23; Eph. 2:8). The danger of this counseling technique is that, in its emphasis on the humanistic, to love one's neighbor as oneself, the vertical dimension may be neglected, to love God with all one's heart, soul, strength, and mind (Luke 10:27).

See INTEGRITY THERAPY, COUNSELING, TRANS-ACTIONAL ANALYSIS.

For Further Reading: Clinebell, *Basic Types of Pastoral*

Counseling; Glasser, *Reality Therapy*; Hamilton, *The Ministry of Pastoral Counseling*.

NORMAN N. BONNER

REALIZED ESCHATOLOGY. This designates the approach to interpreting Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God which was proposed by the British scholar C. H. Dodd in his book *Parables of the Kingdom*. This interpretation of the kingdom of God in the ministry of Jesus sees the reign of God as fully present, i.e., realized in the person and work of Jesus. Dodd formulated his approach in reaction to the earlier position of the German scholar Albert Schweitzer, which was known as *consistent or thoroughgoing eschatology*. Schweitzer had argued that Jesus was a Jewish apocalyptic prophet, who announced that the kingdom of God was about to break into history in a climactic way. But history did not come to an end with the cataclysm which Jesus expected. Jesus had been mistaken.

Dodd sought to deemphasize any futuristic expectation in the teaching of Jesus. He was convinced that the eschatological dimension of Jesus' preaching consisted in the affirmation that all for which the prophets had hoped had now been fulfilled in history by Jesus' appearing. Dodd was strongly criticized for minimizing the futuristic aspect of the kingdom of God, and that criticism led him to modify his position. It is now the general consensus of NT scholarship that for the ministry of Jesus, the kingdom of God is in a real sense both present and future. The eschatology of Jesus is to be thought of as an eschatology in process of realization.

See ESCHATOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Bruce, "Eschatology," *Baker's DT*, 187-93; Evans, "Kingdom of God," *IDB*, 3:17-26; Hunter, *The Work and Words of Jesus*, 90-100, 122-30; Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, 57-69; Perrin, *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus*, 58-78.

HAL A. CAUTHRON

REASON. Reason is the power of the person to experience order in the universe and to bring order into his own thoughts and actions. When something is meaningful or makes sense, it is because it is appropriately ordered by reason. Thus the various forms of reason (e.g., logic) do not exhaust or reduce reason to themselves.

Often the term *reason* is used to refer to the human power to have knowledge by mediation, in which we infer that one thing is true because something else is true. By a series of necessary relationships we arrive at a conclusion. Immediate knowledge would be contrasted with media-

tion (not necessarily with reason, as defined above); immediate knowledge would be gained from sense experience, memory, and intuitions. Yet reason need not be reduced to mediation and eliminated from the immediate.

Reasoning is often contrasted with free association. The necessary relationship is opposed to the mere drifting from idea to idea.

Rationalism is the utilization of certain modes of reasoning as the only insight into truth. Empiricism (gaining knowledge through the senses) is usually contrasted with rationalism; in this relationship empiricism is rejected as confused or distorted knowing (cf. Plato). Attempts to employ all dimensions of the human capacity for knowing would regard either rationalism or empiricism as one-sided approaches to reality and truth (cf. Hegel).

The critique of reason by romanticism, mysticism, authoritarianism, existentialism, and biblical literalism reveals both the many-sided character of reason as well as the numerous problems which it poses to man's quest for truth.

Some people contrast faith and reason as if there is no basis upon which they can exist simultaneously in the same mind. Others think of faith as primary with reason included or of reason as primary with faith included. The problem of the relation between philosophy and theology is comparable to this, for philosophy employs reason and theology is based upon faith. If one observes the broader meaning of reason along with an equally intelligible meaning of faith, then to say that faith and reason require each other is very intelligible. It means that nonsense and absurdity cannot be believed; only that can be believed which makes some kind of sense or has some meaning.

Christianity calls for all a person's ransomed powers to be employed in the service of eternity; and certainly this includes man's reason.

See RATIONALISM, FAITH, HUMANISM, REVELATION, RATIONALITY.

For Further Reading: *Concise Encyclopedia of Western Philosophy and Philosophers*, 339-40; Harris, "The Power of Reason," *The Review of Metaphysics*, June, 1969.

R. DUANE THOMPSON

REBAPTISM. Rebaptism is the practice of baptizing adults who have already been baptized as infants. It was the practice of the Anabaptists in Europe during the period of the Reformation and has since been a mark of such groups as the Mennonites and Baptists. Rebaptism is in effect a protest against infant baptism or christening, and a denial of its validity. The underlying belief is

that the sacrament of baptism was in NT times administered only in the case of adults becoming believers, and was intended to serve as an expression of a personal and voluntary commitment to Christ. A corollary is that baptism is unique to the NT and not the counterpart of circumcision, a rite administered to Jewish infants at eight days of age.

Basic to the believer baptism posture is the belief that repentance and faith (the new birth) are prerequisites of and are symbolized by baptism. Baptism is the sign that one has heard God's convicting and saving Word, that one's life has been buried with Christ, that one has arisen with Christ to new life (Rom. 6:1-11), has experienced the forgiveness of sins (Acts 2:37-39), and has become a part of the new community.

See BAPTISM, INFANT BAPTISM (PRO AND CON), SACRAMENTS, SACRAMENTARIANISM.

For Further Reading: Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament*; Jewett, *Infant Baptism and the Covenant of Grace*; Barth, *The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism*.

MARTIN H. SCHRAG

RECEIVING THE HOLY SPIRIT. While there is a unique reception of the Holy Spirit in the life of the believer subsequent to the new birth, it is the same Spirit whom we receive at conversion. Devotionally speaking, there is no difference between Christ and the Holy Spirit, for the Spirit is the exalted Christ (Acts 2:33; 2 Cor. 3:18). Theologically speaking, there is a real differentiation among the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, but it is a differentiation in unity. This trinity of God's being means that whatever unique function one of the divine Persons has, the other divine Persons also share in the same activity. The concept of the Trinity does not mean three independent centers of consciousness within the divine life. Nor do the progressive stages of Christian experience lend itself to the notion that one can have the Son without the Spirit, as if the Christian life were made up of disjointed events.

Terminologically, we can speak of the deeper Christian life as the fullness of the Spirit without depreciating the reception of Christ in conversion, even as we can speak of the unique coming of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost as a deeper revelation of God without depreciating the person of Jesus Christ in His earthly ministry. The Spirit of Pentecost is the continuation of the earthly Jesus. Even as there were stages in salvation in which God was progressively known as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, so there may be stages in one's personal history of salvation in which one may know God successively as Father,

Son, and Holy Spirit. Yet it is the one and same God who is known. The dispensation of the Spirit signifies that the fullness of the Triune God has been revealed and that this fullness is given to the believer.

See DISPENSATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT.

For Further Reading: Wood, *Pentecostal Grace*; Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, 155; GMS, 484-88.
LAURENCE W. WOOD

RECONCILIATION. The Christian doctrine of reconciliation is derived primarily from four major statements on the subject in Paul's letters: Rom. 5:10-11; 2 Cor. 5:18-19; Eph. 2:16; and Col. 1:20-22. The term presumes on the one hand a previous enmity and on the other a subsequent friendship. Both of these need to be thoughtfully held in view if one is to appreciate the richness of biblical reconciliation.

The enmity is represented by Scripture to be in the mind and heart of man. Cain, the Pharaoh of the Exodus, and Ahab and Jezebel are notable examples of those who apparently maintained their enmity to the end. Yet to all of these, God extended gracious overtures of friendship.

When the references in Paul's letters are consulted, it will be seen that without exception reconciliation is linked to the atoning death of Christ. There is propitiation in the Atonement—the appeasing of the wrath of offended Deity whose just laws have been violated; but Christ's death was not necessary to initiate God's love, for the propitiation was God's own action. God's infinite love is never seen in Scripture to have ever wavered at man's sin, no matter how selfishly, cruelly, and inhumanely expressed. Rather, in the fullness of time, God sent forth His Son, whose sacrificial death redeems us from the guilt and wretchedness of sin's bondage.

Theology defines various aspects of the salvation experience and sometimes the order of events. We may differ in the way these are realized, but there is certainly justification and the forgiveness of sins. The rebel who once hated God because of His moral demands surrenders and exercises simple faith in the fact of Christ and His meritorious death. Reconciliation flows naturally and immediately. The new believer may not realize it, but by faith he has been adopted into the family of God. Glimpses of divine reality and glory follow, and love grows as God is revealed in the heart by the Holy Spirit. Friendship of the closest order now prevails, for the soul is "in Christ."

See JUSTIFICATION, REPENTANCE, ATONEMENT, IN CHRIST.

For Further Reading: Wiley, CT, 2:229-32; Banks, ed., *Reconciliation and Hope*, 104-24; GMS, 403-5.
MYRON D. GOLDSMITH

REDEEMER, REDEMPTION. Salvation is the end result of redemption; redemption itself is the means. The NT word (usually *lutron* and its family) refers to "ransom," payment for deliverance from some evil, "the price of release."

Love is the grand motivation for redemption, and it focuses in Jesus Christ the Redeemer, though God as Redeemer worked toward His salvation goal throughout the OT. "God so loved the world, that he gave" (John 3:16) is the cornerstone of the house called redemption. This cannot surprise us, for God's very nature is love (1 John 4:7-8; 2 Cor. 13:11). His love is universal, not confined to the Jews (John 3:16). That verse also lets us know His love is sacrificial; so does 1 John 4:9-10; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 5:2; and Rev. 1:5. The amazing truth is that He loves us though unworthy, and even when we are His enemies (Rom. 5:8; 1 John 4:10). The NT teaching is that His love is merciful (Eph. 2:4-5). More, the love that made redemption's plan complete saves and sanctifies us (2 Thess. 2:13).

An important personage in OT society was the *Go'el*, "redeemer," the nearest of kin charged with the responsibility of buying back an inheritance which had been alienated from the family line to which it properly belonged. Boaz, by redeeming Elimelech's property, and with it obtaining Ruth, prevented the line of Elimelech from terminating with the death of the two sons Chilion and Mahlon. In this respect also Jesus fulfills the type. He is our *Go'el*, our Redeemer, in restoring us to our proper owner and lineage.

The payment of the *lutron* was common in OT times and applied to anything that released a man from an obligation or debt of his own. But of special significance was the ceremony of the firstborn, traced to sparing sons on Passover night in Egypt. Customarily, the firstborn were given to the Lord and could be bought back for five shekels (Num. 18:16; cf. Barclay, *New Testament Words*, 190). It is worth noting in passing that *lutron* may also refer to buying a slave's freedom (sinners are slaves capable of being freed).

Mark 10:45 and Matt. 20:28 tell us Jesus is our *lutron*, our ransom to free us. Man, caught in the grip of sin and quite incapable of releasing himself, is rescued. (Thus one definition of salvation is "rescue.") Sometimes the figure implies or indi-

cates rescue in and from a battle (sin and righteousness are at war).

Redemption is through the blood of Christ (Eph. 1:7), and one OT meaning of this term is "blood money." This redemption means the forgiveness of sins (Col. 1:14).

Redemption also means a new interpersonal relationship with God (Rom. 3:24). This new relationship means transformation and adoption into the family of God (Gal. 4:5). The old life is forgotten, the new life is present reality, and the future filled with possibilities. Note carefully: The plain NT view is that redemption is due entirely to Jesus Christ, His life in God, His works and teachings, His death and resurrection—the entire person and work of the Redeemer. The *lutron* He paid cost His entire life; we do well to remember this enormously significant fact.

Redemption carries provision for the future life too. True, the new life it enables begins now, but continues throughout eternity.

See RANSOM, SACRIFICE, ATONEMENT, PROPITIATION, EXPIATION, PASSOVER, RESURRECTION.

For Further Reading: Barclay, *New Testament Words* (*agapē* and *lutron*); Burtner and Chiles, *A Compend of Wesley's Theology*, 64 ff; "Redeemer, Redemption," NBD.

DONALD E. DEMARAY

REFORMATION. See PROTESTANT REFORMATION.

REGENERATION. Regeneration is the inward quickening of the repentant and believing sinner from spiritual death to spiritual life which occurs in Christian conversion. As such it is simultaneous with the other aspects of this religious experience, viz., justification, adoption, and initial sanctification.

The Greek equivalent of regeneration, *palin-genesia*, "new birth," or being "born again," is used only once in reference to conversion (Titus 3:5); however, the idea is expressed frequently by other equally precise terms (Eph. 2:1, 5; Jas. 1:18; 1 Pet. 1:23).

The most incisive declaration of the necessity of being "reborn" is our Lord's well-known dialogue with Nicodemus (John 3:1-8). In this conversation Jesus laid down the major elements involved in what the Christian faith intends by the terms "regeneration," the "new birth," and "born again." In reply to questions concerning the kingdom of God, Jesus shifted the discussion drastically. "I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Clearly Nicodemus was being led to see that moral goodness, zeal for religious observance,

and the performance of exact legal duties were insufficient to qualify him for the Kingdom.

Jesus' idea of the inner transformation which regeneration implies was not new in Scripture. Ezekiel, as God's spokesman, declared, "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 an heart of flesh" (Ezek. 36:26). The language is figurative; and Nicodemus' perplexed response to the words of the Lord in John 3:4, 9 suggests that our Lord's insistent words could only be understood in this way.

The NT unfolding of the meaning of regeneration begins with the assumption that man, by the Fall, has been placed in a state of sin—a state so negatively profound that he cannot lift himself from his predicament. The reply of grace to this is, that the Holy Spirit offers a change in human nature so decisive that the dominion of sin which is natural to man is broken, so that repentant and believing persons may serve God freely and walk in His ways.

The effective agent of regeneration is the divine Spirit, who moves quietly into the penitent and believing heart (which has been justified), to bring the inner life into conformity with the new relationship as child, as heir of God, and joint heir with Christ (see Rom. 8:16-17). Clearly this has elements of the mysterious about it; our Lord put this in words as He said: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit" (John 3:8).

More formally, regeneration means literally "to be again" and involves the replacement of the old individual with "a new creature" (2 Cor. 5:17). This indicates at least an initial—though partial—restoration to the moral image of God which was lost in the Fall, plus the reestablishment of a relation of devotion and obedience to God. The "new man" is, in regeneration, made alive, given new patterns of incentive and motivation, and enabled to walk in "newness of life" (Rom. 6:4). The felt reality of this produces the response of the human spirit which is a confirming counterpart of the witness of the Spirit.

See NEW BIRTH, CONVERSION, FIRST WORK OF GRACE, JUSTIFICATION.

For Further Reading: "Conversion," *Baker's DCE*; "Regeneration," *ZPEB*; Wiley, *CT*, 2:402-39.

HAROLD B. KUHN

REINCARNATION. This is the reinhabitation of a personal spirit, released by death from its former

house, in another bodily form. The spirit of a human may return as another human or as an animal. Whether the reincarnation is an improvement or a downgrading depends on Karma, or just fate. The doctrine is variously called Metempsychosis, Transmigration, or Rebirth. It is congenial to Platonism, which supposes an extreme dichotomy between spirit (or soul) and body; but in origin it is more Eastern than Western. It underlines the incubus of animal reverence in Hinduism, since the animal might be an ancestor. The teaching was first systematically taught in the Upanishads, a collection of sacred writings in Hinduism, most of which antedated Plato. The supposed purpose of reincarnation is the gradual purification of the soul, as it passes through higher and higher forms, until it reaches Nirvana. The doctrine is thoroughly pagan and non-Christian. The Bible teaches that "it is appointed for men to die once, and after this comes judgment" (Heb. 9:27, NASB). The creation of man was unique, constituting him a unitary body-soul being which cannot be compounded with lower forms of being. This life is man's sole probation. His redemption is not by Karma but by the blood of Christ.

See NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS, DUALISM, THE-OSOPHY, FATALISM.

For Further Reading: Stilson, *Leading Religions of the World*; Parrinder, *A Dictionary of Non-Christian Religions*.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

REJOICE. See JOY.

RELATIONAL THEOLOGY. This is sometimes referred to as a "theology of relationships." The category of relationship is seen as the locus of religious reality. The concept is that of persons in interaction with each other. Sin is wrong interaction; holiness is right interaction. Christian holiness therefore consists of right relationships with God, other persons, and with oneself; some would insist on the necessity of right relationship with one's environment also (the ecological dimension). Love is seen as the central note of Christianity, since love is the attitude which makes right relationships possible.

This is a dynamic approach to Christian holiness, which moves away from the Calvinistic imputed righteousness, which is a legal rightness through an objective atonement, but which falls short of personal relationships which are truly holy. The approach also moves away from the kind of Wesleyanism which defines holiness as a subjective state of the nature, wrought by a work of grace, and which may also fall short of ex-

pressing itself in terms of relationships. Relational theology would insist that the focus of reality is not in a subjective experience but in the degree to which the experience affects the relationships.

This emphasis on the relational nature of biblical holiness is essential to the preservation of a true moral sense; i.e., that holiness must be moral to the core, and that any understanding of holiness which obscures the moral dimension is false. By "moral holiness" is meant a relationship with God in which the person is never a mere pawn, but is actively and intensely committed to Christ in loving obedience and trust. Every nerve is stretched in the quest for God's best (cf. Phil. 3:13-14, NASB). By implication, this insistence on preserving the moral nature of holiness constitutes a repudiation of any mechanical system of security, which severs sonship from fellowship, legal relationship from loving relationship, and acceptance from obedience.

Relational theology becomes aberrant when it advocates impress upon it the categories and concepts of process theology. This results in a failure to see that the effecting of right relationships, and their maintenance, can only be accomplished by real subjective changes in the nature of the relator. For the human relator is sinful by nature and by choice, and is hence incapable of right relationships with either God, man, or himself. It is his sinfulness which is the moral impediment to harmonious relationships. If the relationalist replies that disharmonious relationships do not result from sinfulness but constitute the sinfulness, it becomes necessary to remind him that deeply rooted in orthodox Wesleyanism is the doctrine of original sin, the need for a real change called regeneration, and a deeper real change called sanctification—and that these changes become not only the means by which right relationships are effected but the conditions for those relationships.

A concept of either holiness or sinfulness which is exclusively relational cannot claim Wesley for support. In his classic debate with the Unitarian John Taylor, speaking of original sin as an inbred proclivity of the nature, he exclaimed, "Believe this, and you are so far a Christian. Deny it, and you are a heathen still." To Taylor's premise that "righteousness is right action," Wesley replied, "Indeed it is not. Here . . . is your fundamental mistake. It is a right state of mind; which differs from right action, as the cause does from the effect" (*Works*, 9:342).

Right relationships then are the goal of grace, and the touchstone of religious validity. But they

presuppose the atonement of Christ, as the necessary moral ground for reconciliation with God; and they also presuppose real, substantive changes in the human relations.

That Jesus himself made process dependent upon state and becoming dependent upon being, instead of the other way around, is clear from such passages as: "You will know them by their fruits. Grapes are not gathered from thorn bushes, nor figs from thistles, are they? Even so, every good tree bears good fruit; but the rotten tree bears bad fruit. A good tree cannot produce bad fruit, nor can a rotten tree produce good fruit" (Matt. 7:16-18, NASB; cf. 12:33-35). The state of goodness does not exclude process but controls it. A good tree can keep on growing and producing, but it will not thereby be becoming a good tree; the production will only express what it already is. No amount of growth or fruit bearing will turn a bad tree into a good one. Likewise, no amount of growth or time will transform a sinful heart into a pure heart. Relationships are objective states which depend upon subjective conditions.

See SANCTIFICATION, NATURE, HUMAN NATURE, SUBSTANCE (SUBSTANTIVE), NEW COVENANT, PROCESS THEOLOGY, WESLEYAN SYNTHESIS.

For Further Reading: Wood, *Pentecostal Grace*; Wynkoop, *A Theology of Love*; Wiley, CT, 2:440-96; Turner, *Christian Holiness*, 98 ff; Purkiser, *Sanctification and Its Synonyms*; Chapman, *The Terminology of Holiness*; Grider, *Entire Sanctification*, 20-24; Wesley, *Works*, 9:192-465; Henry, *Christian Faith and Modern Theology*, 92.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

RELIGION. There is no universally accepted definition of the term "religion." Even the origin of the Latin word *religio* is disputed. Cicero connected it with *religere* as meaning attention to divine things. Lactantius and Augustine saw it as derived from *religare* with the meaning "to bind back," thus representing religion as the ground of obligation. The term "religion" came into English usage from the Vulgate, where *religio* is used to translate the Greek word *thréskeia* in Acts 26:5 and Jas. 1:26-27. In these passages *thréskeia* refers to external religious devotion, while a fourth occurrence in Col. 2:18 is translated "worship."

Contemporary Usage. In modern times religion is approached from a bewildering variety of viewpoints. It means one thing to the anthropologist, another to the sociologist, another to the psychologist, another to the Marxist, another to the mystic, another to the Buddhist, and yet another to the Jew or the Christian. For the humanist, a definition of religion relates to the log-

ical development of some aspect of human culture which becomes an object of intensive investigation, and "God" is reduced to an idea which occurs within the total complex. For the religious person, a definition of religion involves a description of the individual's particular religious creed.

Definitions and Characteristic Features. Among the philosophical comprehensive definitions of religion, the following few are representative. Schleiermacher believed the essence of religion was "the feeling of an absolute dependence"; Huxley, "those things, events, and ideas which arouse the feeling of sacredness"; Kant, "the observance of moral law as a divine institution"; J. G. Frazer, "a propitiation or conciliation of powers superior to man which are believed to direct and control the course of Nature and of human life"; Tillich, the dimension of depth in all of man's life functions, being "ultimately concerned" about the ultimate.

However, the *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* regards all such definitions inadequate. It offers instead the following list of "religion-making characteristics" as criteria for defining religion.

1. Belief in supernatural beings (gods).
2. A distinction between sacred and profane objects.
3. Ritual acts focused on sacred objects.
4. A moral code believed to be sanctioned by the gods.
5. Characteristically religious feelings (awe, sense of mystery, . . . guilt, adoration) . . . which are connected in idea with the gods.
6. Prayer and other forms of communication with gods.
7. A world view, or a general picture of the world as a whole and the place of the individual therein. . . .
8. A more or less total organization of one's life based on the world view.
9. A social group bound together by the above (Alston, "Religion," *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 7:141-42).

A religion need not embody all these features, but when enough of them "are present to a sufficient degree, we have a religion" (*ibid.*, 142).

Conclusions. First, the universal inclination to religion among all nations and in all conditions suggests that man is religious by nature. Since human nature is marred by sin, however, the religion of unregenerated humanity is one of form without authentic divine content. Second, human religion represents man's attempt to enter into communion with God on man's own terms (Karl Barth). Thus religion is not good in itself; it bears the marks of the Fall. Religion crucified

Christ, even good religion as far as religion goes. Third, although true knowledge of God is inaccessible in human religion because of man's finitude and sinfulness, God has revealed himself to man by word and deed over a long span of history, climaxed by the incarnation of the eternal *Logos*. The total revelation is carefully preserved for humankind in the Bible. Fourth, the reason the term "religion" seldom occurs in the Bible is due to the nature of humanistic, non-revelatory religion which "is itself alien to the core of biblical thought" (Gealey, "Religion," *IDB*).

See CHRISTIANITY, NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS.

For Further Reading: Alston, "Religion," *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 7:140-45; Beckwith, "Religion," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 9:453-57; Gealey, "Religion," *IDB*; Hick, *Philosophy of Religion*, esp. 81-90.

J. WESLEY ADAMS

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. See CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.

RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE. Since 1918, the most important debate in theology has been whether theological language can have as its base a philosophical metaphysical system (as both Aquinas and Whitehead argued) or whether "it must derive entirely from faith in relation to revelation, and so be formed from the biblical Word," as the neoorthodox and some neoevangelicals and Wesleyans have insisted. (It is, of course, dependent upon how "biblical Word" is interpreted.)

The question is important epistemologically when the question is asked, "How do I know the truth of religious belief—by faith or by metaphysical speculation?" It is important to the evangelical to understand how he can transcend the confinements of a secular world view which can exclude him from a valid knowledge of God.

The initial consideration is that knowledge unaided by a special help from God is limited. This limitation is never overcome. The consequences of man's limitations in knowledge are recognized by every serious philosophy and theology. That limitation, according to both Catholic and Protestant thinkers, is grounded not only in lack of time and opportunity, but in the nature of man's powers clouded by sin. Thus revelation is necessary as an aid to knowledge. We are incompetent in ourselves but dependent upon the definitive Word who is revealed through Christ in the Scriptures as a loving and concerned Heavenly Father.

Man is free by grace to ignore or respond to

those revelatory acts—to "recognize or fail to recognize His presence." God always leaves room in that "fateful freedom" to respond in faith. Thus faith, as a gift of God's grace, is a correlate of freedom. While the validity of religious knowledge attained by faith may not be demonstrable to the empiricist, its certainty is assured by the inner witness of the Holy Spirit.

See KNOWLEDGE, THEOLOGICAL LANGUAGE.

For Further Reading: Clark, "Apologetics," *Contemporary Evangelical Thought*, ed. Henry, 137-61; Ramsey, *Religious Language*; Gilkey, *Naming the Whirlwind: The Renewal of God-Language*.
OSCAR F. REED

REMARriage. See DIVORCE.

REMISSION OF SINS. See FORGIVENESS.

REMNANT. From the Hebrew root *shr*, meaning "what is left behind after a process of elimination," there are derived two nouns, *shear* and *sheerith*, that can be translated as "remnant," "posterity," "rest," and "residue." Sometimes they are used in the OT to designate material things that are left behind: a city (1 Chron. 11:8), money (2 Chron. 24:14), trees (Isa. 10:19), timber (44:17), etc. In a number of passages these two nouns refer to a "remnant" of people remaining after a disaster; e.g., giants of Bashan (Josh. 12:4), Amorites (2 Sam. 21:2), Amalekites (1 Chron. 4:43), Syrians (Isa. 17:3), and Israelites (Neh. 10:28).

A more distinctive understanding of "remnant" began with the ministry of Isaiah, with *shear* and *sheerith* being used as technical terms for Israelites who survive a national disaster. From this understanding of a residue remaining after a calamity, there emerged what might be termed the "remnant doctrine." Very significantly Isaiah named his son Shear-jashub, meaning "a remnant shall return" (Isa. 7:3). This testimonial name was a prophetic witness to Judah that although the nation's sin would eventually result in exile as a divine judgment, yet, in the mercy of God, a remnant would return. This remnant is the "holy seed" (Isa. 6:13; cf. Ezek. 9:8), and the hope of its survival continued throughout the Exile and into postexilic times.

Jeremiah and Ezekiel saw the hope of Israel in this minority (e.g., Jer. 24:4-7; Ezek. 6:7 ff). God's love for His people was such that this remnant would be gathered from the nations, cleansed from their sinful ways, and formed into the nucleus of a new Israel (e.g., Isa. 4:2-6; Amos 9:8-15; Mic. 2:12; 4:6-8; 5:7-8; Ezek. 36:24-32; Zech. 8:12; 13:9; Hag. 1:12, 14). The remnant hope per-

sisted through the intertestamental period (see, e.g., Enoch 83:8; 2 Esd. 12:34; 13:48; 2 Bar. 40:2), and there are echoes of it in the Gospels (e.g., Matt. 3:9; 22:14; Luke 12:32; John 1:11).

From many passages in his letters, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that Paul saw the Church fulfilling the function of the promised faithful remnant (Rom. 9:24-33; 11:1-12; Gal. 3:7-14; 6:16). In Jas. 1:1, the scattered Christian Church is identified as the true Israel, and Peter describes the Church as "God's own people" (1 Pet. 2:9). Thus the "remnant doctrine" of the OT finds its ultimate fulfillment in the Church of Christ, i.e., in all those, Jews and Gentiles, who, by grace, are in "the household of God" (Eph. 2:18-22).

See PROMISES (DAVIDIC), RESTORATION OF ISRAEL, CHURCH.

For Further Reading: Campbell, "God's People and the Remnant," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 111 (1950), 78-85; Heaton, "The Root SH'R and the Doctrine of the Remnant," *Journal of Theological Studies* (1952), 27-39.

HERBERT MCGONIGLE

REMONSTRANTS. This referred initially to the 42 followers of James Arminius, led by John Uitenbogaert, who signed the *Remonstrance* that was presented to the governing body of the United Netherlands at the Hague in 1610. This document, the *Remonstrance*, "remonstrated" against the Calvinistic teachings on total depravity, unconditional election, limited atonement, irresistible grace, and the perseverance of believers. It also sought the privilege of continuing to teach Arminianism in Holland. The term later came to be a kind of synonym for the Arminians, and it is in the name of a still-existing denomination, in Holland, which dates back to the time of the first Remonstrants: The Remonstrant Brotherhood.

See ARMINIANISM, CALVINISM, TOLERANCE.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

REMORSE. See REPENTANCE.

REPENTANCE. The word *metanoia*, "repentance," means a change of mind. The Bible acknowledges repentance in God as well as man. God's repentance means sorrow or regret followed (usually) by positive action (Gen. 6:6; Exod. 32:14; Deut. 32:36; Jer. 18:8). This does not contradict the doctrine of the divine immutability. God's unchanging law is that His mercy is toward them that love and obey Him, and His judgments toward them that disobey Him. Which of these attitudes God assumes at a given

moment depends on man (cf. Rom. 11:20-23). When a person, as e.g., King Saul, disappoints God, God is sorry and alters both attitude and action in relation to that person (1 Sam. 15:11, 23).

In respect to man's repentance, it can be said to be evangelical if it has in it three elements.

The first is intellectual. By it the sinner comes unto "the knowledge of sin" (Rom. 3:20) and its consequences.

The second element is emotional. It is a genuine sorrow for sin. It must be deeper than sorrow at being caught ("worldly sorrow"). It must be "godly sorrow," sorrow because one has sinned against God (2 Cor. 7:9-10).

The third element in evangelical repentance is volitional, a change of the will and purpose. It is a turning from sin unto God, the heart crying out for pardon and cleansing (Ps. 51:7, 10).

The importance of repentance is underlined by John the Baptist. In his ministry, which was to prepare the way for the Lord, he made repentance the theme. Jesus himself said, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke 13:3, 5).

Although evangelical repentance is basically an act of man, it is impossible apart from the work of the Holy Spirit (Acts 5:31; 11:18; Rom. 2:4; 2 Tim. 2:25; Heb. 12:17).

Repentance is antecedent to and a preparation for salvation. It is necessary if God is to forgive (Acts 2:37-38; 11:18; 20:21). It involves confession and restitution (Exod. 22:1-4; Luke 19:8-9; 1 John 1:9).

See SALVATION, FAITH, WORKS, RESTITUTION.

For Further Reading: Purkiser, ed., *Exploring Our Christian Faith*, 280-83; Turner, "Repentance," *ZPEB*, 62-64.

W. RALPH THOMPSON

REPRESENTATIVE THEORY. This is one of the views about the so-called transmission of original sin from Adam to the rest of us humans. It views Adam as the federal head of the race, and therefore as chosen by God as our representative. When he sinned, we suffered a detriment because he was representing us; and he represented us badly by willfully disobeying God. This is the view held by such theologians as James Arminius and John Wesley. It is contrasted with the realistic mode view of Augustine and others, that we are now in original sin because we actually and realistically participated in Adam's sin, by being racially "in his loins" at the time. Both theories are in great part attempts to interpret what Paul means in Rom. 5:12-21. The realistic mode view suits the view of uncon-

ditional predestination because, then, God, in predestinating some individuals to eternal hell before they were born, would be decreeing in that way, based on their actual guilt for participating realistically in Adam's transgression.

The representative theory suits Arminianism's viewing predestination as conditioned on each person's accepting or rejecting Christ during his sojourn upon the earth. It admits that a certain guilt accrued to all of us because of Adam's sin, but states on the basis of Rom. 5:15-19 that God removed this guilt in a blanket way because of Christ. According to this passage, this is the "free gift" which passes upon everyone. This is why Wesley, Wiley, and others have taught that original sin inclines us to acts of sin, but that, without the acts, original sin alone would not occasion anyone's entering into eternal hell.

See ORIGINAL SIN, PREVENIENT GRACE, REALISM IN THEOLOGY, IN ADAM.

For Further Reading: Wiley, *CT*, 2:107-18.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

REPROBATION. Reprobation is the ultimate state of one who has been controlled completely by a reprobate mind. Such a person has so thoroughly and willfully rejected the overtures of a seeking God in Christ Jesus as to have placed himself purposefully outside the grasp of salvation. His mind is so twisted and distorted by the saturation of sin as to be unable to perceive anything but evil (Rom. 1:28).

The word "reprobate" is used in Jer. 6:30 and Heb. 6:8 in reference to a testing, as in determining the purity of metal, coins, or soil. If the testing indicated the sample was valueless, it was reprobate, i.e., rejected. The apostle Paul uses the idea of testing and proving as regards the message he preached (2 Cor. 13:5-7). He also said that he exercised discipline over his body to avoid becoming a castaway (reprobate, 1 Cor. 9:27).

The harsh usage of the term (Rom. 1:28; 2 Tim. 3:8; Titus 1:16) implies a deliberate rejection and distortion of truth. Falsehood is not only entertained but promoted. The mind of the reprobate is perverted to the point that the normal and beautiful are twisted into that which is depraved, abnormal, and ugly. This condition is the final dreadful result of continual evil choices.

See SIN, UNBELIEF, UNPARDONABLE SIN.

For Further Reading: *HDNT*, 3:318.

RONALD E. WILSON

RESENTMENT. See HARDNESS OF HEART.

RESPECT. Respect is the honor, deference, and courtesy we show to persons, places, customs, traditions, institutions, or offices. It may also be a subjective perception of worth. We may (and should) act respectfully even though we do not admire the person or object. We may respect a spouse, a minister, or an officer of the law, out of deference to his or her relationship to us, or their office, even when we cannot inwardly respect them as persons.

The habit of showing respect is an indispensable ingredient of civility. This is universally and intuitively recognized in all societies. Respectful conduct fosters harmonious and pleasant relationships, and softens the harsh and difficult facets of life. So much has this virtue been prized that many cultures have built up elaborate protocol specifying exact forms for the expression of respect. Tipping the hat, bowing (in Oriental countries), and standing when the national anthem is sung are typical of the countless ways civilized peoples have of showing respect.

The Bible is adamant in its insistence that Christians show respect in all proper situations and forms, and to all persons. Respect is to be shown to parents (Eph. 6:1-2), to spouses (4:33; 1 Pet. 3:7), to kings and all who are in authority (Rom. 13:7), to ministers and church leaders (1 Thess. 5:12-13), to the aged (Lev. 19:32), to all persons irrespective of sex, color, nationality, creed, or class (1 Pet. 2:17-18)—or even present degradation (John 4:7-9, 18).

We are to respect our bodies (1 Cor. 6:19-20); the property of others (Eph. 4:28); their good name (Lev. 19:16); their opinions (Acts 21:18-26); their civil rights (Lam. 3:35; Amos 5:12); and we are to respect the house of God (Eccles. 5:1; Matt. 21:13); and the Word of God (Prov. 13:13).

The ultimate basis for respecting persons is the sanctity of human beings as having been created by God in His image and for His glory and service. To fail to respect persons is to show disrespect to God their Creator. It is noteworthy that whenever society becomes irreligious, the bonds of courtesy and honor among men begin to loosen. Forms of courtesy become hypocritical because motivated solely by self-interest. The smile and deferential manner is sustained by the prospect of the tip or other forms of personal gain. Christians are to guard rigorously against superficial and insincere graciousness. They avoid hypocrisy, however, not by deliberate rudeness, or by being blatantly unconventional, but by inwardly cultivating the Christian virtue of respect.

Respect (or disrespect) is shown in many sub-

tle ways—not only by what we say, but by tone of voice, facial expression, bodily posture, choice of words, including names and colloquialisms. Many Christians are slow in perceiving the relation of humor to proper respect. Some things or persons or concepts are not suitable subjects for joking. We should not joke, for instance, about sacred things or handicapped people. Christians also fail, too often, to understand that we show respect or disrespect by our dress. To be excessively casual in social situations is to say to others that we do not consider them important. This is doubly significant in the house of God. Our manner of dress when attending church is an indicator of our real respect for the place and for the Person we have gone there to worship. Or, if our inner respect is deeper than our dress shows, our carelessness is at least an indicator of our ignorance.

See CULTURE, HONOR, LOVE, REVERENCE, SANCTUARY, SECULARISM, DISCRIMINATION.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

RESPECT OF PERSONS. See PREJUDICE.

RESPONSIBILITY. See ACCOUNTABILITY.

REST, REST OF FAITH. The Epistle to the Hebrews uses the theme of rest to appeal for faithfulness in a congregation that is discouraged and disillusioned. Heb. 4:1-13 is the conclusion of an exposition of Ps. 95:7-11 which the author began in Heb. 3:7. That OT passage recounts the story of Moses' failure to lead the generation of Israelites who came out of Egypt into the land of Canaan. The reason for the failure was their rebellion against God and their putting God to the test (cf. Exod. 17:1-7; Num. 20:1-13). They were unable to enter because of unbelief and disobedience (Heb. 3:19; 4:6). But even the next generation did not find God's rest, as is evident from the fact that David long afterward wrote of God's continuing promise (Ps. 95:7; Heb. 3:7, 15; 4:1, 6-7). "So then, there remains a sabbath rest for the people of God" (4:9, RSV). This promise is now proclaimed as the Christian gospel, and entering God's rest is accomplished by believing (vv. 2-3).

What then is this rest? It is akin to the sabbath rest of God, when He rested from all His works of creation (Gen. 2:2; Heb. 4:10). God rested on the seventh day, when His purpose of creation had been fulfilled. By analogy, entering into the promised rest would be to participate in the full realization of God's redeeming purpose. Rest represents for the writer to the Hebrews the com-

pleteness of God's redemptive provision and the fullness of man's experience of salvation. This latter fact has prompted some Wesleyans to understand "rest of faith" as a synonym for entire sanctification. The analogy of rest expresses something very beautiful and meaningful regarding Christian perfection. However, the expression as found in its NT context could be understood better as including the fullness of salvation experience in this life as well as the ultimate participation in God's rest which will come only in the presence of God.

See FULL SALVATION, REDEMPTION, HEAVEN.

For Further Reading: Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 60-83; Wiley, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 134-55.

HAL A. CAUTHRON

RESTITUTION. Restitution is making wrongs right. It may consist of the correction of a falsehood, or the restoration of stolen or damaged property. The Mosaic directives for the restitution of things stolen, damaged, or lost, ranged from simple indemnity to a fourfold restoration (Exod. 22:1-6; Lev. 6:5; Num. 5:7; cf. Exod. 21:22-36).

While the principle of restitution for wrongs committed is not specifically emphasized in the NT, it is within the spirit of its teachings. Restitution is a logical component of repentance. When salvation came to Zacchaeus, love, replacing selfishness, impelled him to give half of his goods to the poor. He thereby did what he could to correct the imbalance which his greed had helped create in his socioeconomic world. From the money which remained he imposed the strongest demands of the law upon himself, restoring fourfold anything which he had taken by false means (Luke 19:1-10).

See REPENTANCE, BACKSLIDING.

For Further Reading: Marchant, "Restitution," *Baker's DT*; Archer, "Crimes and Punishments," *ZPBD*.

W. RALPH THOMPSON

RESTORATION OF ISRAEL. The concern of this article is: "What does the NT teach about the restoration of Israel?" There are two ways of studying prophecy. One makes the OT the primary source for the outline of the last things and fits the NT with it so far as it is possible; the other, recognizing progressive revelation, takes the NT as the primary source for the doctrine of the last things. We are concerned in this article only with what the NT teaches. Jesus was rejected by His generation of Jews, and so it is clear that they forfeited the Kingdom He proclaimed. The owner of His vineyard (God) would come and destroy the tenants (the Jews) and give the vineyard

to others (the Church, Mark 12:9). However, He hinted rather darkly that in the future Israel will be saved. "Jerusalem [i.e., Israel] will be trodden down by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled" (Luke 21:24, RSV).

Paul devotes three chapters of Romans (9—11) to this question. He first points out that physical descent from Abraham does not make one a true Jew. Not all who are physically descendants from Abraham are the sons of Abraham (9:6). Earlier he had written, "He is not a real Jew who is one outwardly, nor is true circumcision something external and physical. He is a Jew who is one inwardly, and real circumcision is a matter of the heart" (2:28 f, RSV). As the sovereign Creator God and the Lord of history, He can do as He pleases with His creatures. There can be no criticism of God's actions.

Now Paul does something which is of utmost significance. He takes two quotations from Hosea which in their OT setting apply to Israel (Hos. 2:23; 1:10) and applies them to the Church, which consists of more Gentiles than Jews. As he says in Philippians, "For we [Christians] are the true circumcision" (Phil. 3:3, RSV; cf. Col. 2:12). Israel was lost because she rejected the way of righteousness by faith and substituted for it the righteousness of good works (Rom. 9:31).

Paul illustrates this by the figure of an olive tree which represents the people of God. God has broken off natural branches (Israel) and grafted in alien branches *contrary to nature* (11:24); but this is a gracious work of God in which the Gentiles cannot boast. However, Israel is still a holy people (v. 16), i.e., a people who belong to God. The reason for their unbelief and fall was not an arbitrary work of God. Israel stumbled and fell so that salvation has come to the Gentiles. There is in fact among the Jews a remnant of true Jews, chosen by grace (v. 5); and if the rest of the Jews do not remain in unbelief, they will be grafted again into the people of God (v. 23). Then Paul utters a dark saying, "Through their trespass salvation has come to the Gentiles, so as to make Israel jealous" (v. 11, RSV). Paul gives no hint as to how the salvation of the Gentiles will provoke Israel to jealousy and so turn them to faith. However, there is yet to be a great salvation of Israel.

In fact, Paul says, "And so all Israel will be saved" (v. 26, RSV). From the context of this verse, where Paul is speaking of the Jewish people and the Gentiles, it is difficult to do what some scholars do at this place, interpret Israel as spiritual Israel. Of course all spiritual Israel will be saved; to present that fact is tautology. How or by what

means and order ethnic Israel will be saved Paul does not say. One thing is clear: They must be saved by the exercise of faith. They are still in some sense a holy people and are destined to be included in the people of God and take their proper place in the redeemed company.

See JUDAISM, DISPENSATIONALISM, TRIBULATION, PROPHET (PROPHECY), REMNANT, ISRAEL, ESCHATOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Ladd, *The Last Things*.

GEORGE ELDON LADD

RESTORATIONISM. This is the belief, almost universally held by modernists, that ultimately all will repent and be saved; those who refuse to do so in this life will in the next, as they see reality from the standpoint of eternity and as they are prodded by the pangs of hell. Restorationism does not deny the reality of hell, but denies its finality; it is disciplinary only. The belief is thus a form of Universalism.

While the doctrine is sentimentally appealing, it cannot be supported biblically. The passage which declares God's unwillingness for anyone to perish (2 Pet. 3:1-9) shows clearly that the very interface of God's unwillingness is the reality of the possibility. For God's unwillingness is given as the explanation for His delay in terminating earthly probation. If death does not terminate probation, why the delay? Such a passage is reminiscent of Jesus' solemn warning of the closed door (Luke 13:25; cf. Matt. 7:22-23; 12:32; 25:1-13, 46; Mark. 9:47-49; Luke 16:26; 2 Thess. 1:9; Rom. 2:1-12; Revelation 20—22).

See FUTURE PROBATION, ETERNAL PUNISHMENT, UNIVERSALISM.

For Further Reading: Wiley, CT, 3:358-63.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

RESTORE, RESTORATION. See BACKSLIDING.

RESURRECTION OF CHRIST. This is a central item in the NT *kerygma*, the proclamation of the Good News. The apostle Paul declares it to be a crucial truth without which faith is worthless and sin is without remedy (1 Cor. 15:12-19).

Against all efforts to "spiritualize" or "demythologize" the Resurrection, the NT clearly indicates that the body of the crucified Lord was raised from the dead and ascended into heaven, leaving behind an empty tomb and a believing Church.

The resurrection of Christ is proclaimed as the first instance of true *anastasis* ("standing or rising up"), the NT term translated "resurrection" (38 times). "In fact Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who have fallen

asleep" (1 Cor. 15:20, RSV). All prior instances of restoration of life to the dead were instances of revivification rather than resurrection as such.

Christ's resurrection is the prototype and guarantee of ours (John 14:19; 1 Cor. 15:21-26), and His resurrected and glorified body is our best clue as to the nature of the eternal state of the redeemed (1 Cor. 15:49-54; Phil. 3:20-21; 1 John 3:1-3).

For these reasons, the resurrection of Christ is evidenced in Scripture as few other facts are. Ten evidences of the Resurrection have been given:

1. The certainty of Christ's death is clearly established in the certification of the Roman officer (Mark 15:44) and John's observation of the water and blood from the spear wound in Jesus' side (John 19:34-35). The "swoon theory" of a natural resuscitation is thereby explicitly denied.

2. The burial of the body was not by avowed disciples in a secret place but by members of the Sanhedrin (Joseph and Nicodemus, John 19:38-39) in a new tomb in a private garden, the location known to enemies as well as friends.

3. No living person expected to see Jesus again. The caution of the Sanhedrin leaders was not based on expectation of resurrection but on fear of deception by the disciples (Matt. 27:63-64). It was quite impossible for the psychologically defeated disciples either to contrive the removal of the body or to invent the story of the Resurrection.

4. The first testimony to the Resurrection came from Christ's enemies, not from His friends. The soldier guards reported not to Pilate but to the Sanhedrin, and were bribed to tell a story that on the surface involved contradiction ("While we slept, His disciples stole Him away" [see Matt. 28:11-14], when if they slept they could not know who came or what happened).

5. There is the incidental reference to the graveclothes, wrappings lying in the form of the body which had passed through them. The napkin that had been about the Savior's head was folded and laid to one side. The stone had been rolled away, not to let Jesus out but to let the disciples see what had happened.

6. Ten separate appearances of the risen Redeemer to more than 518 persons under a wide variety of circumstances are recorded (Matt. 28:9-10, 16-20; Mark 16:9-19; Luke 24:9-53; John 20:11-31; 21:1-25; Acts 1:3-9; 1 Cor. 15:5-8).

7. Only total conviction that Christ was physically alive could account for the revolution in the attitude of the disciples: from deepest gloom to highest joy. The apostolic preaching of the

Resurrection was never challenged by the authorities; the disciples were simply ordered to stop. What the disciples became is as convincing an evidence for the Resurrection as what they said.

8. There was no effort to preserve the tomb, the location of which is uncertain to the present time. The Resurrection alone could account for such an unnatural development. The opposition in that time had only to produce the body of Jesus to completely destroy the Christian witness. This was never done.

9. The change in the day of worship from Saturday to the Lord's day is indirect evidence of the Church's conviction that Christ rose early on the first day of the week (Mark 16:9). The day is often not mentioned; when it is, it is always "the first day of the week."

10. "The power of his resurrection" (Phil. 3:10) in the ongoing life of the Church is witness to the reality of the Resurrection. No movement based on deceit or error could have the morally constructive power manifest in normative Christianity across the ages.

Theologically, the Resurrection is central to Christology as well as soteriology or doctrine of salvation. Without the Resurrection, Jesus was a martyr; with it, He is "declared with power to be the Son of God" (Rom. 1:4, NIV). The Resurrection was the Father's seal on both Christ's life and teachings, and His atoning death (Acts 17:31).

See SOTERIOLOGY, CHRISTOLOGY, REDEEMER (REDEMPTION), DEATH OF CHRIST.

For Further Reading: Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, 3:2; Clark, *Interpreting the Resurrection*; Thomas, "The Resurrection of Jesus Christ," *ISBE*, 4:2565-69; King, *The Forty Days*; Wiley, CT, 2:204-8. W. T. PURKISER

RESURRECTION OF THE BODY. The Apostles' Creed declares, "I believe . . . in the resurrection of the body." Other Early Church creeds echo and amplify the teaching of Scripture that the bodies of the dead shall be raised. Jesus declared, "I am the resurrection and the life" (John 11:25). Because of the empty tomb, believers have been assured of final victory over death (1 Cor. 15:57). The apostle gave words of reassurance to believers that loved ones who had died in the faith would not be left out at the coming of Christ. "The dead in Christ shall rise first" (1 Thess. 4:16), promptly to be followed by believers living and remaining. Before Felix the governor, Paul testified that "there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust" (Acts 24:15).

The Scriptures go beyond the Greek concept of "the immortality of the soul," to declare a re-

union of soul and body. Instead of nonmaterial, ghostlike phantoms, recognizable bodies of loved ones who have died would come forth from the graves. The resurrected body will assure a preservation of personal identity, without being identical atomically and biologically. Rather the resurrected body will be changed, and made "like unto his glorious body" (Phil. 3:21).

While the OT assumed the resurrection of the body in teaching and example (e.g., Ps. 49:15; Dan. 12:2; Ezek. 37:1-14), its highest expression is found in the NT. The apostle Paul outlined the truth in most significant detail in 1 Corinthians 15. He directed his writing in answer to those who questioned the fact and significance of the resurrection (v. 12). Paul declared that failure to affirm this truth would be a denial of Christ's own resurrection and its meaning (vv. 13, 16). The validity of one's testimony and the facts of faith together with the power of preaching would be at stake by such denial (vv. 14-15). But Christ's resurrection clearly opened the way for the resurrection of the dead (vv. 20-22).

Paul next addresses the questions: "How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" (v. 35). Our resurrected bodies shall be gloriously fitted for eternal fellowship with our risen Lord. Our earthly bodies are sown in "corruption," "dishonour," and "weakness." They will be raised in "incorruption," "glory," and "power" (vv. 42-43). Our earthly bodies are created after the "first man"; our resurrected bodies will "bear the image of the heavenly" (vv. 47, 49). The old "flesh and blood" body (v. 50) will give way to the incorruptible body especially created for "immortality" (vv. 52-54). This final resurrection of the body will declare the ultimate triumph, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" (v. 55).

See RESURRECTION OF CHRIST, BODY, ESCHATOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Wiley, CT, 3:320-28; GMS, 652-58; Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, 464 ff.

RONALD E. WILSON

RETALIATION. See REVENGE.

RETRIBUTION, RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE. This is the rendering of condign punishments according to the deserts of an individual. Retribution might be the receiving of rewards as well as punishments, but the term is used generally in connection with punishments. Retribution is the exacting of a penalty for wrongdoing. Hebrew law was grounded on this principle.

Retribution is to be distinguished from remedial punishment, or punishment inflicted for the

good of the offender. The death of a murderer is not for the good of the murderer. Sin is to be punished irrespective of the effect upon others. It is punished because the wrongdoer deserves to be punished. The state must require the sinner or be held responsible for participating in the sin.

Capital punishment for murder is retribution. The state executes justice and punishes the offender, else it is held as participating in the crime. The people must cleanse the land by the execution of the murderer (Num. 35:34).

In theft, restitution is not sufficient. The law has been violated and punishment is demanded (Num. 35:33-34; Lev. 6:2-7). This principle reaches its fulfillment in the Atonement, in which Christ's death satisfied divine justice in place of the death of the sinner. To reject retributive justice is to reject the biblical doctrine of the Atonement.

See CAPITAL PUNISHMENT, ETERNAL PUNISHMENT, ATONEMENT, PROPITIATION.

For Further Reading: Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 74-76; Wiley, CT, 1:387 ff; 3:356 ff.

HAROLD J. OCKENGA

REVELATION, BOOK OF. There are four traditional methods of interpreting this last book of the Bible. First, the *Preterist* approaches it as history and literature and limits its message to the troublous times in which it was written. Second, the *Historical* interpreter treats it as a series of prophecies of progressive world history in a religious context. Third, the *Futurist* interprets this book as prophecy pertaining to the end time of history, with strong emphasis upon the millennium as a literal period of 1,000 years. In postmillennialism Christ will return at the end of a 1,000-year utopian world order. In premillennialism Christ will return to set up His kingdom of 1,000 years. In dispensational premillennialism a resurrected Jewish state will be the focal point of Christ's millennial reign on earth. This brief review illustrates the time and place orientation of these approaches which tend to minimize the ageless message of the Revelation—which message it shares with the rest of the NT.

The fourth is the *Idealist*, essentially a spiritualizing approach which tends to perpetuate the allegorical method of Bible interpretation, which in turn seeks to find moral and spiritual lessons in details apart from the central message.

These approaches offer contributions to the understanding of the Revelation, but they are weakened by their primary presuppositions. As with other books of the Bible, the pre-

suppositional norm must be that the author wrote for his own day in a manner understandable to his readers. On this basis one proceeds quite naturally, first, to a study of the historical situation which gave rise to the writing; second, to an analysis of the language—while recognizing its literary forms—in order to understand what the author meant to say; and third, to a formulation of the message for preaching, teaching, and living.

The second step encounters the greatest problems because the book is unique in the NT. The author calls it a prophecy (1:3). Chapters 2 and 3 are epistolary. The remainder is apocalyptic, a literary form which makes abundant use of revelations, visions, symbolism, and figures of speech. The author presents a dramatic picture of the great conflict being waged between the kingdoms of good and evil, between God and Satan, from both the heavenly and the earthly points of view (cf. 4:1; 17:1 ff). The events John saw taking place on earth were manifestations of extra-terrestrial activity. He viewed them in relation to the end (Gr. *eschaton*) which refers to *kairos* time (event, happening) rather than *chronos* time (historical sequence). The focus is upon God's redemptive activity in establishing His kingdom among men rather than upon the succession of these acts in history.

This kingdom, prophetically manifest in the OT people of God and actualized in Christ and His Church, now awaits its consummation in the last great *eschaton*. John apprehends this panorama in midstream and assures his readers that God will ultimately triumph through Jesus Christ. In emulation of John, our hearts must supplement our minds if we would interpret this book aright.

See PROPHET (PROPHECY), RAPTURE, APOCALYPTIC, MILLENNIUM.

For Further Reading: "Revelation," BBC; "Revelation," WBC; Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*; Bowman, *The Revelation to John*. HARVEY J. S. BLANEY

REVELATION, NATURAL. This term, known also as *general* revelation, describes the knowledge of God made known through nature, history, and the nature of man. It stands in contrast to *special* revelation, which refers to the truths of God found only in the Bible.

Scripture teaches that the creation testifies to God's existence as the Creator. His fingerprints are all over the things which He has made. Ps. 19:1-6 says the creation testifies day and night to people of every land and language about the glory of God. Thus the Hebrew poets and prophets

ridiculed the heathen practice of idol worship (Psalm 135; Isaiah 40). Such a vast, beautiful creation required a Creator of wisdom and might, qualities no idol could possess. In Rom. 1:18-23 Paul says everyone who does not worship God is without an excuse, for God's existence is clearly revealed by the things He has created. In preaching to the Gentiles, the apostles began with the revelation of God through nature and proceeded to proclaim the perfect revelation of God in Jesus Christ (Acts 14:8-18; 17:16-34).

The Bible portrays history as evidence of God's activity. He rules over the affairs of men (Ps. 22:28), rewarding righteousness and judging wickedness (1 Kings 8:32; Ps. 34:15-22; Prov. 14:34). He sets boundaries of time and space to nations (Acts 17:26), raising up rulers and putting them down (Dan. 4:17, 25, 32; Luke 1:51-52). God prophesies His intentions and history records their fulfillment. History is God-fashioned and moves toward the end which He has determined.

Man's own nature reveals God. Sin could not erase the fact that man was made for fellowship with God. The religious practices of the world's peoples reflect their groping for that fellowship. God's law is written on man's heart and works through his conscience to approve well doing and condemn wrongdoing (Rom. 2:14-16).

Natural revelation, however, has serious limitations resulting from man's fall into sin. Creation was subjected to futility and can no longer reveal God perfectly (Rom. 8:19-23). Man's abilities, corrupted by sin, can no longer perceive clearly God's revelation in nature (2 Cor. 4:4). At best, nature speaks only of God the Creator; it is silent about God the Savior. Thus special revelation, as found in the Bible, is absolutely necessary for us to know about redemption from sin provided through Jesus Christ, in order that we might be restored to fellowship with God (1 Cor. 1:21).

See NATURAL THEOLOGY, NATURAL LAW, REVELATION (SPECIAL).

For Further Reading: Berkouwer, *General Revelation*; Wiley, *CT*, 1:51-52, 126-34. LUKE L. KEEFER, JR.

REVELATION, SPECIAL. This term distinguishes God's immediate and unique self-disclosure to and through individuals, from general revelation, or His oblique self-disclosure through nature. *General* revelation is necessarily implicit in creation and God's providential care of the world, while *special* revelation is special in two respects: The *means* and *channels* are special (selective), and the *purpose* is special: redemption.

Three avenues have been used by God in the special revelation of himself to the human race. (1) He has manifested himself directly to individuals. (2) He has revealed himself through the inspired writings of prophets and apostles. And (3) He has revealed himself in the person of Jesus Christ.

There are many accounts of God's revelation of himself in special ways to individuals. He appeared to Abraham once in a smoking firepot and a flaming torch (Gen. 15:17), and again in the form of a man (18:1-33). He appeared to Moses in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush (Exod. 3:2-4:17). Thunders and lightnings, a consuming fire, an earthquake, and the sound of a trumpet were the media through which He manifested himself to Israel at Sinai (19:16 ff). Sometimes He revealed himself to men in dreams (e.g., 1 Sam. 3:4-14). David experienced His presence in "the sound of marching in the tops of balsam trees" (2 Sam. 5:24, RSV). Often God spoke through prophets (e.g., 12:1-14; 1 Kings 21:17-24; Ezek. 6:1 ff). At times a voice was His means of revelation (Gen. 4:6-15; 1 Sam. 3:4-14). Isaiah experienced Him in a vision in the Temple (Isaiah 6). Saul of Tarsus became aware of Him in a blinding light and a voice (Acts 9:1-9). God sent His angel to Peter (12:6-11). Miracles sometimes have been God's medium of revelation. John beheld Him in glory in the Apocalypse.

In view of the time span covered between Adam and John, it is apparent that God's special, personal revelations of himself have been relatively infrequent. Furthermore, their occurrences have been governed by the will of God rather than by dint of human effort. In another sense, however, God specially awakens and calls sinners everywhere and reveals himself to all who draw near to Him (Isa. 55:1; Jas. 4:8).

The Scriptures are a special revelation of God to man, made necessary because of the Fall. For sin not only brought guilt and separation from God; it darkened man's intellect, plunging him ever deeper into moral degradation (Rom. 1:18-32). In such a state he was unable to see God in general revelation.

The Scriptures reveal those divine acts by which God has made himself known unto the race. They reveal His deep concern for the race. They display His deep concern for every man, motivated by love—love so profound that He sacrificed His only begotten Son that rebellious man might have eternal life. The OT reveals God's preparation of a chosen people through whom to give salvation to the world. The NT de-

scribes the Savior's coming and the gift of the Holy Spirit. It sets forth those principles by which the new life in Christ can be brought to perfection. The Scriptures reveal things about God which otherwise would be totally hidden from man. Among them is the trinity of divine Persons within one essence. Another is the equality of the divine Persons within a functional hierarchy. Still another is the extent of His concern for man.

Because they were inspired, the human writers of the Scriptures sometimes recorded truths so profound that they themselves did not comprehend them (1 Pet. 1:10-11). They spoke better than they knew.

But God's greatest and best means of self-revelation was the incarnation of the eternal Son of God. "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth" (John 1:14, NKJB). When one of the Eleven asked Jesus to show them the Father, Jesus' response was, "Have I been with you so long, and yet you have not known Me, Philip? He who has seen Me has seen the Father" (14:8-9, NKJB). To see and hear and touch Jesus was to observe God's love, His compassion, His power, His detestation of hypocrisy: the perfections of God's character.

When the Son had finished His mission, He returned to the Father and sent the Holy Spirit to abide in believers forever. In fact, a careful reading of John 14:18-23 makes clear that with the Holy Spirit comes the entire Trinity to make of obedient believers their dwelling place.

But the end is not yet. At best, we still see "in a mirror, dimly" (1 Cor. 13:12, NKJB). After a while we shall see Him as He is (1 John 3:2). That will be special revelation indeed!

See REVELATION (NATURAL), BIBLE, CHRIST, NATURAL THEOLOGY, THEOPHANY, INSPIRATION (OF THE BIBLE).

For Further Reading: Pinnock, *Biblical Revelation*; Ramm, *Special Revelation and the Word of God*; Wiley, *CT*, 1:134-41. W. RALPH THOMPSON

REVENGE. This refers, in a technical sense, to a practice among Semitic people whereby a person avenges any hurt or breach of honor. In the case of murder, the next of kin must take vengeance. This was a basic part of the primitive form of justice practiced at a time when there was no recourse to public courts of law. The Hebrew word for revenge or vengeance is *nagam*, which represents an ethical demand and connotes justice. It refers to restoration, a balancing of honor, and is something "taken" by the offended party. It does

not necessarily carry the derogatory overtones of our English term "revenge." Thus we must read of its OT occurrences in this context.

An indication of the human nature of Israel's practice of vengeance is seen in its application to manslaughter. If a man unwittingly killed another, he could flee to one of the six cities of refuge designated for this purpose, where he would be safe from the avenging kinsman. Here he must remain until the death of the current high priest, at which time he could return to his home (Joshua 20).

A further restraint placed upon the expression of revenge is set forth in the familiar words of the law of retaliation found in Lev. 24:19-20: "When a man causes a disfigurement in his neighbor, as he has done it shall be done to him, fracture for fracture, eye for eye, tooth for tooth; as he has disfigured a man, he shall be disfigured" (RSV; see also Exod. 21:24 and Deut. 19:21). This restraint is unique in Israel, indicating that the punishment or revenge must fit the crime and stands in contrast to other ancient law statements outside Israel where revenge usually exceeded the crime.

The NT standard of Christian love completely excludes the taking of personal revenge (Matt. 5:38-42; Rom. 12:19-21).

See LOVE, FORGIVENESS, JUSTICE.

For Further Reading: Pederson, *Israel*, 2:378-92; de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 1:160-Lord.

ALVIN S. LAWHEAD

REVERENCE. This is the attitude toward a person or object which expresses respect, awe, affection, and veneration.

In the KJV the verb "reverence" occurs seven times in the OT and six times in the NT. In each instance it is a command or call to pay respect to or to venerate a person or an object, as in Lev. 19:30: "Ye shall keep my sabbaths, and reverence my sanctuary: I am the Lord."

Wiley defines the noun "reverence" as a "profound respect mingled with fear and affection," or "a strong sentiment of respect and esteem, sometimes with traces of fear" (CT, 3:38). Coleridge, the great poet and philosopher, defined it as a "synthesis of love and fear." Reverence therefore may be said to be fear tempered by love.

Reverence extends to all things that are considered as divine; in the Judean and the Christian contexts, it relates primarily to God. It is also used in reference to the Word of God and His ordinances, name, day, house in which we worship, and people. In the NT it has reference to

the names of God the Father, Christ the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

In Eastern tradition, reverence was given to the aged, to superiors, and to parents. Reverence is conceived of as respect and deference due to the aged, especially to parents (Eph. 6:1; Heb. 12:9).

Reverence for, and the worship of, Christ was the distinguishing peculiarity of the NT saints. His followers gave Him such worship as could not be given to any other being but God. Many texts show that He received such supreme worship as could not be given to any but God without idolatry. Jesus claimed it and received it, and God honored it and blessed those who rendered it (Luke 24:52; Acts 7:59; 1 Thess. 3:11-13).

Christ is to be worshipped by every creature in the universe (Phil. 2:10).

See WORSHIP, RESPECT, FEAR, LOVE.

For Further Reading: IDB, 4:71; Miley, *Systematic Theology*, 1:254; Vine, *ED*, 3:293; Wiley, *CT*, 3:38, 94.

DONALD R. PETERMAN

REVIVAL. This may be defined as a religious awakening, prompted by the Holy Spirit, that (1) restores in the church a vivid awareness of God's holiness and love, and (2) revitalizes its comprehension of what love for and obedience to God actually mean. Through the Holy Spirit's activity the church in revival is brought to intense reflection on the central themes of its faith, to repentance and renewal, and to expanded realization of the dimensions of discipleship.

Although the social, political, ecclesiastical, and individual factors that form the context in which revival occurs are important and cannot be ignored, they do not finally account for its occurrence. The factors that accompany revivals in the church are diverse and cannot be reduced to a formula. Additionally, since only the Holy Spirit adequately understands the church, the world, and the mind of the Father, no formula can ever circumscribe His activity. But this does not exclude the church's responsibility to seek and prepare for revival. Appropriate preparation for revival gives serious attention to prayer, is sensitive to the state of the church and the community at large, learns from the history of revivals, and seeks biblical guidance.

Revivals normally result in renewed evangelism, a revitalized missionary impulse, and in expanded circulation of religious literature. They often result in the formation of educational institutions, and reform of existing social, political, and economic institutions. In sum, they open all aspects of life to the power and meaning of the gospel.

Among the great revivals in the Christian church may be listed the Cluniac Reform in the 10th century; the Protestant Reformation in the 16th century; the Pietist movement in the 17th and 18th centuries; the Evangelical Revival in the 18th century; and the First and Second Great Awakenings in 18th- and 19th-century America.

See REVIVALISM, EVANGELISM.

For Further Reading: Autrey, *Revivals of the Old Testament*; Orr, *The Flaming Tongue*; Wood, *The Inextinguishable Blaze*.
ALBERT L. TRUESDALE, JR.

REVIVALISM. The theory and practice of seeking religious conversions in large numbers amidst awakened understanding and excited group emotions is called revivalism. Insofar as a plan of gathering crowds, preaching the gospel, and training converts is evident in the earliest Christian communities in Jerusalem, Samaria, Damascus, Corinth, and Ephesus, the Book of the Acts and the Epistles of Paul indicate that revivalism was pervasive in the Early Church.

Occasional religious awakenings, guided by human agents, took place during the long centuries following the establishment of the papacy and the Eastern patriarchate, especially in the conversion of the Slavs, in the founding of the Cistercian and Franciscan monastic orders, in the preaching that inspired the Crusades to wrest Jerusalem from the Turkish Empire, and in the popular preaching of Savonarola in Renaissance Florence. During the Reformation, the Anabaptists used both revivalism and evangelism in small groups to spread their intensely spiritual version of the gospel. The more radical preachers of the Puritan revolution in 17th-century England and the Quakers that emerged in succeeding decades, followed studied practices of preaching and witness intended to bring about large-scale awakenings. So did the Presbyterian ministers who accompanied the first Scottish settlers in northern Ireland.

The origins of modern Protestant revivalism, however, lie more clearly in the evangelical awakening that George Whitefield and John and Charles Wesley led in England and America during the 18th century, and which Pietists meanwhile promoted in Germany and among the German-speaking settlers of America. The major elements of those revivals have remained central to this day: preaching which affirmed the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification, as at Pentecost; reliance upon the authority and inspiration of Scripture to communicate unerringly all the truth necessary for Christian faith and ethical conduct; and a call to fulfill the Great

Commission of evangelizing all peoples. Modern missions and revivalism have, accordingly, gone hand in hand, from the times of the Wesleys and of William Carey and Adoniram Judson, right down to the present moment of mass awakenings in Korea, Indonesia, and central Africa, and the mixed African and Indian population of northeastern Brazil.

During the 19th century—the great century of Christian expansion—the theory and practice of revivalism was greatly enriched. In North America, Charles G. Finney and many Arminianized Presbyterians and Congregationalists joined Methodists and Baptists in measures that they believed were scriptural to promote revivals. Among these were camp meetings, which early in the century became as important to eastern and urban congregations in the United States as to the religious life of the midwestern frontier; interchurch concerts of prayer; protracted meetings; calling of repentant persons forward to a “mourner’s bench” or the Communion rail, thereafter called the “altar”; encouraging exhortation by women; and, later, city-wide campaigns such as Dwight L. Moody made famous on both sides of the Atlantic. In the decades preceding the Civil War, Finney, the Methodists, and a growing number of Congregational, Baptist, and Presbyterian revivalists in both America and England made devotion to such social reforms as anti-slavery, temperance, and justice to the poor and oppressed to be indispensable marks of biblical conversion.

A considerable reaction set in, however, when conservative Calvinists charged that reliance upon such allegedly human measures demeaned God’s sovereign and electing grace. That resistance became especially strong in the American South before the Civil War, and among antission Baptists in the Mississippi Valley. It fortified the growing opposition to efforts to eliminate social evils, especially slavery. And it generated a contrary theory of revivals that allowed only “spiritual” efforts, namely, prayer, the preaching of the Word, the administration of the sacraments, and the renewal of discipline within the believing community. These would prepare human hearts to receive the salvation that must come by divine initiative and election. The doctrine of the “spiritual” church, set out by James H. Thornwell and other Southern Presbyterians, maintained that whatever efforts revivals might have in eliminating social injustice or oppression were incidental to the purification of the church, and not properly the concern of the ministry.

Little known until recently was the rebirth of

revivalism among Roman Catholics in the 19th century, first in Germany and elsewhere on the Continent, then, through the work of the Redemptorist Fathers and other immigrant priests, in the parish missions of Catholic congregations in America. Following closely prescribed formats, traveling evangelists preached with as much passion as possible the model sermons provided for them, and helped to win many of the wandering immigrants back to the church. The sermons moved step by step from warnings of future damnation to descriptions of the loving heart of the Crucified Lord and the Blessed Virgin. The aim was to bring people back to the confession and to regular participation in the Mass.

Among Protestant evangelicals, preoccupation with the restoration of the power of primitive Christianity to convict and convert the masses and so to sanctify a culture increased steadily in both the Old World and the New, despite the arguments against preaching social reform. Millenarian doctrines, stressing the imminence of the Second Coming and emphasizing the promise of an outpouring of the Spirit in the last days, won a following on three continents, especially in the Niagara Bible conferences that Plymouth Brethren sponsored. The use of Pentecostal language, passed down from John Fletcher, to describe and define the Wesleyan doctrine of entire sanctification as the "baptism of the Holy Ghost" spread widely during the last decades of the 19th century, especially in the Keswick conferences in England and the National Holiness Association in America. And, in the early years of the 20th century, the Pentecostal movement was born in what were at first tiny revivals where Christians believed they had received the baptism of the Holy Spirit attested by the experience of speaking in an "unknown" language.

In the 20th century, therefore, revivalism has remained a dominant note in Protestant Christianity and a significant one in the Catholic religion as well. All the major evangelical movements, save the most conservative of the Calvinists, affirm a theory and practice of revivalism suited to their theological traditions and forms of ecclesiastical organization. All tend to support, most of them heartily, the continuing tradition of city-wide revival campaigns, represented by the names of Billy Sunday in the first part, and Billy Graham in the last part of the century. And all, however much they may reject the politics of social reform or the confrontation of particular social evils, affirm the power of religious awakenings to reorder a society's social and political priorities, renew devotion to the law

of the Lord, and place a revitalized Christian faith at the center of cultural life.

See REVIVAL, EVANGELISM, MISSION (MISSIONS, MISIOLOGY), SOUL WINNING, SOCIAL ETHICS.

For Further Reading: Sweet, *Revivalism in America*; Townsend, *The Supernatural Factor in Revivals*; Mal-lalieu, *The Why, When, and How of Revivals*; Finney, *Revival Lectures*; Wood, *The Burning Heart*; Orr, *The Light of the Nations*.
TIMOTHY L. SMITH

REWARDS. A reward is generally thought of as a boon, recognition, or prize given because of a specific achievement or good deed. It may also be a consequence, such as an inner feeling of well-being or an assurance of divine approval. The term usually denotes pleasing consequences, but may also be used as a synonym for punishment, as "the reward of unrighteousness" (2 Pet. 2:13; cf. Matt. 16:27; 2 Tim. 4:14; Rev. 18:6; 22:12).

There can be no doubt that both Jesus and the apostles held out the prospect of rewards as an incentive to works of righteousness (Matt. 5:12; 6:4, 6, 18; 10:41-42; 1 Cor. 3:14; 1 Tim. 5:18; 2 John 8). This fact creates two theological problems. One is the question of motive. Moral philosophy says we are to do well not for the sake of reward but to please God, or at least simply because it is right. How can any concern whatsoever for rewards be reconciled with pure love, which sings, "I will serve Thee because I love Thee"? How can the promise of rewards escape the odium of bribery?

This objection loses its weight when we remember that love itself desires appropriate response, and the Christian views rewards, not materialistically, certainly not as bribes, but as the self-giving of God himself in His own special forms of approval and blessing. What greater reward could a child of God have than to hear the Master say, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant: . . . enter thou into the joy of thy lord" (Matt. 25:21)? In his struggle on earth he is sustained by the joy of receiving what God desires to give him. Many of these recompensing blessings he will enjoy now (cf. 6:6); others are incentives from the other side. The power of incentives cannot be scorned when God himself provides them; and perhaps in providing them, God displays a truer view of human nature and of virtue itself than the moral philosopher.

The other theological problem suggested by the concept of rewards is the lurking implication of salvation by works. But nowhere is eternal life held out as a reward for good deeds; rewards are additional blessings promised to those whose

salvation is by grace through faith. Paul affirms the principle: "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt" (Rom. 4:4). The basis of reward is merit; the basis of salvation is entirely different—it is grace alone. Therefore, while "the wages of sin is death," eternal life is "the gift of God . . . through Jesus Christ our Lord" (6:23).

Divine rewards in this life are analogous to reaping (Gal. 6:7-8). They are the blessings of consequences—a clear conscience, a sense of God's smile, a sense of achievement, souls won, prayers answered. As to the nature of rewards at the judgment and in heaven we can only speculate. The distinct impression gathered from the Scripture is that sacrificial service in this life, beyond the call of duty, will have some bearing on the privileges and responsibilities bestowed upon us in the next. At any rate, the conclusion of Dawson Walker is appropriate: "The idea of reward accompanies, almost of necessity, belief in a personal God. Viewed as the apostolic writers were taught by our Lord to view it, it is the loftiest and most potent incentive to holiness of life" (HDNT).

See SOWING AND REAPING, WORK (WORKS).

For Further Reading: HDNT, 3:368; Smith, *The Biblical Doctrine of Heaven*, 171-89.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

RICHES. See MONEY.

RIGHT, RIGHTEOUSNESS. To be right is to be fair, just, straight, or equal. The word carries the concept of correct judgment or righteous acts. The word "righteousness" is applied to one who is right in character and action.

God is righteous, and thus possesses righteousness. He "is the fountain of justice so everything that He does may be relied upon as just" (*Baker's DT*, 461; cf. Gen. 18:25; Rom. 9:14). God is under obligation to do right, whether that means He saves or punishes (Isa. 42:6; 10:20-21).

Since God is righteous, He will deal with man in accordance to His character. For that reason sin must be punished. However, God has provided a way by which man may be forgiven, declared righteous, and made right in God's eyes. This is the meaning and purpose of Christ's death for all men—the righteous One dying to make righteous the sinner.

This must not be seen as a transfer on legal terms of God's righteousness to the sinner. The sinner is no longer reckoned a sinner because he has placed his faith in Christ, who is God's righteousness, and has accepted the obligation en-

tailed in such faith to act righteously. His faith is counted for righteousness (Rom. 4:5-8), because it is a turning from self-righteousness (which is always an illusion) to Christ's death as the only adequate basis for pardon and source of moral power (*Exploring Our Christian Faith*, 290-92).

Thus it can be said that a forgiven man is a righteous man in relation to God and His law, but this man "is under moral obligation to proceed from that point to be righteous in heart and life (cf. Rom. 6:12-16)." He has not been given a "non-forfeitable legal title of a standing of innocence on the basis of an objective transaction in his behalf, the benefits of which are imputed to him unconditionally" (GMS, 457).

Man's righteousness, then, is his conforming through grace to the image of God in childlike innocence and simplicity. It is a positive inclination to goodness which is more than just outward, although inward righteousness manifests itself outwardly.

See JUSTIFICATION, IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS, HOLINESS.

For Further Reading: ISBE, 4:2591-93; *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 10:37-38; *The New Westminster Dictionary of the Bible*, 805.

LEO G. COX

RIGHT HAND. This is one word in Greek, *dexios*. It means "right hand" or "right side." It indicates the place of honor. In the NT it is used for the exaltation of Jesus at the right hand of God. The "right hand" of the Father is more than the place of honor; it is delegated power and authority (Acts 2:33).

Psalm 110 is probably the OT chapter most frequently quoted in the NT. The first verse reads (NIV):

The LORD says to my Lord:
"Sit at my right hand
until I make your enemies
a footstool for your feet."

In the first line "LORD" represents the Hebrew *Yahweh*, while "Lord" represents *adon*. We interpret this as meaning here: "The Father said to the Son."

Jesus quoted this passage and applied it to the Messiah, who was both David's Son and David's Lord (Matt. 22:44; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:42). On the Day of Pentecost Peter quoted it as proof that Jesus was the Messiah (Acts 2:34-36). The writer of Hebrews does the same (Heb. 1:13). Jesus also asserted His Messiahship before the Sanhedrin by saying: "But from now on, the Son of Man will be seated at the right hand of the mighty

God" (Luke 22:69, NIV). And that is where He is today (Eph. 1:20; Col. 3:1; 1 Pet. 3:22).

See EXALTATION OF CHRIST, ASCENSION (THE), ADVOCATE, MEDIATION (MEDIATOR).

For Further Reading: Vine, ED, 3:296.

RALPH EARLE

RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD. See ATTRIBUTES, DIVINE.

RIGHTS. In and of itself, the word *right* refers to that which is correct, legal, and equitable. A derivative meaning is *a right*, i.e., a privilege which may properly be claimed. The question of "rights" thus becomes the question of personal privileges and legal claims. The question covers civil rights, property rights, domestic rights, and other categories. Problems arise from three sources: (1) a failure to understand the philosophical basis for determining a right; (2) the apparent conflict of rights; and (3) the tendency of people to claim rights which do not exist.

Problems arising from (2) and (3) can be more readily resolved if the basis for determining a right is clearly understood. The *democratic* principle is the assumption that rights are defined from below, by the people. The *constitutional* principle saves the democratic principle from anarchy by adopting a common law, in the form of a constitution and its expanding and supporting legislation, as the ground for determining individual rights—a constitution adopted by the people themselves. The *statist* principle assumes that rights are determined not from below but from above. This may be the *monarchical* form ("the divine right of kings"); the *party* form (communism); the *dictatorship* form (fascism); or the *power* form which supposes that the ability to enforce a claimed right validates the right itself (e.g., the neighborhood bully).

It is easy for theorists to declare the prior claim of the utilitarian principle, viz., that personal rights are to be determined by the highest good and happiness of the largest number of people. But this is an abstract principle which always tends to get lost in the concrete systems of power actually operating. The basic selfishness of sinful man is such that in the practical situation special interest groups as well as individuals always tend to define rights in terms of what is in their favor. This keeps the whole question of rights ambiguous, and private notions of "my rights" almost invariably warped. The results are claims—often loud and vehement—to "rights" which are purely imaginary.

The fault lies in failing to see that God is the

Source of human rights, and that God's law is the sole basis for defining them. The fundamental rights presupposed by the American constitution, for example—the "unalienable Rights [to] Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness"—were ascribed in the Declaration of Independence directly to God the Creator. History shows that the rights themselves have tended to be lost when God has been forgotten as their Source and Basis.

However, the Christian is bound to penetrate to the very core of the entire question by perceiving that only God's rights are absolute. All human rights are subordinate to His. More specifically, the central claim of fallen human nature—"my right to myself"—is itself the grand delusion. As Millard Reed says, the very essence of the carnal mind is the delusion of self-sovereignty. When one has enthroned himself as lord, he will be touchy about his rights and forever fighting for them. On the other hand, when once the Lordship of Christ is established, the question of personal rights falls back to proper size and perspective. From then on the question of rights is handled, not from the perspective of "my rights," but of their relationship to the advancement of the Kingdom.

The apostle Paul is the perfect example of what the Christian attitude toward rights should be. He was inwardly free either to use his rights or to forego them. Luke records three times that he exercised his civil rights as a Roman citizen (Acts 16:37; 22:25-29; 25:10-11). But other rights he chose not to claim in order that he "might win the more" (1 Cor. 9:1-19, NASB).

The Spirit-filled, self-crucified believer can more readily resolve the problems created by the seeming conflict of rights. Two principles will be operative here: Lesser rights will be set aside in order to realize higher rights; and personal rights will be secondary to the rights of others. At the same time the Spirit-filled Christian will more readily recognize phony "right" claims. He may at times refuse what another claims as a right because he sees it is a false claim, and harm rather than good would result from conceding it.

The distorted, often upside-down perception of rights common in today's society is a serious sickness. An exaggerated emphasis on individual and minority rights has resulted in the crippling abridgement of proprietary rights. Pupils claim not only the rights of students, but the rights of teachers and administrators. Employees claim not only the rights of employees but the rights of ownership and management. Examples could be multiplied. And in the confusion one seldom

hears a reminder that all rights carry corresponding responsibilities. Christians, at least, should endeavor to think clearly in this vexed and complex area of human life.

See CITIZENSHIP, MONEY, STEWARDSHIP, PROPERTY RIGHTS, CIVIL RIGHTS.

For Further Reading: Wiley, CT, 3:68-100.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

RITSCHLIANISM. This is a form of theological modernism as taught by Albrecht Benjamin Ritschl (1822-99). It denied Christ's deity, as all modernists have done. It denied the doctrine of original sin. Ritschl said, for one thing, on original sin that it cannot be a correct teaching, for it would have meant that all humans would have been sinful to the same degree.

After publications such as Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859) had caused many people to think that science was going to destroy the Christian faith, Ritschl tried to divorce factual and historical matters from what is "important" in Christianity, so that science could not hurt Christianity—and to affirm Christianity's importance in the realm of values and the moral life. But Christianity is rooted in the very soil of history and facticity, and orthodox Christians feel that Ritschl's divorce of facticity matters from values, and affirming only the values, was far too much of a sacrifice.

Karl Barth (1886-1968), who emphasized such facticity matters as Christ's virgin birth and His bodily resurrection, led out in a theological movement which pretty well succeeded in discounting Ritschlianism.

See LIBERALISM, DEMYTHOLOGIZATION, DARWINISM.

For Further Reading: Barth, *Protestant Theology in the 19th Century*; Fletcher, *The Moderns*.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

RITUAL. This is the conscious effort to remind ourselves of, and to exhibit to others in accurate form, the substance of our Christian faith. It seems that usually, the more simple ritual is, the more authentically it fulfills its function of symbolizing realities of our faith.

Both the OT and the NT reject ceremonialism as a substitute for a right heart relationship with God. The Lord delights not in sacrifices, but in a contrite and obedient heart (Ps. 40:6-8; 51:16-17; 1 Sam. 15:22). Outward ceremonies do not effect salvation (Acts 15:1, 24; 1 Cor. 1:14-17). Pure religion is not ritual, but participation in the grace of God (Rom 14:17). Ordinances, rites, and holy days are no substitute for a heart and life alto-

gether devoted to God (1 Cor. 7:19; Gal. 5:2, 6; Col. 2:16-17).

However, when the prophets condemned ritualism, they were not rejecting Temple worship with its sacrifices and offerings. They meant that when these are performed without a heart and life that corresponds with the religious profession, they are vain (Isa. 1:13-14; 1 Sam. 15:22). Rituals are not magical formulae to atone for sin.

The purpose of rituals, then, is to seek to embody and convey in a form other than words the true attitude and condition of the heart toward God. The performance is designed to strengthen the resolve (Acts 2:38, 41; Luke 22:19).

The NT allows few rituals: baptism and the Lord's Supper, and perhaps ordination. Circumcision was substituted by the Early Church with the rite of baptism as the NT sign of the people of God.

Jesus taught that ceremonialism is not Christianity. The forms of religion, with their rules and regulations outlined in the oral traditions of His day, are neither an excuse nor a cure for breaking the commandments of God (Mark 7:7-9). With Jesus' full approval, His followers did not observe the oral traditions, which many times violated the direct commands of God (vv. 9-13).

However, ritualistic ceremonies may manifest a righteous heart. They help fulfill all righteousness, as in the case of Jesus in Matt. 3:15. They are fitting for us, also, not as payment for our salvation, but as a testimony to it and as an aid in reverent worship.

See LITURGY (LITURGICS), WORSHIP, SACRAMENTARIANISM, REBAPTISM.

For Further Reading: "Sacraments," DCT, Wiley, CT, 3:147-52, 185; GMS, 99 ff, 179, 415 ff.

JOHN B. NIELSON

ROGERIAN COUNSELING. Carl R. Rogers is one of the best-known therapists and teachers of counseling of our day. Part of the existential school of psychology, he, along with Rollo May, Abraham Maslow, and others, believes a person's constant flow of choices, big and little, add up to a kind of life's cumulative grade point average, determining the kind of person one becomes. Rogers and the existentialists focus on one's efforts at finding fulfillment, personal identity, and meaning, all of which are interlocked.

Client-centered therapy, primarily associated with Carl Rogers, tends not to hold clients responsible for their problems. But Rogers is criticized because he provides no clear guidance for dealing with difficulties. Clearly there is a happy

medium between the directive counseling of Jay Adams and the nondirective approach of Carl Rogers.

Part of the problem with Rogerian counseling is theological. Rogers believes man is inherently good. Why, then, does one suffer corruption? The answer lies in the influence of others. Believing that, patients will, of course, engage both in self-pity and hostility. It is difficult to imagine Carl Rogers raising Karl Menninger's question, "Whatever became of sin?"

Rogers believes personality maladjustments result from failure to integrate all experiences into one's self-image. Acceptance of experiences good and bad is healthy; denial of experiences creates feelings and perceptions not consistent with one's self-image. Denial also makes "inconsistent" experiences threatening and divorces one from reality. These false (dishonest) perceptions persisted in, cause the building of defenses against reality (truth) and result in mounting tensions. Healthy personalities adjust to reality as it comes and therefore tend to perceive accurately.

Rogers' experience taught him therapy comes in a three-step process: (1) The patient begins to accept himself as he is with his feelings, sexuality, understandings, perceptions, etc.; (2) he begins to get insight about the dynamics (reasons) underlying his behavior; (3) he gets handles for a more constructive life-style—i.e., he accepts himself as he is and learns to live out that self, to be himself. That true self expressed, Rogers believes, will behave in socially acceptable ways. The Christian theologian is not so sure; regeneration and continuing works of grace have capabilities of saving people from egocentric action associated with sin.

See PERSON (PERSONALITY), PASTORAL COUNSELING, INTEGRITY THERAPY, ACCOUNTABILITY, PELAGIANISM, MATURITY.

For Further Reading: Kagan and Havemann, *Psychology: An Introduction*; Rogers, *On Becoming a Person*; Tweedie, *The Christian and the Couch*, 119-20, 151.

DONALD E. DEMARAY

ROMAN CATHOLICISM. See CATHOLICISM, ROMAN.

RULE, RULER. See KINGDOM OF GOD.

RULE OF FAITH. There are two aspects to the rule of faith (Latin, *regula fidei*): the Bible itself and summaries of its main doctrines—i.e., creeds and articles of faith.

Among Protestants, there is a general agreement that the Bible is the sole and supreme Rule of faith and conduct (2 Tim. 3:14-17). As such, the Bible marks out the territory of essential belief. Anything outside its limits cannot be imposed as an essential article of faith. Anything which contradicts it, rightly interpreted, is unorthodox and, if persisted in, is heretical.

Creeds, or confessions, are derived from the Bible. They constitute the rule of faith in a secondary sense.

Some people seize on certain expressions of Holy Writ and wrest them into a system which is contrary to the teaching of the Bible as a whole. This can be prevented or corrected by drawing up confessions of faith which summarize essential and orthodox belief as revealed in the Scriptures. For the Protestant, they derive their authority from the Bible, and are only valid as they are true expositions of its message.

We can see the beginnings of this process of forming creeds in reference to the apostles' teaching (Acts 2:42), and in such passages of Scripture as 1 Cor. 15:1-4; Eph. 4:4-6; Phil. 2:5-11; 1 Tim. 2:3-6; Titus 2:11-14; etc.

Though it cannot be historically traced back to the apostles, what is known as the Apostles' Creed is a summary of biblical doctrine. As such, it is accepted by many denominations. For theologians, the creeds of Nicea (325) and Chalcedon (451), the beginning and end of a process defining the deity and humanity of Christ and the unity of both in One Person, are a valid definition of biblical truth and, as such, a test of orthodoxy.

Although the Bible is such a vast depository of truth, there is a remarkable agreement on the basic doctrines among those churches which give it the supreme place as *the* Rule of faith.

See HERMENEUTICS, BIBLE, BIBLICAL AUTHORITY, CANON.

For Further Reading: Wiley, *CT*, 1:185-214, esp. 201-14; Pope, *A Compendium of Christian Theology*, 1:33-230.

JACK FORD

S

SABBATARIANISM. This refers to the Christian observance of the seventh day in conformity with the fourth commandment, or the transference of Sabbath observances to Sunday.

Seventh-Day Sabbatarianism. Palestinian Jewish Christians probably continued to observe the customary Sabbath to avoid unnecessary offence and as an occasion for evangelism. But during the first two centuries the church as a whole abandoned the Sabbath in favor of worship on the Lord's Day. Following the precedent of Col. 2:16 ff and Heb. 3:7—4:11, patristic writers understood the Sabbath rest not as bodily inactivity but as spiritual and perpetual abstinence from evil works for devotion to worship and/or as the awaited eschatological Sabbath.

During the third and fourth centuries the Sabbath was kept by many Christians as a memorial of creation. Significantly, however, this Christian observance was *not* marked by not working. After the fifth century the practice once again disappeared—only to be revived in modern times by Seventh-Day Adventists and others.

Sunday Sabbatarianism. The disappearance of seventh-day Sabbatarianism was perhaps a consequence of Constantine's decree (A.D. 321) making Sunday the official Roman day of rest and the resulting tendency to regard it as "the Christian Sabbath." Until Constantine it was not possible for many Christians, because of their low socioeconomic status, to treat Sunday as a day of rest, had they desired to do so. Subsequently the unexpectedly successful state church, newly responsible for the moral life of the entire empire, reacted to the abuses of Sunday idleness by applying the fourth commandment to Sunday. Sabbatarianism was an important feature of medieval Catholic theory, if not practice, against which many early Reformers protested.

The most striking development of Sabbatarianism occurred in late 16th-century English Puritanism, originally as a reaction more to the drunkenness and sordid amusements which Sunday holidays occasioned among the lower and middle classes, than to Sunday labor. Eventually nearly all the OT Sabbath regulations were applied to Sunday. This is the background of

American expressions of Sabbatarianism, such as the so-called blue laws.

Implications. It is a fact that of the Ten Commandments only the 4th, "Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy" (Exod. 20:8; cf. Deut. 5:12), is not repeated in the NT. In view of the occasional nature of much of the NT literature, its omission may be entirely coincidental however (cf. Rom. 13:9 which specifically cites the last five commandments and "any other commandment").

Despite Jesus' clear rejection of Pharisaic casuistry as applied to the Sabbath, He customarily participated in the weekly synagogue worship assembly (cf. Luke 4:16-27) and used the traditional cessation of ordinary labors afforded, not for inactivity but to act mercifully in behalf of needy men (Mark 1:29-31; 3:1-6; Luke 13:10-17; 14:1-6; John 5:2-18; 9:1-41).

Paul specifically rejects the Judaizing observance of the sabbath (Gal. 4:9-11; Col. 2:16-17), for every day for the Christian is the Lord's although one day may be observed in preference to the others (Rom. 14:5-6). The widely shared view that Christianity fulfilled Judaism by no means led early Christians to diminish the importance of regular community worship (cf. Heb. 10:19-25, esp. 25) or the sanctity of the Lord's day, but instead led them to sanctify every day.

This offers no support for legalistic or rigidly scrupulous expressions of Christian Sabbatarianism, but neither does it endorse the all-too-easy modern disregard for regular worship in favor of self-indulging leisure. At issue in the modern setting is not only the respect due the Lord's day, but the proper utilization of the increasing hours of leisure which are also the Lord's. On these issues Paul advises, "Let every one be fully convinced in his own mind," and, "Happy is he who has no reason to judge himself for what he approves" (Rom. 14:5, 22, RSV).

See LORD'S DAY, REST (REST OF FAITH), LAW.

For Further Reading: Breward, "Sabbatarianism," *NIDCC*, 869 f; Corlett, *The Christian Sabbath*; Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 442-50; IDB, 3:151 ff; Rordorf, *Sunday: The History of the Day of Rest and Worship in the Earliest*

Centuries of the Christian Church; Beckwith and Scott, *This Is the Day*; Wiley, CT, 3:143-50; GMS, 542.

GEORGE LYONS

SABBATH. See LORD'S DAY.

SABELLIANISM. This is the anti-Trinitarian teaching of the ancient Sabellius, that the Father, Son, and Spirit do not exist at the same time as three Persons in one nature (as in Trinitarianism), but as three successive ways in which the uni-personal God has manifested himself historically: first as Father, then as the Son, then as the Holy Spirit. The view is called Modalism because the three are not persons, but three successive modes or fashions in which the uni-personal God has manifested himself. It is called Monarchianism when the stress is upon the oneness in God which this antithreeness view of God makes possible.

See UNITARIANISM, TRINITY (THE HOLY), ECONOMIC TRINITY.

For Further Reading: Tertullian, *Against Praxeas*; Lowry, *The Trinity and Christian Devotion*; Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*. J. KENNETH GRIDER

SACRAMENTARIANISM. This is the attachment of exaggerated importance to the sacraments. It is the tendency to link personal salvation too rigidly to the correct performance of approved sacramental rituals. The sacraments in general are seen as the primary if not sole means by which grace is mediated and received. An accentuation of the sacramentarian viewpoint can be seen in the inflexible insistence of some groups that there can be no salvation apart from immersion in water; a variation is the observance of the Lord's Supper in every worship service, or at least on every Lord's day. Some Lutherans rely on the Lord's Supper as the periodic absolution from sin; to withhold the Lord's Supper is to withhold forgiveness. In these and other ways the sacraments are thus elevated to the level of spiritual mechanics, and become a revival of Judaism within a Christian context.

See SACRAMENTS, BAPTISM, HOLY COMMUNION, BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

For Further Reading: Wiley, CT, 2:413 ff; 3:157; Curtis, *The Christian Faith*, 425-33. RICHARD S. TAYLOR

SACRAMENTS. Our word *sacrament* comes from the Latin *sacramentum*, originally applied to money deposited in a sacred place by parties involved in court proceedings. It was regarded as a pledge that the participants considered their cause good and just. It came also to signify the

Roman soldier's oath of fidelity. Early Latin church fathers used the term to translate the Greek *mysterion*, "mystery": something eminently and especially sacred. So it is the word has come to signify a sacred ordinance or rite in which the Christian believer receives blessing from God and deliberately binds himself in covenant to Him. Theologically, the term "signifies an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof" (Wiley, CT, 3:155).

The Roman and Greek Catholic churches observe seven sacraments: baptism, the Lord's Supper, confirmation, penance, extreme unction, ordination, and matrimony. These sacraments, it is held, actually contain the grace they signify, and when properly administered by the priest convey grace to the soul of every person who, without mortal sin, receives them.

At the opposite pole from this belief in the inherent virtue of the sacraments themselves is the Socinian view that the sacraments do not differ from any other religious rite or ceremony. Their only use, it is said, is to incite pious sentiments and give the believer an opportunity to testify to his faith.

Protestant doctrine generally recognizes two sacraments: baptism and the Lord's Supper. Only these are observed because only they were instituted by Christ (Matt. 28:19; 26:26-27). Also, it is believed by some that these two have their origins in the OT rites of circumcision and the Passover. The first, a sacrament of the covenant of grace symbolizing the cutting away of sin, was replaced in the NT by baptism. The latter, symbolizing the deliverance of God's people, was replaced by the Lord's Supper.

Saving grace does not come through observing the sacraments. That is received only through personal faith in Jesus Christ; but the sacraments are a source of divine blessing. "To everyone who receives the sign a seal and pledge of the invisible grace is also given; and everyone who draws near with a true heart and with full assurance of faith does, in his own person, enter into God's covenant" (Wakefield, *Christian Theology*, 556).

Some Protestant groups do not participate in either of the sacraments. The Quakers, or Friends, and the Salvation Army are examples. The Quakers in particular hold that the visible rites and symbols distract from what the Spirit of God really wants to do for the believer.

See SACRAMENTS (QUAKER AND S.A. VIEWS), SACRAMENTARIANISM, BAPTISM, HOLY COMMUNION.

For Further Reading: Wiley, CT, 3:155-74; Purkiser, ed., *Exploring Our Christian Faith*, 409-15; Demaray, *Basic Beliefs*, 113-30.

ARMOR D. PEISKER

SACRAMENTS: QUAKER AND SALVATION ARMY VIEWS. The Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) and The Salvation Army are unique in Christendom because of their outward non-observance of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper.

At the ideological level, the sacramental understanding of Quakers and Salvationists is largely structured by four factors: First, the philosophical framework of the Quaker and Salvationist interpretation is a sacramental world view. Because they "take so seriously the idea that ours is a sacramental universe . . . they cannot limit the notion to a particular ceremony" (Trueblood, *The People Called Quakers*, 138; cf. *The Sacraments: the Salvationist's Viewpoint*, 78).

Second, inseparable from this sacramental world view is the theological focus that since Jesus came to replace shadow with substance, as the writer to the Hebrews emphasizes, why would He then institute two more ceremonies which point to spiritual reality?

These two factors are crucial, for without an awareness of them the Quaker and Salvationist viewpoints are incomprehensible.

Third, the philosophical framework and theological focus interact within a biblical perspective called "the prophetic tradition." In contrast to the "priestly" emphasis on ritual in the worship of God, the prophets insisted "that an inward life of conformity to the mind of God was the only condition on which His will could find expression in the outward life" (*The Sacraments: the Salvationist's Viewpoint*, 74). This tradition, however, does not necessarily negate ceremonies. Rather, it provides a corrective to at least two dangers inherent in ceremonial: "To think that unless the sign is there, God's Spirit will not be there . . . [and] to think that if the sign is there my spirit need not be there" (William Metcalf, *The Salvationist and the Sacraments*, 30). Thus, as those who identify themselves with the prophetic tradition, both Quakers and Salvationists confess that God's grace may be received apart from as well as in conjunction with the sacraments. Hence, they do not criticize those who meaningfully observe the sacraments.

Fourth, Quakers and Salvationists believe that the effect of the three preceding factors makes room for a valid hermeneutical approach which enables them adequately to account for and interpret the obvious presence of baptism and the

Lord's Supper in many of the NT documents. This approach involves the concept of progressive revelation: Not only is there in the NT itself a development away from and beyond the ceremonial emphasis in the OT, there is within the NT itself an apparent movement away from and beyond sacramental emphases. This may be seen in the increasing silence concerning baptism and Communion in the chronologically later writings of the NT. When baptism and the Lord's Supper are viewed within the broader, progressively revelatory context of Scripture, Quakers and Salvationists believe that we cannot say that they are necessary for salvation and/or a maturing Christian experience, nor can we substantiate that Jesus instituted them as binding and perpetual observances in the Church.

As a result of this understanding of the sacraments, Quakers and Salvationists affirm that their attitude toward baptism and the Lord's Supper is positive rather than negative. This is because both movements witness to the fact that apart from the outward observance of the sacraments we may experience the realities to which they point: the baptism with the Holy Spirit and continual communion with the indwelling Christ. In this way they seek to observe the sacraments existentially, at their deepest level, rather than ceremonially.

See SACRAMENTS, SACRAMENTARIANISM.

For Further Reading: Booth, *Echoes and Memories*, 201-10; Brown, *Sacraments: A Quaker View*; McKinley, "Quaker Influence on the Early Salvation Army: An Essay in Practical Theology," *Heritage of Holiness*, 47-55; Trueblood, *Robert Barclay*, 215-30.

JOHN G. MERRITT

SACRIFICE. "Sacrifice" is a translation of a Hebrew noun (*zebah*) meaning literally "slaughter" and referring to the killing of a domestic animal as an offering to the Deity. A sacrifice may function in two ways: as a gift to God or as an atonement in overcoming estrangement between man and God. Since the OT gives no rationale for sacrifice as atonement, one must decide how it functions on the basis of theological analysis. There are two options: (1) propitiation, in which the sacrifice appeases the Deity and changes His attitude toward man; (2) expiation, in which the offerer's sin is removed so that he is "qualified" to stand in God's presence.

Pagan sacrifices are merely propitiatory in nature and thus do not necessarily call for an ethical response on the part of the worshipper. By contrast, the preexilic prophets constantly rebuke Israel for a lack of ethical responsibility. In fact,

they condemn the sacrificial system so severely, even in some instances seeming to question its place in the divine order (cf. Amos 5:21-25; Jer. 7:21 ff), that many scholars have felt that they were against sacrifices *per se*. However, a more adequate interpretation suggests that they were actually condemning its misuse, that is, practicing it as propitiation as defined above rather than as expiation.

Since the term "propitiation" has traditionally been included in atonement vocabulary, most Wesleyan theologians retain it by redefining it so as to include expiation as still the primary element. This is done in terms of the holiness of God which is seen as love's opposition to sin and experienced by the sinner as wrath. His holiness stands as a barrier to a divine-human relationship, since love cannot abide the presence of sin. When the sin of man is removed, he then finds acceptance by God and, in his experience of being reconciled to God, senses that God is reconciled to Him. The removal of sin "satisfied" the holiness of God in this sense, and to that "satisfaction" the term "propitiation" is applied; but its meaning is radically altered from the pagan concept of changing God's mind by an offering. As H. Orton Wiley states it, quoting W. B. Pope, "Strictly speaking the atoning sacrifice declares a propitiation already in the divine heart" (Wiley, *CT*, 2:287).

The NT applies the symbol of sacrifice to the death of Christ. Hebrews stresses the inadequacy of the OT system to "really take away sins" (10:4, TLB), that is, to change the worshipper. It provided for a justification in which the worshipper is forensically declared righteous (a relative change) but not for sanctification (a real change). In contrast, the sacrifice of Christ "made perfect forever those who are being made holy" (v. 14, NIV). The death of Christ was not a sacrifice which appeased God or changed His attitude toward man; rather, it was the act of God in Christ reconciling the world to himself.

See GOD, ATONEMENT, OFFER (OFFERING), SATISFACTION, DAY OF ATONEMENT, EXPIATION, PROPITIATION, SIN OFFERING.

For Further Reading: Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*; "Sacrifice," *Theological Word Book of the Bible*, ed. Richardson.

H. RAY DUNNING

SACRIFICIAL LAMB. See LAMB, SACRIFICIAL.

SADDUCEES. This group of Jews constituted one of the three leading religious sects of Palestine preceding and during the life of Christ. Their name may have been derived from Zadok, the

progenitor of the high-priestly line under King Solomon (1 Kings 1:32, 34, 38, 45). Ezekiel refers to the chief priests as "sons of Zakok" (Ezek. 40:46; 44:15 ff). On the other hand, their name may be a Hebraization of the Greek word *syn-dikoi* ("syndics"—"members of the council"), a term which may go back to the Hasmonaeans, of which the Sadducees were councilors. However, the Sadducees gave the impression that their title derives from the Hebrew *saddiqim*, which means "righteous ones."

During the postexilic period, these men, who came from the upper levels of society, controlled the life of the Jews through religious sanctions.

The views of the Sadducees may be summarized as follows: (1) They accepted only the written law, the Torah, and rejected the oral tradition which grew up around it and which was accepted by the Pharisees. They were very literal in their interpretation of the Torah. (2) They were antisupernaturalists to the extent of denying the existence of angels and the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. (3) They insisted on a very formal style of worship, a natural consequence of their control of the Temple.

History has not been too kind to the Sadducees, in that it has perpetuated the idea that they were very this-worldly and were materialistic in their outlook. Being the ruling party in their time in a small country whose existence, at the best, was tenuous, they tended to act according to expediency with respect to matters of culture and politics. They have been accused of capitulating easily to the Romans and to the Greek culture, much to the dismay of the rank and file Jews. The attitude of the Qumran community toward the Temple practices and the priesthood in Jerusalem is a clear witness to this fact. The Pharisees constituted the part of the people and for that reason were constantly at odds with the Sadducees.

With the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 the Sadducees disappeared from the life of the Jews.

See PHARISEES.

For Further Reading: Bruce, *New Testament History*, 69-81; Lohse, *The New Testament Environment*, 74-77; Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 222-32.

WILLARD H. TAYLOR

SAINT, SAINTLINESS. A saint (Latin *sanctus*) is a holy and eminently godly person. However, believers are customarily called "saints" (*hagioi*) in the NT (some 55 times), even when yet carnal (1 Cor. 6:2; 14:33; 16:1, 15). Such positional sanctity is expected to become true saintliness in life and character (1:2, NIV).

Beyond this religious and/or biblical use there is the formal, official practice of the Roman Catholic church of the beatification and canonization of specially chosen people. More than 100 days of the year are dedicated to some saint. There is also the diverse, rather loose, usage of the term *saint* in naming people, places, events, or even birds and beasts.

One net result of all of this is the obscuring of the true biblical meaning and the avoidance of its serious use lest one be regarded as spiritually proud.

Nevertheless, biblical basics remain. (1) Man is hopelessly lost and away from God, sinful in act and disposition. (2) God, by His redeeming grace in Christ and the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, can deliver man from all sin and make him a saint fit for heaven. "This sainthood is not an attainment, it is a state into which God in grace calls men" (Vine, *ED*, 2:226; cf. Eph. 5:25-27).

The order of salvation by which God makes saints is conviction (convincing people of their sinfulness), conversion (initial sanctification), progressive sanctification, entire sanctification (the baptism with the Holy Spirit), further progressive sanctification, glorification. In this saint-making process there are both continuity and crisis, both human and divine elements; but the origin and adequacy are all of God.

See HOLINESS, CHRISTIAN PERFECTION, CHRISTLIKENESS, SANCTIFICATION.

For Further Reading: Wiley, *CT*, 3:7-67; GMS, 462-507; Sangster, *The Pure in Heart*.

JOHN E. RILEY

SALT. Crystallized rock salt was valued as a seasoning and food preservative by all ancient people. In earliest times the Hebrews obtained salt from the Salt Sea (Gen. 14:3), and particularly from the hill of salt at the southwestern corner, an area associated with the fate of Lot's wife, who, looking back at Sodom, turned into a pillar of salt (19:26).

Highly valued, salt became a symbol of fidelity and constancy, and was used in salt agreements—covenants between man and man and between God and man (Num. 18:19; 2 Chron. 13:5). In the Levitical cereal (grain) offering salt was the key preservative, symbolizing God's faithfulness and man's constancy (Lev. 2:13).

While usually a symbol for that which was held in esteem, occasionally salt suggested the result of destruction, the wasteland, the desert (Deut. 29:23; Job 39:6; Jer. 17:6). Abimelech sprinkled salt on Shechem after his destruction

of the city, thereby symbolizing its perpetual desolation (Judg. 9:45).

Jesus spoke of His disciples as "the salt of the earth," referring to their seasoning and preserving qualities (Matt. 5:13). He did note that when they lose those spiritual qualities, they become insipid and worthless (Luke 14:34-35).

Paul urged that the Christian's speech be "seasoned with salt," a metaphor meaning gracious wholesomeness (Col. 4:6). Salt is also a symbol of Christian peace and unity (Mark 9:50).

See LIGHT, LEAVEN.

For Further Reading: *NBD*, 1125. BERT H. HALL

SALVATION. Deeply embedded in the record of the OT is the Exodus from Egypt. The vocabulary of salvation harks back to this birthday of the nation of Israel. Israel saw itself as having been saved from bondage to foreigners and given civil and religious freedom to worship Yahweh their God, and henceforth attributed their deliverance to their miracle-working Deity. Gradually this concept acquired a more spiritual and personal meaning of deliverance from sin and/or sickness. This is especially evident in Psalms and Isaiah. Most of the occurrences of the term "salvation" occur in these two OT books. The concept came into prominence during the Exile when once again God was asked to save them from their Assyrian and Babylonian captors and restore them to their homeland. Accordingly the connotation given the term "salvation" is best determined by its immediate context.

The idea of salvation is often presented under different terminology. Thus, in Ezekiel the sinner will "live" if he repents (chap. 18). In the Psalms the trend is from the national and corporate to the personal and individual. The deliverance sought in the Psalms is from enemies (7:1), from disease (6:2-4), from bloodguiltiness (51:14), and from sin (38:8; 79:9).

It is in the Epistles that the concept of salvation acquires its most specific Christian expression. As stated in Romans, all have sinned, whether Jew or Gentile, and hence all need salvation from sin (1:18—3:18). Mankind is "dead in trespasses and sin" (Eph. 2:1) and therefore is powerless to save itself by good works or attempts to keep the Mosaic law. The law itself is not the means of salvation; it simply exposes the sin; hence the need for salvation only through Christ.

Salvation comes only through Jesus Christ who offers His own sinless life as a substitute for the guilty. He died that believers may live eternally. This idea of a sinner, treated as though he had never sinned because his guilt is borne by

the Son of God himself, is the central and most distinctive feature of the Christian religion.

Thus salvation from personal sin involves the removal of guilt and also the sentence of death. Positively it bestows the new status of adoption or sonship, and hence of "joint-heirs with Christ" (Rom. 8:17; cf. 1 Pet. 3:7). It may be experienced immediately when one believes. It is also a continuing process as one grows in grace and in the knowledge of Christ (2 Pet. 1:3-11). Finally, salvation occurs when one receives the commendation following the Last Judgment, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; . . . enter thou into the joy of thy lord" (Matt. 25:21). The climax of the salvation theme, and of the Bible itself, is found in Rev. 21:3—"Behold, the dwelling of God is with men. He will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself will be with them" (RSV); God and man in at-one-ment.

During the intertestamental period the idea of a future judgment became increasingly prominent as the doctrine of a general resurrection was stressed by the Pharisees. Such was the situation when John the Baptist began to call people to repentance to escape the "wrath to come," the "day of wrath"—not as catastrophe to the nation, as in the prophets (Zeph. 1:14-16), but rather a day of general judgment on all mankind to determine their destiny (cf. Matt. 3:6-12; 12:41-42). Salvation of the individual and of the nation was linked with increasing emphasis on the individual (cf. 12:36; 25:31-46). Repentance, as the condition for salvation, stressed first in the prophets (Amos 4:11-12; Isa. 1:16-18), addressed to the nation, became more personal in the exilic and postexilic periods (Ezek. 18:5-24), and received its most emphatic expression in John the Baptist.

In the period of Jesus' ministry, salvation of the lost was focused on such villages as Capernaum and Chorazin (Matt. 11:20-24). They failed to receive Jesus' message and repent. By contrast the Samaritans did receive the gospel (John 4:39-42) with great joy (Acts 8:5, 8, 25).

Increasingly the emphasis was on individual repentance, faith, and salvation from sin in this life. In the Fourth Gospel salvation is equated with eternal life, a spiritual life, given by God, and experienced now, and not limited to an extension of this life in heaven. Salvation here is a quality of life, not simply an extension of life (John 5:21-29).

In addition to the salvation of the soul is the resurrection of the body into a new level of personal existence (1 Cor. 15:21-28). Paul speaks of the "redemption of our body" in connection with "adoption" as sons (Rom. 8:23).

Salvation also involves all of creation in a manner not specifically indicated—"the creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay" (v. 21, NIV) and ultimately there will be "new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells" (2 Pet. 3:13, RSV). Accordingly, "every knee [shall] bow . . . and . . . every tongue . . . confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father" (Phil. 2:10-11).

See REDEEMER (REDEMPTION), CONVERSION, SANCTIFICATION, RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

For Further Reading: Stevens, *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*; Denney, *The Death of Christ*; Cullmann, *Salvation in History*. GEORGE ALLEN TURNER

SANCTIFICATION. This is the English translation of the Greek *hagiasmos* (10 times in the NT; noun form of *hagiazō*, "sanctify," 29 times; adjective *hagios*, "holy," 229 times). The OT equivalent, *qadosh* (830 times in various grammatical forms), is often translated "holiness."

The English terms "sanctification" and "holiness" mean the same in derivation and translate the same Hebrew and Greek terms ("sanctification" from the Latin root *sanctus*, "holy"; "holiness," from the Anglo-Saxon root *halig*, "holy"); but sanctification is popularly used to describe the act or process whereby a state of holiness is realized.

The OT *qadosh* includes ideas of radiance, separation, and purity. The NT *hagiazō* is characteristically defined as separated, consecrated and/or purified, made free from sin.

Biblical theologians characteristically note two basic elements in sanctification in both OT and NT but related in different proportions.

In the OT, the idea of separation or consecration is predominant. Sanctification is separation from the profane and unholy and devotion to God, and thus may be used of things—days, mountains, altars, cities, priestly vestments, the priesthood, the nation, an army. But even in the OT, when used of persons, the idea of cleansing or purity is present and becomes increasingly so in the prophetic writings. The nature of God is seen to be reflected in what human beings ought to be who are separated or consecrated to Him (Isa. 6:1-8; Lev. 19:2; cf. 1 Pet. 1:15-16).

In the NT, the idea of moral purity is predominant, although concepts of ritual purity and consecration are not absent (cf. Matt. 23:17-19; 1 Cor. 7:14).

Theologically, sanctification "means to make clean or holy in the ethical sense, though the idea of consecration is not necessarily lacking" (Rall, *ISBE*, 4:2683, II, 3). It is the total act or process by

which inner renewal takes place in the justified. Justification may be said to be "Christ for us with the Father"; sanctification is "Christ in us by the Spirit."

As such, technically speaking, sanctification begins in regeneration which may properly be called initial sanctification.

The Wesleyan concept of entire sanctification (1 Thess. 5:23-24) is especially related to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit (Rom. 15:16; 2 Thess. 2:13; 1 Pet. 1:2). While the Holy Spirit is vitally active at every stage of the believer's experience, there is frequent reference to an infilling of the Spirit after conversion (John 14:15-17; Acts 2:1-4; 8:4-8, 14-17; 15:8-9; Eph. 5:18; Gal. 3:14); and Acts frequently distinguishes believers as "filled with the Spirit" from those who as yet lack this full grace (Acts 4:8; 6:2-6; 13:9; etc.).

The essential condition for entire sanctification is faith (Acts 15:8-9; 26:18), but a faith the prerequisite of which is an act of consecration or self-surrender such as only a Christian can make (Rom. 6:13, 19; 12:1-2; 1 Thess. 4:3-8). The NT stresses the requirement that what was potential in the Atonement become actual in the believer (Rom. 6:1-14; 8:1-11; Heb. 12:14-17; 13:11-14).

In the Epistles, entire sanctification as a subsequent work of grace shows up most explicitly in 1 Thessalonians (3:9—4:8; 5:22-24 in relation to 1:2—2:20). It must be remembered that the NT Epistles were written within the context of faith, as *didachē* or instruction for believers and are not addressed to unconverted persons as such. Their frequent exhortations to sanctify must therefore be applied to believers primarily.

A succinct modern formulation of the doctrine of entire sanctification is found in Article 10, "Articles of Faith," *Constitution of the Church of the Nazarene*:

We believe that entire sanctification is that act of God, subsequent to regeneration, by which believers are made free from original sin, or depravity, and brought into a state of entire devotion to God, and the holy obedience of love made perfect.

It is wrought by the baptism with the Holy Spirit, and comprehends in one experience the cleansing of the heart from sin and the abiding indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit, empowering the believer for life and service.

Entire sanctification is provided by the blood of Jesus, is wrought instantaneously by faith, preceded by entire consecration; and to this work and state of grace the Holy Spirit bears witness.

This experience is also known by various terms representing its different phases, such as "Christian perfection," "perfect love," "heart purity," "the

baptism with the Holy Spirit," "the fullness of the blessing," and "Christian holiness."

See ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION, SECOND WORK OF GRACE, HOLINESS, PROGRESSIVE SANCTIFICATION, PURITY AND MATURITY, SERVICE, MORAL ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

For Further Reading: Lindstrom, *Wesley and Sanctification*; Purkiser, *Sanctification and Its Synonyms*; Steele, *The Gospel of the Comforter*; Taylor, *Life in the Spirit*; Turner, *The Vision Which Transforms*; Wesley, *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection*. W. T. PURKISER

SANCTIFICATION, PROGRESSIVE. See

PROGRESSIVE SANCTIFICATION.

SANCTITY OF THE BODY. There have been two major attitudes toward the body on the part of the human race: embarrassment, because it is viewed as evil or shameful; or idolatrous, because it is viewed as the ultimate good or reality. The latter, in the various forms of the body-cult, is the contemporary mood. The body becomes, not an instrument for serving God, but an end in itself. The perspective of 1 Tim. 4:8 is lost.

Frank G. Carver wrote: "There are several ways a person may regard his body. He may pamper and idolize it. He may regard it with disgust or shame. He may use it like a machine to produce work. He may use it as a weapon to gain power. He may dedicate it to carnal pleasures and use it as an instrument of vice. Or with Paul, he may look upon it as a temple" (BBC, 8:369). The apostle Paul shows (in 1 Cor. 6:15 ff) that the believer's body is sacred in a way even more special than for the rest of mankind, because it is the means by which his mystical union with Christ is evidenced.

The Judeo-Christian view is not that the body is an evil enemy, to be put off as soon as possible, but a holy constituent of man as divinely created. The dualism of body and spirit is also a unity, to be reestablished by the resurrection. As Wiley put it, "Christianity regards the body not as a prison house of the soul, but as a temple of the Holy Spirit" (CT, 3:47).

According to Wiley, the Christian care of the body includes exercise, rest, and recreation; the subjugation of the appetites to man's higher intellectual and spiritual interests; proper clothing, not only for protection and comfort but for propriety and decency. Above all, the body must be preserved holy, as an instrument of the Holy Spirit rather than an instrument of sin. "Holiness destroys nothing that is essential to man, either physically or spiritually. The appetites and passions remain, but they are freed from the incubus of sin" (ibid., 49). And Richard Taylor adds:

"Christian discipline never despises earthly blessings but consecrates them to spiritual ends" (*The Disciplined Life*, 42).

The sanctity of the body is a matter of holy conviction with the Spirit-filled Christian. A wholesome and healthy body is as much a part of his or her divine calling as devotional exercise. He or she will follow Paul in ruling the body rather than in being ruled by it (1 Cor. 9:27). The Christian will not permit it to become an instrument of pride or incitation to lust, but will keep it consecrated always to God as a living sacrifice (Rom. 12:1).

See BODY, CONSECRATION, STEWARDSHIP.

For Further Reading: Wiley, CT, 3:47-51; Taylor, *The Disciplined Life*.
NEIL E. HIGHTOWER

SARX. See FLESH.

SATAN. The term "Satan" comes from *Satanas* and is used over 50 times in the Bible. It identifies the one who is man's chief adversary, accuser, and deceiver, which is the meaning of the term. Satan is also the source of slander and the destroyer of peace, which is why he is called the devil (*Diabolus*), the one who hurls himself against God and man in defiance and prideful rebellion.

Because Satan is the devil, he is also cited in Scripture as being Belial, low and unworthy (2 Cor. 6:15), Beelzebub, the prince of demons (Matt. 12:24), Apollyon, the destroyer (Rev. 9:11), the serpent and dragon (12:7-17), the wicked one (Matt. 13:9), and the enemy of God and man (vv. 25, 28).

That the devil is a personal being is supported by three lines of evidence: First, the Bible describes Satan as having personal attributes (2 Cor. 2:11; Matt. 25:41). Second, the theological teaching about sin is that it began as personal revolt against God, an attempt to set up an autonomous existence (John 8:44; 1 Tim. 3:6). And third, God's people are often keenly and painfully aware of personal opposition in doing God's service (1 Thess. 2:18).

Because Satan's power is large (Matt. 4:8-9; Luke 13:11, 16; Rev. 2:10), albeit limited (Luke 22:31; Jas. 4:7; Jude 9), he is referred to by Christ as being "the prince of this world" (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11). These references, along with others, provide insight as to Satan's purposes. He seeks to dominate (Isa. 14:12-14), to deceive (Matt. 4:5, 7), to incite disobedience against God (Eph. 2:2), and to destroy God's people and God's kingdom (Eph. 6:10-18).

In attempting to accomplish his purposes as

world ruler, Satan seeks to blind the eyes of the unsaved to the gospel (2 Cor. 4:3-4), to snatch the work of God from people's hearts before it can take root (Matt. 13:19), to encourage disobedience (Eph. 2:2), and to make people subservient to his power (1 John 5:19).

To be victorious in the war against Satan, it is important to realize the nature and methods of Satan's attacks. The Christian must be sober, vigilant (1 Pet. 5:8), humble (Jas. 4:6-7), strong in the Lord (Eph. 6:10), prepared for hard trials (1 Cor. 10:13), and aware of Satan's methods (2 Cor. 2:11).

The judgment of Satan has already begun, and his final punishment is certain. Christ came to destroy Satan's work (1 John 3:8). He began by exposing the devil's lies (John 8:44; Matt. 4:1-11). He continued by expelling Satan's dominion (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11). The climax of Satan's defeat will come when he and his angels are cast into the lake of fire (Matt. 25:41; Rev. 20:2, 10). Thus the Christian is assured of victory over all the power of Satan (Luke 10:19).

See SATAN WORSHIP, DEMONS (DEMON POSSESSION), EXORCISM, SPIRITUAL WARFARE.

For Further Reading: Wiley, CT, 2:74-81; Herbert Lockyer, *All the Doctrines of the Bible*, 132-39.

ELDON R. FUHRMAN

SATAN WORSHIP. The biblical terms "devil" or "Satan" describe the source of the evil which entraps humanity. The name "Satan" came from postexilic Hebrew history, but the concept appeared earlier, e.g., as the Genesis serpent (cf. Babylonian "leviathan" and Native American "trickster"—usually a coyote or a bear).

Satan appears in the OT as accuser and adversary who disrupts the divine-human covenant (see Job and Zechariah). Possessing power, Satan nonetheless is subject to God.

In the NT Satan's kingdom of evil contrasts with Christ's kingdom of light. The triumph of Christ over Satan is a central theme of the Revelation.

Satan worship utilizes all modes of knowing, thus depraving sense, reason, and intuition. It is overtly present in ritual and covertly present in idolatry.

Ritualization occurs in the Church of Satan, founded by its high priest, Anton La Vey, who also wrote the *Satanic Bible* (1969). Rituals may include sexual exploitation and human sacrifice. Occult practices are extracted from ancient religions such as Druidism.

Idolatry occurs more subtly, within the powers which shape human society. As indicated by

Jesus' wilderness experience, satanic temptation to turn commerce, governance, and religion into ends rather than means lies at the root of false worship. Satan's messengers masquerade as angels of light (see 2 Cor. 11:13-15). "Culture religion" is a term used to describe modern idolatry.

The Church overcomes evil by the blood of Christ and the word of testimony (Rev. 12:11). Christian holiness affirms this triumph.

See SATAN, DEMONS (DEMON POSSESSION), SIN (ORIGIN OF).

For Further Reading: Eliade, *Occultism, Witchcraft, and Cultural Fashions*; HDNT, 2:569 ff.

ARTHUR O. ROBERTS

SATISFACTION. This word appears in only two places in the KJV and translates the Hebrew *kopher* which means "a price paid as compensation" (Num. 35:31-32). Other versions employ the word "ransom" in these verses, but even so the concept of atonement is incipient in these instances. The term "satisfaction" is not used in the NT, but the idea surfaces in passages which speak of Christ's death as satisfying some divine and human necessities (cf. Rom. 6:23; 2 Cor. 5:14-15, 21; Gal. 3:13; Titus 2:14; 1 Pet 2:24).

In the history of the Christian church "satisfaction" became a significant theological term expressing some of the deep meanings of the work of Christ. Until the Middle Ages the term was related to repentance. Tertullian in the second century wrote that God as Judge demands justice of His creatures, and this demand can only be met by repentance. The practice of repentance in subsequent centuries became formalized in penance as a sacrament and in expected religious deeds, which fulfilled the satisfaction due to God.

It was Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109) who tied the word to soteriology, especially the doctrine of the Atonement. He published his classic study *Cur Deus Homo*, in which he rejected the long-held ransom theory and set forth the view that the death of Christ was a satisfaction rendered to God's justice and honor. This was the first scientific statement of atonement ideas implicit in teachings of the church fathers. Wiley summarizes Anselm's theory as follows: "Sin violates the divine honor, and deserves infinite punishment since God is infinite. Sin is guilt or a debt, and under the government of God, this debt must be paid. This necessity is grounded in the infinite perfections of God. . . . Man cannot pay this debt, for he is not only finite, but morally bankrupt through sin. Adequate satisfaction being impossible from a being so inferior to God

as man is, the Son of God became man in order to pay the debt for us. Being divine, He could pay the infinite debt; and being both human and sinless, could properly represent man. But as sinless He was not obligated to die, and owing no debt on His own account, He received as a reward of His merit, the forgiveness of our sins" (Wiley, *CT*, 2:235-36).

Anselm's theory was amplified by Aquinas (1225-74) and became normative for Catholic theology and influential in Protestant thought. However, the major change occurred in Protestant atonement theory when the Reformers invested the idea of satisfaction with the meaning of substitution instead of merit. The satisfaction of the divine justice was effected by Christ bearing the punishment due mankind. This penal satisfaction theory has held the field in the Reformed tradition. Its major weakness rests in the doubtful assertion that Christ who is sinless can really bear our penalty.

Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) advanced the governmental theory which acknowledges the need for satisfaction but limited it to the maintenance of the government of God throughout the universe. The sufferings of Christ are substituted for our rightful punishment, and God's acceptance of them is the point of satisfaction. As a result, the dignity of the divine government is effectively upheld and vindicated just as if we had received the punishment deserved.

Liberal views of the Atonement, such as Abelard's moral influence theory, give little attention to the issue of satisfaction and substitution and focus on the saving impact of the demonstration of divine love in the death of Christ.

Finally, the satisfaction aspect of atonement theory takes seriously the exploration of the meaning of the NT's consistent declaration that Christ died for us.

See ATONEMENT, ATONEMENT (THEORIES OF), PROPITIATION, VICARIOUS.

For Further Reading: Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*; Bromiley, *Historical Theology; An Introduction*, 177-80; Wiley, *CT*, 2:270-302.

WILLARD H. TAYLOR

SAVIOR. The One who saves from sin and who is the Source of salvation. Salvation implies the existence of a Savior.

God is a God of salvation; this is the message of both Jewish and Christian faith. He has saved His people and will save them. In the Bible, Savior is both a historical and eschatological reality. God is often called "Savior" (e.g., RSV), which is hence a name for God in the Bible.

The OT allows no other savior than Yahweh.

"I, I am Yahweh, and besides me there is no savior" (cf. Isa. 44:11, RSV). Though appearing as a shadowy form at times, His role as the Deliverer and Savior of the Jewish people is never in question. Repeatedly in the OT the Jewish people are in need of deliverance from adversity, oppression, death, and captivity.

In the NT, the word *sōtēr* occurs 24 times and is translated "Savior" on each occasion. There is a sense in which Christ became the Savior by His incarnation, that is, His taking of human flesh. In a much fuller sense, He became Savior when He died on the Cross. However, the uniqueness of Christ's power to save does not reside in His life or teachings, or even in His person, but primarily in His atoning death and triumphant resurrection. As A. M. Hills says, "No other one ever put his own life and blood into the efficiency of his religion. No other is or can be such a Savior as Christ" (Hills, *Fundamental Christian Theology*, 304-5).

There are many lesser saviors—political, military, medical—but only one Savior from man's three great perils—sin, death, and hell. But the NT assurance is that "he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them" (Heb. 7:25). He saves from sin now, from death in the resurrection, and from hell in the Judgment. His power to save from all sin now is the assurance of His ability to save from death and hell.

See CHRIST, SOTERIOLOGY, CROSS, ATONEMENT, SALVATION.

For Further Reading: Richardson, ed., *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, 20; GMS, 303-57; Hills, *Fundamental Christian Theology*, 2:104-10.

DONALD R. PETERMAN

SCANDAL. This English term derives from the Greek *skandalon*, which means "that which causes sin" or "gives occasion for sin," or "that which causes stumbling," or "trouble, obstacle." It can also carry the idea of offense or that which offends.

Theologically, "scandal" relates to the exclusiveness of biblical religion. Gerhard Kittel once coined the phrase *das Ärgernis der Einmaligkeit*, "the scandal or offence of particularity." Why did God elect to mediate His salvation through a small, Near Eastern nation like Israel? Why did He choose a Roman cross as the means of propitiation and reconciliation of mankind to himself? These ideas are scandalous and offensive to the sin-bound reason of man. The apostle Paul speaks of his people as having "stumbled over

the stumbling stone" (Rom. 9:32, RSV). A crucified Messiah was a stumbling block or scandal to the Jews and folly to the Gentiles (1 Cor. 1:23; Gal. 5:11). But these are facts or truths with which mankind must come to terms. Those who commit themselves to God in faith do not stumble, are not offended, do not sin (1 John 2:7-11; Luke 7:23). Failure to accept God's way of salvation through Christ and the Cross is to remain in sin. Indeed, rejection causes the Stone of Stumbling to become the Rock of Judgment.

See CHRISTIANITY, NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS, COMPARATIVE RELIGION, HEATHEN (FATE OF).

WILLARD H. TAYLOR

SCHISM. The term comes from the Greek *schisma*, literally meaning "a split" or "a tear." In the NT it is usually translated "division" or "dissension," and in 1 Cor. 1:10 and 11:18 refers to factions and parties in the Corinthian congregation.

In the Early Church it describes groups which broke away and formed rival churches. At first it referred to divisions not based on basic doctrine and so not necessarily heretical. According to Calvin (*Institutes*, 4:2-5), Augustine emphasizes this distinction. After the time of Irenaeus (second century), as emphasis on the institutional unity of the church increased, gradually all disruptions were considered schismatic and even sinful.

In Roman Catholic canon law, schism is any break with the unity of the church, whether based on difference in basic doctrine or simple refusal of church authority (*New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 12:1131).

The most serious schism in the Christian church before the Reformation was the East-West division in 1054 in which the church was divided into the Eastern Orthodox and the Roman Catholic churches. This schism was never healed, though certain overtures were made to the Eastern church in 1965.

See HERESY, DIVISION, SEPARATION.

For Further Reading: *Encyclopaedia Britannica Micro-paedia*, 5:960; ERE, 7:232-35. M. ESTES HANEY

SCHOLASTICISM. This has to do particularly with the kind of Christian theology that was in vogue during the 9th to the 14th centuries. It made little use of Scripture and much use of ancient pagans such as Plato and Aristotle. It discoursed about God on the basis of reason or dialectics, and on the basis of nature, with its observable phenomena.

See THOMISM, NATURAL THEOLOGY, NATURAL LAW, REALISM AND NOMINALISM.

For Further Reading: Pieper, *Scholasticism: Personalities and Problems of Medieval Philosophy*.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

SCOTTISH REALISM. This term refers to the philosophical movement which was articulated by Thomas Reid during the 18th-century Scottish Enlightenment and which permeated American thought from the Revolution through the Civil War.

Reid sought to apply Newtonian inductive methodology to the study of the human mind, and to combat the skeptical tendencies of Descartes, Locke, Berkeley, and Hume through appeal to "common sense" (common convictions as revealed in practical behavior and common language traits) and "consciousness." One happy outcome was a continuity between the philosophizing of the man in the street and that of the professional, on the one hand, and between professional philosophy and Christian orthodoxy on the other.

Because of Scottish Realism, philosophy in 19th-century America was considered to be the handmaid of biblical revelation. It provided support for the theistic doctrines of Deists, Unitarians, and Transcendentalists, as well as for Calvinistic thinkers such as John Witherspoon, Charles Hodge, and James McCosh at Princeton. However, it also supported a free will position and thus was warmly embraced by such Methodists as Asa Shinn, Nathan Bangs, Wilbur Fiske, and Daniel Whedon, and by such Arminianized Calvinists as Timothy Dwight, Albert Barnes, and Charles G. Finney. It led to a spate of books purporting to refute Edwardian determinism.

Probably Scottish Realism received its finest expression in America in the philosophical writings of Christian holiness authors Asa Mahan and Thomas Upham. Upham gave definitive articulation to a "faculty psychology" which distinguished between intellect, emotion, and volition on the basis of conscious experience. His formulations became the context for understanding human nature in terms of which American evangelical Christianity yet today interprets spiritual experience.

See REALISM AND NOMINALISM, REALISM, EPISTEMOLOGY, HUMAN NATURE.

For Further Reading: Grave, "The Scottish Philosophy of Common Sense," *The Asbury Seminarian*, October, 1977; *The Monist*, April, 1978; Hamilton, articles in *WTJ*, 1974, 1975, and 1978 issues.

JAMES E. HAMILTON

SCRIPTURE. See BIBLE.

SEALING OF THE SPIRIT. Three times in the NT, reference is made to believers being sealed by or with the Holy Spirit (2 Cor. 1:22; Eph. 1:13; 4:30). As John Owen has so succinctly interpreted these statements, "God's sealing of believers then is his gracious communication of the Holy Spirit unto them, so to act his divine power in them, as to enable them unto all the duties of their holy calling, evidencing them to be accepted with him, both for themselves and others and asserting their preservation unto eternal life" (*The Holy Spirit*, 347).

In sealing, the mark can only be made upon the seal by the possessor of the signet, and the seal can only reflect the image of the signet which marks it. The sealing with the Holy Spirit denotes God's ownership of the one sealed, and the life of holiness reflects the presence of the Holy Spirit who seals.

Calvinists understand the sealing with the Spirit as the guaranteed eternal security of the Christian. As Paul indicates in Ephesians, believers are "sealed for the day of redemption" (4:30, RSV), and this sealing is "the guarantee of our inheritance until we acquire possession of it" (1:14, RSV). Arminians have no difficulty accepting the idea of security, but they reject the teaching of an unconditional security effected monergistically by the sealing with the Spirit. When Paul exhorted his readers not to "grieve the Holy Spirit of God, in whom you were sealed for the day of redemption," he did so because they were not being unconditionally preserved for eternal life.

The sealing with the Holy Spirit is not to be identified with conversion. It is distinct from regeneration and subsequent to it (2 Cor. 1:22; Eph. 1:13). It is the work of the Holy Spirit in a believer's heart in sanctifying grace, the witness of a pure heart and the evidence of Christ enthroned.

See HOLY SPIRIT, BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT.

For Further Reading: Carter, *The Person and Ministry of the Holy Spirit*, 302-5; Marsh, *Emblems of the Holy Spirit*, 26-37; Gordon, *The Ministry of the Spirit*, 75-89.

WILLIAM B. COKER

SECOND BLESSING. See SECOND WORK OF GRACE.

SECOND CHANCE. See FUTURE PROBATION.

SECOND COMING OF CHRIST. The revelation of eschatology (end-time events) in the Bible

clearly sets Christianity apart from, and above, all non-Christian religions. An adequate view of God is the basic foundation of Christianity. And such a view provides an order of events from creation to the closing events of time. The second coming of Christ is central to this understanding of end-time events, or eschatology.

Among the many passages which form the basis for our belief in the Second Coming are: "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven" (Matt. 26:64), and Jesus' promise, "I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also" (John 14:2-3). The very last words recorded in Scripture, given some 60 years or more after Christ's ascension, were spoken to John on the Island of Patmos and are recorded in Rev. 22:20, "Surely I come quickly." To these words John responded, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

Signs of His coming include great tribulation, false prophets and "christs," social disturbances, and worldwide evangelization (Matthew 24; 2 Thess. 2:1-12; 1 Tim. 4:1-3; 2 Tim. 3:1-5).

Another sign of His coming will be apostasy among Christians and a falling away. Within the Church there will be a cooling off spiritually: "Because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold" (Matt. 24:12).

As to the manner of Christ's coming, the NT indicates suddenness and surprise. "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be" (Matt. 24:27; cf. 36-41; 1 Cor. 15:51-53; 1 Thess. 4:14-18). Because Christ's second coming is sudden and unannounced, there must be maintained a perpetual readiness on the part of each believer. "Take ye heed, watch and pray: for ye know not when the time is" (Mark 13:33).

Some believe that the Second Coming will inaugurate a 1,000-year visible and literal reign of Christ on earth; others believe that Christ's appearance will signal the destruction of the earth, its remaking, and the Final Judgment (cf. 2 Pet. 3:10-13). Christ will judge the wicked, for when He comes, He shall "bring to light the things now hidden in darkness" (1 Cor. 4:5, RSV).

See ESCHATOLOGY, RAPTURE, TRIBULATION, MILLENNIUM, JUDGE (JUDGMENT), PAROUSIA.

For Further Reading: GMS, 624-48; Wiley, CT, 3:243-62. NORMAN R. OKE

SECOND WORK OF GRACE. This is the teaching that, besides conversion, there is a second special crisis in Christian experience. Such is taught, in a sense, by Roman Catholics, who teach that after the time of one's initiation into salvation at baptism, one receives the Holy Spirit at his confirmation.

In general, also, Pentecostals (the older Pentecostals and the Neo-Pentecostals) teach that, after the time of one's conversion, he should be baptized with the Holy Spirit as a second work of grace. This is a time, for Pentecostals, when a believer speaks in tongues—either as an initial evidence of being Spirit-baptized, or as the beginning of what will be a gift that is exercised thereafter.

The holiness people, or Wesleyans, are the ones who most emphasize a second work of grace as such. For them, it is a synonym of entire sanctification, and it is their most distinctive doctrinal emphasis.

Holiness people understand that several things occur at the first work of grace, often called conversion—when a sinner repents and believes. At that time he is justified (Rom. 5:1); regenerated (John 3:5-8); initially sanctified (Titus 3:5); reconciled (2 Cor. 5:18-21); and adopted as God's child (John 1:12; Rom. 8:15-16).

They also find, in Scripture, that a second crisis in Christian experience is sometimes told about and at other times is urged. It is often told about in Acts, where persons who are evidently already believers receive or are filled with or are baptized with the Holy Spirit (see Acts 1:5-8; 2:4; 8:1 ff, 10-11; 19:1-7). Besides, it seems to be described as already having happened in such passages as Rom. 6:1-6; 8:1-9; and Phil. 3:15.

There are other times, in Scripture, when persons who are already believers are urged to receive another special grace. It is most clear that the Thessalonians are Christians (see 1 Thess. 1:3-4, 6, 8, 10). Yet Paul says he would like to see them in order to "supply what is lacking" in their faith (3:10, NIV). Then he tells them that it is God's will that they be sanctified (4:3); and he virtually prays: "May God himself, the God of peace, sanctify you through and through" (5:23, NIV).

The basic reason why Scripture describes Christian experience as received through a first and a second work of grace is because there are two kinds of sin: acts of sin; and the state of original sin which characterizes the whole human race because the first Adam, as the representative of the race, sinned against God (cf. Genesis 3; Rom. 5:12-21; 1 Cor. 15:21 ff). The acts of sin

are forgiven in the first work of grace; and the state of original sin is cleansed away in the second work of grace (see Rom. 8:1-2).

See SIN, ORIGINAL SIN, FIRST WORK OF GRACE, ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION.

For Further Reading: Jones, *Perfectionist Persuasion: The Holiness Movement and American Methodism*; Knight, *The Holiness Pilgrimage*; Ruth, *The Second Crisis in Christian Experience*; Turner, *The Vision Which Transforms*; Grider, *Entire Sanctification*.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

SECT. See CHURCH.

SECULARISM. Secularism (Latin *saecula*, "age" or "period") refers to an ideology which turns man's attention away from the supernatural and worlds beyond toward this world and the present age. Harvey Cox (*The Secular City*) attempts to distinguish between secularism as a closed world view which functions much like a new religion and secularization which he views as an irreversible historical process liberating society from closed world views. It seems, however, that the move toward secularization in theology is an accommodation of unbelief or a capitulation to unbelief rather than the confrontation of unbelief by the biblical faith.

Secularism puts everything in man's hands. It denies absolutes and idealizes pluralism and relativity. It makes man responsible for developing his own morality and ethics with reference to himself alone. It is a religious response to the supposedly religionless modern scientific and technological man. In one breath its advocates say that secularization is necessary to reach man in his religionless condition, and in the next breath they say that secularization is necessary to free man from the tyranny of his religious concepts.

Coming from opposite directions, however, the secularist and the biblical Christian meet in agreement on one point. The compartmentalization of life into sacred versus secular is wrong. To the secularist, we must secularize all of life. The Bible, however, views all of life as sacred, even the mundane, and therefore the attempts to secularize it are wrong. The Christian shares Paul's view of life when he says, "Whether, then, you eat or drink or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God" (1 Cor. 10:31, NASB; cf. Col. 3:17).

See WORLD (WORLDLINESS), PROFANE (PROFANITY), SANCTIFICATION, HUMANISM.

For Further Reading: Cox, *The Secular City*; Ellul, *The New Demons*, 1-47; Schaeffer, *Death in the City*.

GLENN R. BORING

SELF. "Self" is a relatively new term as it is used in theology today. It is a creation of the modern science of psychology. A theological treatment of man today—in his relationships with himself, other persons, and God—is veritably impossible without an extensive use of the term. In the theological context "self" refers to one's *inner* identity—that which makes him an individual and/or a person as distinct from others. There are many factors that relate to the formulation of that self, which in turn also determine its "health" or pathology. It is the self that remains constant through all of the various conditions that either develop or destroy it.

How is this modern term "self" related to Scripture? Significantly, there is no term for self, *per se*, in the NT. Some modern versions translate *anthrōpos* (man) as "self" in Rom. 6:6 (NASB, NIV, RSV); 7:22 (RSV, NEB); Eph. 4:22, 24 and Col. 3:9-10 (NASB, NIV). But the diversified translations of *anthrōpos* in these same verses reflect the lack of any clear concept—"man" (Rom. 7:22, NASB); "nature" (Eph. 4:22, 24 and Col. 3:9-10, RSV, NEB); and even "being" (Rom. 7:22, NIV).

Most often "self" is part of the compound words "myself," "yourself," "himself," etc., which are translations of reflexive pronouns (*heautous* et al.) or the reflexive use of the pronoun (*autos* et al.). The *self* is that which one is able to objectify as *himself*. However, in contrast to modern psychology where the self is exclusively inward, in the NT the objectified self is the whole or total person, both inner and outer.

Very close to the meaning of "self" is the dramatic use of the first person singular ("I"), especially when it is reinforced by the personal pronoun *ego* (cf. Gal. 2:19-20). In his dramatic introspection (Rom. 7:14-25) Paul described the conflict between his mind and flesh and equated the mind with his inner self (*anthrōpos*, v. 22), and the flesh with his "members," obviously outward (v. 23). Significantly, *both* the mind and the flesh were identified as "I" or "me" (cf. vv. 18, 25). Paul exhorted the Romans to present (*paristēmi*) "yourselves to God . . . and your members" (Rom. 6:13, NASB); and the identical "presentation" terminology in v. 19 and 12:1 makes it clear that such a presentation included their members or body.

Yet a word of caution is needed. When Paul wrote, "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I [*ego*] who live" (Gal. 2:20, NASB), he does not mean that the self (as understood today) actually dies! If that were so, the *person* would cease to exist. In the strictest sense the "I" that is crucified with Christ, dies in a theological

sense—meaning that we participate by faith in the Cross death of Christ. The essential self does not die or cease to exist, nor can we crucify ourselves. Thus the expression "self-crucifixion" is a misnomer. "Dying with Christ" is a metaphor and is best understood as dying to self.

See MAN, HUMAN NATURE, DEATH TO SELF, CROSS (CROSS-BEARING).

For Further Reading: Howard, *Newness of Life*; Adcock, *Fundamentals of Psychology*; Tournier, *The Whole Person in a Broken World*. RICHARD E. HOWARD

SELF-CONTROL. See DISCIPLINE.

SELF-CRUCIFIXION. See DEATH TO SELF.

SELF-EXAMINATION. The biblical basis for the Christian discipline of self-examination is most explicit in such passages as 1 Cor. 11:28-32 (where it refers to preparation for receiving the Lord's Supper), Gal. 6:4 (where the reference is to conduct as evidence of grace), and 2 Cor. 13:5. In the latter, it is the recommended antidote for judging others, and its purpose is to discover whether one is truly Christian, i.e., shares the life of Christ.

Historically at the extremes, classical ascetic theology (mostly Roman Catholic) contrasts with monergistic views of salvation by grace which see such self-discipline as self-righteousness. Overemphasis on the practice has been rightly criticized as unhealthy subjectivism, or morbid preoccupation with self.

Proper self-examination, however, is on firm ground theologically. Only man, made in God's image, is endowed with the power to pass judgment upon himself in the lonely privacy of his personhood. He alone can differentiate between what he is and what he ought to be, an endowment reflected in conscience. He cannot permanently escape this responsibility. One's "inwardness," in spirit and intention, is the supreme test of Christian faith. To face God is also to face self, since God looks on the heart. To be afraid of silence and one's true self is the revelation of inner poverty.

William Law, in his chapter on evening prayer, laid stress on the deliberate, step-by-step recollection of the actions of the day, along with confession, not of a general sort, but of each particular failure, as a means to reformation and blessing. Law warned of the ease with which we excuse human frailty, without sorrow, and thus without amendment. Searching self-knowledge of one's natural temperament, chief weaknesses, prevalent temptations, as well as providential

opportunities, through the Spirit's ministry, becomes an important means of grace.

The older writers on this theme recommend the earnest contemplation of death as a means to the illumination of life. The Scheme of Self-examination used by the first Methodists at Oxford gave attention, in a series of self-addressed questions, to the practicality of the expression of neighbor love in the daily round.

See CONSCIENCE, CHRISTIAN PERFECTION, SELF, GROW (GROWTH).

For Further Reading: Lewis, *The Practice of the Christian Life*; Law, *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*; Taylor, *The Rules and Exercises of Holy Living*.

ARNOLD E. AIRHART

SELF-IMAGE. The idea or concept one has of oneself is one's self-image. Such an image is possible because self-consciousness is a part of the image of God in man (Gen. 1:26-27). O. A. Curtis describes self-grasp and self-estimate as capabilities of a person which allows one to say, "I am not this or that, I am myself" (*The Christian Faith*, 20-22).

Lewis Sherrell identifies "self-transcendence" as the quality which makes it possible to ask, "What does the self 'see' when it thinks of itself?" (*The Gift of Power*, 9, 35).

The self-image may be an idealized conception of oneself, or an intelligent and honest insight into reality. Paul warned of the peril of thinking of oneself "more highly than he ought to think" (Rom. 12:3).

If the self-image corresponds to reality, self-understanding and self-knowledge result in a healthy personality. If not, this becomes the basis for anxiety and certain mental and emotional illnesses. The key to a healthy self-image is loving God with the whole self, a loving made possible and natural by being sanctified wholly (Luke 10:27; 1 Thess. 5:23).

See SELF, DEATH TO SELF, HUMILITY, LIFE-STYLE.

For Further Reading: Shoemaker, *Self-knowledge and Self-identity*; Wolman, *Dictionary of Behavioral Science*, 342.

J. OTTIS SAYES

SEMI-PELAGIANISM. Semi-Pelagianism is a name which was introduced during the Scholastic period to describe a system of doctrine that was formulated quite simultaneously in the fifth century in southern France and North Africa, as an attempt to find and maintain a middle ground between the extreme views of Pelagianism and Augustinianism (Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, 3:857-58; 4:537-39).

After the Synod of Carthage in 412 and just

prior to the Council of Ephesus in 431, both of which condemned Pelagius and his doctrines, John Cassianus founded, expounded, and defended the views which became known as Semi-Pelagian. Other earnest men, such as Vincent of Lerins and Faustus, bishop of Rhegium, fearing the demoralizing, fatalistic, and deterministic effects of Augustine's doctrines of irresistible grace, predestination, and perseverance, carried the system forward until it was condemned by the Synods of Orange and Valence in 529 (Latourette, *Christianity Through the Ages*, 59-61).

Primary emphases of Semi-Pelagianism included the views that original sin and free will are not mutually exclusive, that the divine and human wills cooperate and are coefficient factors in regeneration, that regeneration is the divine blessing on human volition, and that guilt comes, not from original sin, but only by an individual act willingly committed.

Wesleyan-Arminian theologians reject the idea of human merit and other tendencies toward naturalism and humanism of Semi-Pelagianism, by placing the weight of the synergistic system on the side of God and His prevenient grace.

See PELAGIANISM, AUGUSTINIANISM, SYNERGISM, MONERGISM, ARMINIANISM.

For Further Reading: Ayer, *A Source Book for Ancient Church History*, 466-69; Bruce, *The Spreading Flame*, 311, 335-36, 359, 370; Latourette, *A History of Christianity*, 179-82; Wiley, *CT*, 1:69; 2:27, 39-40, 43-44, 348, 351, 415; 3:184. WAYNE E. CALDWELL

SEPARATION. A key doctrine of both Old and New Testaments, separation, as it relates to Christian experience, indicates the Christian's distinction from sin and sinners and his being set apart to God. Israel was called out from heathen people and pagan practices. So Christians are urged to come out from among the unclean and to be separate (2 Cor. 6:17). Fellowship with the Lord is possible only to those who, like Him, are holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners (Heb. 7:26).

Separation is illustrated by the wedding vow. Israel in Scripture is considered married to Yahweh. The NT Church is the Bride of Christ, and friendship with the world is branded as adultery (Jas. 4:4). The "world" may designate the people who do not serve God, and/or their culture.

Conservative Christians believe that to be saved, men must separate from all evil by thorough repentance. Holiness theologians stress also—perhaps more than other conservatives—a further separation. The converted must renounce self and yield all ambitions and affections into

the hands of God. This act Paul calls a crucifixion. He says, "The world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world" (Gal. 6:14).

Separation is not the same as either regeneration or entire sanctification, but both a precondition and a result. Needed divine grace is freely given, both to cease the committing of sin, in repentance, and to see and renounce its inner nature in consecration.

See REPENTANCE, CONSECRATE (CONSECRATION), WORLD (WORLDLINESS).

For Further Reading: Steele, *Love Enthroned*, 134 ff; Will, *Commentary on Matthew*, 68-69.

LOUIS A. BOUCK

SERAPH, SERAPHIM. See ANGEL.

SERVANT. The Hebrew word for servant, *ebed*, initially referred to bond relationships within tribal society. It became an important term within covenant theology, defining God's redemptive mode through the Messiah and His faithful followers.

The OT shows servants managing possessions, looking after family affairs, giving counsel, and carrying messages—much like service professions in today's technical society. But servanthood meant more than that. The patriarch Job, King David, and the prophet Isaiah are all called "servants of God." So was Israel; indeed, prophetic writings contain frequent calls to its faithful servanthood.

Nowhere is the paradox of leadership through service more forcefully expressed than in Isaiah (esp. chaps. 42; 52-54: The stricken one who "hath borne our griefs" will be exalted). Jewish theologians draw from these passages the messianic character of Israel, despite dispersions and holocausts. Christians acknowledge Christ as the One through whom the Abrahamic covenant becomes the "light to the nations." The Church proclaims this Good News.

Jesus consciously accepted the servant role as prophesied by Isaiah, teaching it in respect to himself and to His followers (see Mark 10:42-45; Matt. 20:27; Col. 2:5-11; 2 Cor. 4:5). He rebuked His disciples for seeking preferment and privilege, admonishing them repeatedly to find greatness in service. Christ is Pioneer of the new humanity which regains righteous mastery of the earth (Hebrews 2).

Jesus washed dusty feet, served tables, touched untouchables, ate with outcasts, and healed the sick. That His example has been followed, in part at least, by the Church can be evidenced by a long history of compassionate

service activities and agencies. The Protestant principle of the universal priesthood of believers arises from servant theology, both in worship and in work, whereby each becomes a channel of God's grace to another.

See DEACON, MINISTER (MINISTRY), SERVICE, SERVANT OF JEHOVAH.

For Further Reading: Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership*; Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus*. ARTHUR O. ROBERTS

SERVANT OF JEHOVAH. One who is voluntarily committed to the redemptive mission of God in the world after the pattern of and in the likeness of Jesus Christ.

OT meanings are rooted in the divinely anointed obedient persons (patriarchs, Moses, Job, Elijah, Isaiah, etc.) who gave their complete obedience to God as Master. This allegiance and the relationship grew to a sacred bond, reaching its culmination in the description of the Suffering Servant of Jehovah (or Yahweh) in Isa. 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; 52:13—53:12.

The models of and the concept of servanthood in the old covenant find their completeness in the new covenant in the person of Jesus Christ. He saw himself as servant of God (Mark 9:12; 10:45; 14:14) and presented himself as the Model to His disciples for all time.

A contemporary servant of God is one who is totally offered to the will of God the Father even as was Christ (Matt. 23:11; Mark 10:45; Luke 22:26; John 13:16).

The most frequently used words in the NT for servant are "child" and "slave." A servant of God, then, in the likeness of Christ, is adopted by grace into the household of God and achieves fulfillment by joyous abandon to do the Father's will. Other biblical words that are translated as "servant" suggest meanings of "attendant," "table waiter," "domestic servant," "public servant," and "menial slave."

Historically, the meaning of being a servant of Yahweh began to take shape in the mission of the covenant people Israel as typified in their leaders (i.e., Moses), came to its personal embodiment in Jesus Christ, and has since been finding its application in the lives of followers of Christ who are anointed by the Spirit of God. At the center of the mission of the Church is the continuation of the servant role (Phil. 2:5-11).

Christian servanthood should not be seen as cringing servility or joyless subjection to bondage. Rather, it may be seen, as Christ understood it, as the highest form of selfless dedication to the redeeming purpose of God the Father. A servant of Yahweh is a divinely honored ambassador, a

minister, a commissioned and empowered colleague with Christ (1 Cor. 4:1-2).

The doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ in the world has direct relationship to the scriptural teaching that living Christians are the enfleshment of the servant Christ. Contemporary servants of Yahweh share corporately the same mandate and joy as did Jesus.

See SERVANT, CONSECRATE (CONSECRATION), SERVICE, STEWARDSHIP.

For Further Reading: Schultz, *Portraits of a Servant*; Mudge, *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 12:113-28; Kittel, 2:81-93, 261-80; 5:654-717. GORDON WETMORE

SERVICE. This has to do with working for another as he directs. Service to God is doing His bidding, laboring in His will.

The word is applied in the OT largely to priests of the sanctuary. Their consecration by blood and by oil suggests the need in Christian service for the blood of Christ and the oil of the Spirit.

To serve the Lord is both our privilege and our choice. "Choose you this day whom ye will serve" (Josh. 24:15). It is Christ or Belial, God or mammon (money), but not both, for no man can serve two masters (Matt. 6:24).

To serve Christ is to follow Him through death to self, and a resulting fruitfulness (John 12:24-26). Like Him we must bear the cross, for the servant is not above his Lord (Matt. 10:24).

To everyone, Christian service brings responsibility to fulfill the Great Commission. This may involve suffering: "Serving the Lord with all humility of mind, and with many tears, and temptations" (Acts 20:19); but it brings blessing: "There stood by me this night the angel of God, whose I am, and whom I serve" (27:23).

Service to God should be grateful and joyful (Deut. 28:47). An example is the OT love-slave. Bankrupt, he served six years, going free in the seventh. If, however, he renounced freedom, saying, "I love my master," he became a servant forever, entering into a new and closer relationship to his master.

Like the Hebrew servant, Christians at some point face a choice. Either we go back to our "freedom" and failure, or forward, declaring, "I am, O Lord, wholly and forever Thine." Our reasonable, or spiritual, service is to present our all to God, receiving a divine transformation, and proving in personal experience what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God (Rom. 12:1-2).

See CONSECRATE (CONSECRATION), OBEDIENCE, SERVANT, MINISTRY, PRUDENCE.

For Further Reading: Wood, *Perfect Love*, 227-31; Taylor, *Life in the Spirit*, 109-24; Geiger, *The Word and the Doctrine*, 271-429.

LOUIS A. BOUCK

SERVITUDE. See BONDAGE.

SEVEN CARDINAL VIRTUES. The seven cardinal virtues stem from the field of Christian ethics; they are sometimes related to the seven gifts of the Spirit (cf. Isa. 11:2). These virtues were named by the medieval church as the basal elements of character. The seven attitudes include faith, hope, love, justice, prudence, temperance, and fortitude.

They are called *cardinal* because all other Christian virtues are said to hinge on one or the other of these seven. The first three are often called theological virtues because they are firmly rooted in the NT (cf. 1 Cor. 13:13). The last four are known as natural, or moral, virtues because they are rooted chiefly in Greek philosophy: Plato's *Republic* stressed the virtues of wisdom, courage, temperance, and justice.

Though these four natural virtues were prominent in ancient philosophy, the churchmen found ample support for them in Scripture. Justice was a hallmark of the prophets; inspired wisdom came from Hebrew teachers; temperance was commended by Peter (2 Pet. 1:6) and by Paul (1 Cor. 9:25; Gal. 5:23; Titus 1:8). In the Scriptures "courage" is akin to the parallel Greek "virtue," but the source of biblical courage almost always derives from one's confidence in the promises and the power of God.

The churchmen of the Middle Ages thus saw the best ethical thinking of the Greeks corroborating God's revelation in Scripture. A. B. D. Alexander writes: "Under the influence of Ambrose and Augustine, the cardinal virtues henceforth form a generally accepted scheme for the Christian treatment of systematic ethics" (ERE, 11:431). This has been true especially for Roman Catholic theology.

Protestant ethics has given less attention to the cardinal virtues. But both Catholics and Protestants agree that it is man's relationship to God which gives cohesion and unity to his moral life. The NT attitudes of faith, hope, and love toward God are the primary elements for coordinating Christian character.

See CHARACTER, GROW (GROWTH), HOLINESS, SEVEN DEADLY SINS, TEMPERANCE, VIRTUE.

For Further Reading: ERE, 11:430-32; Stalker, *The Seven Cardinal Virtues*.

A. F. HARPER

SEVEN DEADLY SINS. The concept of the seven deadly sins, related to the field of Christian

ethics, comes from the medieval church. The original classification, however, may go as far back as the monastic period. The concept today is discussed chiefly by Roman Catholic theologians.

The idea arises from the religionist's concern to discover the relative importance of moral values—or disvalues (cf. the question of the NT lawyer, "Master, which is the great commandment in the law?" [Matt. 22:36]).

The seven sins at the top of this list were pride, covetousness, lust, envy, gluttony, anger, and sloth. Of these, lust and covetousness are named in the Ten Commandments. Jesus warned against pride (Mark 7:22) and sloth (Matt. 25:26). The Epistles speak specifically of envy (Jas. 4:5) and anger (Eph. 4:26), while the wise man of the OT warns against gluttony (Prov. 23:21).

These sins head the list because they represent the primary human urges that are most likely to give rise to sin. They are thus highly subversive of the law of God and of the church.

Such sins are *deadly* or *mortal* because they wilfully violate the divine law, destroy friendship with God, and cause the death of the soul. The Roman church contrasts these *deadly* sins with the sins that are only *venial*. Even these lesser sins tend to injure the spiritual life, but they do not of themselves bring eternal death (cf. 1 John 5:16-17).

Some theologians note that the seven are *root* sins—most likely to be sources for other sins. They are "deadly" in their fatal effects on both character and salvation. They are not deadly in the sense of being unforgivable or beyond the curative and delivering power of God.

See SIN, CHARACTER, HOLINESS, SEVEN CARDINAL VIRTUES.

For Further Reading: Alexander, ERE; Stalker, *The Seven Deadly Sins*.

A. F. HARPER

SEX, SEXUALITY. The Scriptures of the OT and NT are clear that human sexuality is a matter of sacred concern for God. Man's sexuality finds its origin in His creative design. His most holy purposes for man are inextricably linked with its proper expression. His best gifts of human joy and fulfillment are most commonly related to its proper use. It is part of a great and sacred mystery (Eph. 5:32).

Human sexual activity is the occasion for the begetting of human life. In this, man exercises the power that is God-given and godlike. Two people give existence and destiny to another without that person's request or consent. This power, granted to man in his freedom, is his to

use or abuse. It is one of God's most serious gifts to man. Failure to use this power responsibly brings judgment. Correct use brings blessing.

Sex can become the means for the expression of the most sacred form of human love. Greater than the love of friend for friend, or that of parent and child, the love of spouse for spouse within a biblical marriage covenant can assume a quality without equal in any other human relationship. Love within that covenant when exclusive (monogamous) and enduring, can produce a level of mutual giving and receiving, a life of exchange, that is uniquely fulfilling. The union then of one life with another produces a unity which the Scriptures call "one flesh" (Gen. 2:24). The beauty and sacredness of this is in striking contrast to the products which result when man expresses his sexuality outside this God-intended context.

This should not be surprising when one notes the biblical context in which man's sexuality is introduced. In Gen. 1:27 and 5:1-2, we are told that God made man in His own image, male and female. The purpose here is not to suggest sexuality in God. Rather, it is to indicate the nature of man which enables him to share in a life that is like that which God knows, a life in love. It is clear that God intended human sexual differentiation and that to be a human person is to be either male or female. No one is both. Thus the concept of man transcends maleness or femaleness because it is inclusive of both. In this sense neither male nor female in himself or herself is fully man. The minimal unit of humanity that is fully man must be inclusive of both. Every human individual is thus incomplete, and his or her sexuality is the sign of that incompleteness. The individual person finds fulfillment in another whose difference makes that fulfillment possible. In the union of those differences human love at its best is obtainable. Only in the union of those differences is reproduction and the future of mankind possible.

The fact that human sexuality biblically is related to the making of man in God's image has led some theologians to see in the expression of man's sexuality within marriage that is exclusive and enduring a limited, finite analogy at the human level of the inner nature of the Triune God. There three Persons, none of which exhausts in himself the Godhead, and each of which is to be differentiated from the others, coinhere in a life of mutual giving and receiving of which man's "one flesh" is supposed to be a creaturely analogy. See the remarks of Jesus in the Gospel of

John on the relationship of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit to each other.

The above makes marriage a viable analogy for illustrating the relationship of Christ to the Church (Eph. 5:21-33). It must be kept in mind, though, that the relationship of Christ and the Church is the prior one. Logically the plan of God for a bride for His Son was before His plan for a bride for man. Thus the relationship of Christ and the Church should not be seen as like that of husband and wife but vice versa. In this man has an eternal and an unchanging pattern for the use of his sexuality. Man's sexuality is both analogy and parable. It is to illustrate and to teach an eternal purpose. No man's fulfillment is in himself. His true life is found in another. The human marriage relationship is biblically defined. Man's true fulfillment in love is in God.

This should make obvious why the Scripture attaches the highest penalty to the nonbiblical use of man's sexuality. When engaged in with the person to whom one is not married, sex brings God's judgment instead of His blessing. Sexual relations with a person of the same sex or with an animal are perversions and abominations biblically. See Leviticus 18. One's sexuality is a sacred gift to be used for sacred purposes. What one does with his sexuality is indicative of what he does with the God who gave it to him.

See MAN, WOMAN, DIVINE IMAGE, FAMILY, ADULTERY, POLYGAMY.

For Further Reading: Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, 3, 1:206 ff; Piper, *A Christian Interpretation of Sex*; Thielicke, *Theological Ethics*, vol. 3: Sex.

DENNIS F. KINLAW

SHAME. This may be objective or subjective, or both. If objective, it is a situation in which one is bearing disgrace and reproach. Shame is the loss of the public image of respectability and good character. The shame or disgrace may be deserved or it may be undeserved; if undeserved, no actual sin is involved, but rumor, misunderstanding, or slander.

If the shame is subjective, it is an emotion of acute embarrassment and humiliation. It may be a superficial issue, yet socially painful (Luke 14:9). Unfortunately, the perversity of the sinful heart is such that people frequently are ashamed of things of which they ought to be proud, and proud of those things of which they ought to be ashamed (Phil. 3:19).

Jesus was put to an open shame (Heb. 6:6) by the ignominious death on the Cross; this was shame in the objective sense. But He refused to

allow the shame to become subjective; He despised it (12:2).

Inability to blush is not a mark of maturity but decadence. Christians should have a capacity for shame in the presence of evil. They should be ashamed to expose themselves indecently (Jer. 13:26). They should be ashamed of doing less than their best in the Lord's service (2 Tim. 2:15). They should avoid embarrassing their brethren or the poor (Ps. 14:6; 1 Cor. 11:22).

Shame is at the very heart of true repentance. This is not an embarrassment for having been caught, or regret because of consequences (called the "sorrow of the world" [2 Cor. 7:10]), but a painful and profound grief for having done the wrong.

A sense of shame is generally associated with a low self-image. If the self-depreciation is over superficial matters, such as worry about good looks or talents, it may accompany the usual insecurity of immaturity; or it may be a sign of neurotic pride and self-preoccupation. In either case efforts to remove the false shame are legitimate. But in many instances a low self-image is caused by a secret awareness of real guilt. People do not like themselves because they know themselves. Only a bungler will try to trump up a better self-image in such cases. Let the person face that which causes shame, and make it right both with God and man, and he will stand tall without psychological hocus-pocus.

It will come as a surprise to many to learn that there are far more frequent references in the Bible to shame than to guilt. Fear of being shamed is seen as a powerful incentive to good behavior.

See REPENTANCE, GUILT, SELF-IMAGE, REALITY THERAPY.

For Further Reading: Noble, "Shame Versus Guilt," *WTJ*, Spring, 1971. RICHARD S. TAYLOR

SHEKINAH. This is a term for the visible manifestation of the presence of God, as in the pillar of cloud and fire which led Israel through the wilderness (Exod. 13:21). Though in our Bible the word does not occur, it was used in Jewish paraphrases as a synonym for God or for His glory. In the OT the Shekinah pointed forward to Christ, the brightness of God's glory (Heb. 1:3).

The Shekinah was seen as a fire enfolded in a cloud. Usually only the cloud was visible, but at times the fire appeared, as on Mount Sinai when the law was given (Exod. 19:18). The Shekinah of the Lord dwelt among His people, especially in the Tabernacle, where God spoke to Moses face-to-face (33:11). Christ is the Word made

flesh, who tabernacled among us (John 1:14, NASB marg.).

Identified by some with the Holy Spirit, the Shekinah (meaning "to dwell") suggests the companionship, purity, and radiance of the Comforter abiding in the sanctified heart.

See HOLY OF HOLIES, GLORY, PRESENCE (DIVINE).

For Further Reading: *NBD*, 1174; *ZPBD*, 782.

LOUIS A. BOUCK

SHEOL. The location and nature of Sheol (Heb. *sheol*) are described in a number of OT passages. Synonyms for Sheol in the OT are: pit, region dark and deep, Abaddon, land of forgetfulness (Ps. 88:12), place of no return (Job 3:13-19; Isa. 14:9-23), hell, death (Prov. 5:5), sleep (Nah. 3:18).

Man goes down to Sheol (Gen. 37:35, RSV). His body returns to the dust from which it was quickened (2:7); his spirit (breath) returns to God who gave it (Eccles. 12:7); and a "shade" of the self goes to Sheol. Darkness (Job 10:21-22), slumber (Nah. 3:18), weakness (Isa. 14:10), and forgetfulness (Ps. 88:12)—such symbols of death are the opposites of life, light, and activity. Job 3:13-19 states that silence reigns in Sheol, while Isa. 26:14 says that the inhabitants of Sheol are unremembered.

Biblical man never prayed to go to Sheol, neither did he fear going to Sheol. What he didn't want was to enter Sheol before he had enjoyed the fullness of life. A number of prayers in the Psalms were to insure long life, not to avoid Sheol.

Isa. 14:15; Ezek. 32:23, 25, 28-30 appear to some to suggest that the Pit is a special place in Sheol for special enemies. Ezek. 32:17-32 seems to indicate some separation in Sheol. The circumcised are separated from the uncircumcised, those slain in battle from those who were properly buried, and some nations were separated from other nations.

The deliverance of Enoch (Gen. 5:24) and Elijah (2 Kings 2:11) from death and passages such as Isa. 26:19 and Dan. 12:2 indicate belief in life beyond the temporary abode of Sheol. Luke 16:23 suggests the partitioning of Sheol into Gehenna and Paradise. The resurrection of Jesus insures the final abolition of sin and death (Sheol).

See HADES, RESURRECTION OF THE BODY, IMMORTALITY, INTERMEDIATE STATE.

For Further Reading: Baillie, *And the Life Everlasting*, 142-58; Pache, *The Future Life*, 279-325; Shaw, *Life After Death*, 10 ff. FRED E. YOUNG

SIGN. In the scope of scriptural usage, a sign can be a physical mark (Gen. 4:15), a warning (Num. 16:38), a monument (Josh. 4:6), an ensign (Ps. 74:4), a reminder (Deut. 6:8), a portent (Isa. 20:3), a signature (2 Thess. 3:17), or a miracle (John 4:54). Underlying all of these, however, is the idea that a sign is something visible which points beyond itself for its real meaning. In its predominant religious sense it indicates God's presence and activity which demand a human response of faith and obedience.

In respect to the past, signs are reminders of God's covenants (the rainbow [Gen. 9:12-13] and circumcision [17:11]), and His redemptive acts (the signs and wonders of the Exodus [Exod. 10:1-2]; the Passover festival [13:9]; and the 12 stones from the Jordan [Josh. 4:6]). In the present they signify His presence in healing (John 6:2), in revealing His Son (Acts 2:22), and in confirming the word of His servants (Rom. 15:18-19; Heb. 2:4). In references to the future they confirm the word of prophecy (1 Sam. 2:34; Isa. 7:11, 14) and indicate the advent of eschatological events (Matt. 24:3).

Signs are not exclusive grounds for faith. Magicians can produce them (Exod. 7:11, 22; Acts 8:9-11) as well as false prophets working under satanic power (Mark 13:22; 2 Thess. 2:9; Rev. 13:13-14). Some in Jesus' day were characterized as sign-seekers (John 2:18; 6:30; 1 Cor. 1:22), but He refused to satisfy their demand for signs (Matt. 12:38-42). Notwithstanding this reserve, miracles did have evidential value, and they were recorded as a means to faith, at least for that generation (Heb. 2:3-4). John 20:30-31 reflects the apostolic outlook: These signs are "written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name" (RSV).

See MIRACLE, CREDENTIALS OF SCRIPTURE, FALSE CHRIST.

For Further Reading: Richardson, ed., *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, 152-55; Kittel, 4:200-269.

LUKE L. KEEFER, JR.

SIMPLICITY OF MORAL ACTION. This term signifies a doctrine maintaining the impossibility of a divided heart in moral matters. The doctrine came into prominence and received precise definition in connection with the Oberlin theology of Charles G. Finney and Asa Mahan.

Following Kant and Cousin, the Oberlin men held that the moral character of actions is determined exclusively by the ultimate or controlling intention. An intention is a conscious choice of the will. A choice is "ultimate" when two condi-

tions are fulfilled. First, it must control all other choices and be subordinate to none. Second, its exclusive basis must be the intrinsic character of its object. All states of mind or of feeling, as well as all outward actions, derive moral character only from one's ultimate intention. On this view, such incompatible elements as right and wrong, obedience and disobedience, or sin and holiness cannot coexist in a single moral act.

This doctrine affected Oberlin teaching concerning both conversion and entire sanctification. First, together with the biblical doctrine of repentance this concept made it possible to argue that there is a sense in which moral perfection, perfect love, and entire consecration are essential elements of the new birth. Second, Mahan and Finney both spoke of entire sanctification as vastly more mature, confirmed, and settled state of Christian experience, wrought by the Holy Spirit's renovation of the feelings. Finney referred especially to the relative permanence of this state.

James H. Fairchild, however, argued that entire sanctification as an experience distinct from conversion belongs only to a theology maintaining mixed moral action. This Finney implicitly conceded in his self-correcting lectures on entire sanctification delivered at Oberlin in late 1838 and printed in the *Oberlin Evangelist*, and only recently made currently available by Timothy L. Smith.

See SIN, MOTIVES, INTENTION, HEART PURITY, HOLINESS, BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT.

For Further Reading: *The Asbury Seminarian*, October, 1977, 20-35; WTJ, Spring, 1978, 51-64; Finney, *Lectures on Systematic Theology*, 95-114; *The Promise of the Spirit*, comp. and ed. Smith, 117-216, 262.

JAMES E. HAMILTON

SIN. That branch of theology which deals with the doctrine of sin is called *hamartiology*. It claims a very large share of careful attention, since sin is man's basic problem. It is sin which necessitates salvation, indeed, the entire plan of redemption, including the Incarnation, the death and resurrection of Christ, and the gift of the Holy Spirit. The peril of eternal damnation is due solely to sin. In addition, the earthly dislocations and conflicts of humanity are either expressions of sin or traceable to it. One's doctrine of sin reveals his concept of God, of the nature of man, of the Atonement, and of the principles and possibilities of grace.

There are many Hebrew and Greek words that are rendered "sin" in English translations of the Bible. The words appearing most frequently are

the Hebrew word *chattath* and the Greek word *hamartia*. The idea expressed by these words is "missing the mark" or "failing." However, they have several shades of meaning. *Hamartia* is used as the basic generic term for sin in the NT.

In respect to the etymological sense of a marksman missing a target, interpreters commonly assume that the target is missed because of fallen man's inability to attain the perfect standard which God demands and for which man strives. But man, in his fallen condition, misses the mark primarily because of a wrong aim (aiming at the wrong target). The picture is not that of the sinner desiring to be holy and falling short. Sinful man, until awakened by the Holy Spirit, does not want to be holy. He wants fulfillment, but he misses it because he seeks it through selfish pursuits rather than through submitting to the will of God where it is found. He is in rebellion against God (Rom. 8:7). Because he shoots at the wrong target, he misses the fulfillment which he desires.

Other Hebrew and Greek words which are translated "sin" reveal its varied nature. The main Hebrew nouns are *resha*, "wickedness, confusion"; *avon*, "iniquity, perversion, guilt"; *pesha*, "transgression, rebellion"; *aven*, "wrongness, trouble, vanity"; *sheger*, "lying, deceit"; *ra*, "evil," usually in its judicial or natural effects; *maal*, "trespass, breach of trust"; *asham*, "error, negligence, guilt"; and *awel*, "injustice." Hebrew verbs for "sin" include *sarar*, "to disobey"; and *abar*, "to transgress."

Greek words for sin besides *hamartia* include *adikia*, "unrighteousness"; *anomia*, "lawlessness"; *asebeia*, "impiety"; *parabasis*, "transgression"; *paraptōma*, "a fall" from a right relationship with God; *ponēria*, "depravity"; *epithumia*, "desire, lust"; and *apeitheia*, meaning "disobedience." In one sense, "Sin is the want of conformity to the divine law or standard of excellence" (Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 2:187). In another sense, it is the wilful transgression of a known law of God (cf. Romans 6—8; 1 John 3). This was John Wesley's definition of sin "properly so-called."

There are two general kinds of sin. Sin is that quality of man's fallen nature which inclines him to commit acts of sin. On the other hand, sin is a specific event of rebellion, transgression, or omission, in thought or practice.

Every individual inherits the sinful nature from Adam (Gen. 5:3; Rom. 5:12, 18). The Church has called this nature by such terms as "inbred sin," "inherited sin," "moral depravity," "the carnal mind," "the old man," and most commonly, "original sin." That the sinful nature leads

to acts of sin is stated by the apostle Paul in Rom. 7:7-9. There Paul testifies that he was spiritually alive as an innocent child, but when the years of accountability arrived, his sinful nature impelled him to transgress. This brought guilt and death.

Acts of sin must be confessed, forsaken, and forgiven (Isa. 55:7; Luke 13:3, 5; Acts 17:30; 1 John 1:9). The sinful nature must be confessed, deplored, and cleansed. Cleansing happened to the first Christian disciples, to the Samaritan believers, and to the house of Cornelius when they were filled with the Holy Spirit (Acts 15:8-9). In many ways the Thessalonian Christians were exemplary when Paul wrote his first Epistle to them (1 Thess. 1:5-10). Yet he desired that they have complete cleansing from sin (5:23). Peter shows that holiness must extend to every activity of the believer's life (1 Pet. 1:14-16).

Christ came to save from acts of sin and to destroy the sinful disposition (Matt. 1:21; Rom. 6:6; 12:1-4). He died that His people might be sanctified (Eph. 5:25; Heb. 13:12). Holiness is necessary if any person would see the Lord (12:14). Those who truly desire to be filled with God's righteousness are assured of its complete availability (Matt. 5:6).

See LEGAL SIN (ETHICAL SIN), ORIGINAL SIN, FALL (THE), FAILURE, SINNING RELIGION, INIQUITY, LIABILITY TO SIN, INFIRMITY, MISTAKES, SINLESS PERFECTION.

For Further Reading: Purkiser, ed., *Exploring Our Christian Faith*; Dubarle, *The Biblical Doctrine of Original Sin*; Taylor, *A Right Conception of Sin*; GMS, 268-302; Wiley, CT, 2:51-140; Metz, *Studies in Biblical Holiness*, 52-85; Geiger, *The Word and the Doctrine*, 47-136.

W. RALPH THOMPSON

SIN, ORIGIN OF. Our world, with all of its suffering, grief, and tragedy, is a very different world from the "very good" world described in Genesis 1—2. The further biblical records in chap. 3 and throughout the Bible accounts for this evil as the result of man's disobedience to a known and clearly understood command of God. Therefore, although God is the Creator and Sovereign Ruler of all things, He is not thereby the author of sin.

Genesis describes the divine-human relationship as unique, compared with the other forms of life. Into man was breathed the "breath of life," by which he became a creature in God's own image, able to have fellowship with God and to hold dominion over all other living creatures. While according to our best knowledge the animals obey God by instinct, a part of man's having the divine image was the gift of personality with all thereby connoted about free choice

and responsibility. Life at its highest is not instinctive or robotlike. It involves a free and loving relationship, maintained by active choice.

As personal creatures in a perfect world, it was the place and privilege of Adam and Eve to glorify the Creator by free and loving service. This would have been impossible without probation—some test by which they might demonstrate their love and glorification of God. Therefore the one forbidden tree stood in their midst, and the warning that in the day they ate of it, they would die.

It is often asked how holy beings such as Adam and Eve could have fallen into sin. This has been well spoken to as follows: "A will determined to do good with an omnipotent energy is not subject to change, but a will determined to do good with a finite and limited force is so subject" (Wiley, *CT*, 2:58). The finite will of a holy being can change or be induced to change, a profound and provocative fact for every entirely sanctified soul to consider.

The temptation and fall of man as described in Genesis 3 succinctly and adequately accounts for sin in human experience. Under the experience of deception and a solicitation to be more than the Creator had made them, the first pair allowed doubt to be stirred in their hearts, lingered in the presence of the tempter, and did that which was forbidden. Realizing something of their loss and guilt, they now dreaded to meet their glorious Creator.

In the reference to the serpent, it is necessary to realize the presence of the satanic. Without the person of Satan on the scene, deceiving the pair by an illusion and thus slandering the Creator, holy beings would never have fallen.

For the ultimate origin of sin, therefore, Christian theology is dependent upon what the Scriptures teach about the devil. A spiritual order of creation exists, angels from which order an unrevealed number did not keep their first estate, but fell (2 Pet. 2:4). Jesus declared, "I beheld, Satan as lightning fall from heaven" (Luke 10:18). It appears that Satan was the leader of the rebellion in heaven, and that within his personality as a holy and spirit creature of God, sin first originated. While Scripture speaks with great reserve on this subject, some see evidence that pride of his high rank in creation and the desire for greater glory was the cause of the original act of sin. From personality and freedom comes the power to glorify God forever or to rebel against Him and experience spiritual ruin.

See SIN, FALL (THE), SATAN, PROBATION, TEMPTATION.

For Further Reading: GMS, 79-83; Stevens, *Doctrines of the Christian Religion*, 154-55; Wiley, *CT*, 2:52-78.

MYRON D. GOLDSMITH

SIN OFFERING. Among the several kinds of sacrifices referred to in the OT, there is one category for dealing specifically with sin. Peculiar to Israel in this category is the sin offering, related to the word for sin which means "to miss the mark or fall short." The ritual to be used at the time of this offering is found in Lev. 4:1—5:13.

The sin offering was first of all to atone for sins of ignorance, which might come to light later. This is clearly reflected in the words of the RSV translation of the ritual mentioned above, "If any one sins unwittingly." Some willful sins could also be atoned for, such as deception and stealing, provided that, in addition to the animal sacrifice, full restitution be made (Lev. 6:1-7). But in either case, animal sacrifices were typical and anticipatory of the blood of Christ (Heb. 10:4).

A second significant point concerning the sin offering in the OT relates to a feature in the ritual accompanying the offering. It was required that the worshipper lay his hands upon the sacrifice, thereby identifying himself with the sacrifice which becomes his substitute. In like fashion, Christ, our Sin Offering, completely identified himself with us and became our Substitute on the Cross. It is in this light that we are to understand the words of Paul in 2 Cor. 5:21, "God made him who had no sin to be sin [fn., a sin offering] for us, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God" (NIV).

See ATONEMENT, SACRIFICE, OFFER (OFFERING).

For Further Reading: Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*; Oehler, *Theology of the Old Testament*; Oesterley, *Sacrifice in Ancient Israel*. ALVIN S. LAWHEAD

SINCERITY. The words "sincere" and "sincerity" are found in the KJV in the following NT passages: 1 Cor. 5:8; 2 Cor. 1:12; 2:17; 8:8; Eph. 6:24; Phil. 1:10, 16; Titus 2:7; and 1 Pet. 2:2. In these passages six different Greek words are being translated. The closest to our understanding of "sincerity" is *gnēsios*, "true, genuine." Paul reminded the Corinthians that their promptness and faithfulness in fulfilling their previous pledge toward the offering for the poor in Jerusalem would prove the "sincerity" of their love. Love that is all promise and no performance is insincere. Thus sincerity is measured by action, by follow-through, by willingness to sacrifice.

In sincerity there is a correspondence between beliefs and faith, between words and feelings. To believe certain doctrines sincerely is to be com-

mitted to them without secret equivocation. To love another sincerely is to love him or her exactly as one says he does (Rom. 12:9). To be sincere in one's commitment to Jesus Christ is to be obedient when it is costly.

Furthermore, sincerity is to be gauged by one's attitude toward the truth. To say that sincerity is all that matters is to demonstrate insincerity. Genuineness of commitment always attaches itself to the truth. The masses will be deceived by the Antichrist because they "did not receive the love of the truth" (2 Thess. 2:10, NASB)—which is to say, they were insincere in their professed interest in spiritual realities.

See TRUTH, CHARACTER, INTEGRITY, HONESTY.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

SINLESS PERFECTION. Wesleyanism has never taught "sinless perfection" in the form its critics have imputed to it. W. T. Purkiser observes that "one special whipping boy has been the phrase 'sinless perfection.' Few, if any, advocates of scriptural holiness use the term, but it is commonly used by opponents of the doctrine" (*Sanctification and Its Synonyms*, 69).

John Wesley said: "Absolute or infallible perfection I never contended for. Sinless perfection I do not contend for seeing it is not scriptural" (*Works*, 12:257). One reason is Wesleyanism's definition of perfection. It is the believer's heart that is made perfect in love; it is not a perfection of head or hand, and therefore not a perfection beyond the need of the atoning merits of Christ's blood.

A second reason for not using the term "sinless perfection" is Wesleyanism's definition of *sin*. Sin, "properly so-called"—a phrase popularized by John Wesley—is a voluntary transgression of a known law of God. Wesley refused to call involuntary transgressions sin, because he believed the intention or motivation of an act determined its moral quality. However, he knew that many Christians used the broader definition, and that, indeed, there was such a twofold use reflected in Scripture. The term "sinless perfection" is usually interpreted as implying sinlessness in the broader sense as well as the narrower.

A third liability in the term "sinless perfection" is that it seems to imply the impossibility of temptation. Wesleyans have never taught that any work or state of grace places the entirely sanctified beyond moral testing or trial. Temptation is not, however, sin.

Thomas Cook's comment is appropriate: "Some assert that the doctrine of entire extirpation of sin from the heart puts the soul be-

yond real temptation. 'There can be no real temptation,' they say, 'to a soul which has nothing in its nature responsive to solicitations to sin.' But such an assumption is much too broad. It renders angels in probation, Adam and Eve, and our Lord Himself, incapable of real temptation. But the fact that some angels fell, that Adam sinned, and that Jesus Christ 'was in all points tempted as we are,' should be sufficient proof that holy souls are capable of temptation" (*New Testament Holiness*, 16).

See CHRISTIAN PERFECTION, SIN, INFIRMITIES, TEMPTATION.

For Further Reading: Purkiser, *Sanctification and Its Synonyms*; Flew, *The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology*; Cook, *New Testament Holiness*.

NEIL E. HIGHTOWER

SINLESSNESS OF CHRIST. This term refers to the condition or state of moral purity in the Son of God before, during, and after His 33 years on earth. He was without either original or committed sin.

There was no original sin in Christ. The Jews believed that inherited depravity was transmitted from Adam through the male; but Christ was conceived of the Holy Spirit and was born without that sinful bias that belongs to all other members of the human race. The birth of the infant Christ was not a birth out of sinful human nature, but a conjoining of the human nature from Mary with the divine nature of the Holy Spirit. In a sense, Christ was sanctified by this conception. Because of this, Christ was perfect in His relation to His Heavenly Father from His birth, and absolutely free from the sinful bias which is characteristic of every other son of Adam.

Christ was also free from committed sin: "Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth" (1 Pet. 2:22). As a child, He was obedient: "He went down with them, and came to Nazareth, and was subject unto them" (Luke 2:51). As a youth, He was respectful and upright: "And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man" (v. 52). As a man, He was "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens" (Heb. 7:26).

The question is often asked in reference to the temptation of Christ (Matt. 4:1-11), "Could Christ have sinned?" The technical terms around which the debate has raged have been *peccability*, "capable of sinning," and *impeccability*, "incapable of sinning." As a man with a free will Jesus could have sinned. The temptation was not

a charade, but very real. As Second Adam He was exposed to the power and peril of real options. Yet His unity with the Father was such that disobedience was a moral impossibility. While He may have felt the force of Satan's appeals, there was in Him no wavering, but instant and total loyalty to His Father.

Christ not only loved righteousness, He hated sin. He was always strong in applauding right, and equally strong in denouncing evil. The holiness of Christ was full-orbed as well as spotless. A full manifestation of holiness does not consist merely in doing nothing wrong, but in doing all that is right. Christ exemplified all of that in His own life.

It was the sinlessness of Christ which qualified Him to give His life as an atoning sacrifice for others.

See TEMPTATION OF CHRIST, CHRISTOLOGY, HUMANITY OF CHRIST.

For Further Reading: Miley, *Systematic Theology*, 2:246; Newell, *Hebrews Verse by Verse*, 147-50; GMS, 350; Westcott, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 107; Wiley, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 163-64. DONALD R. PETERMAN

SINNING RELIGION. The term really should be in quotes—"sinning religion"—for it is meaningless excepting as a colloquial symbol of a common doctrine of sin. The belief is that Christians cannot avoid sin, that in fact, every Christian sins "in thought, word, and deed" every day. This pessimism concerning the possibilities of the Christian life is very pervasive and widespread, among Lutherans, Reformed, and even some Arminians. Not all would express themselves as crassly or extremely, but they share one thing in common—a doubt concerning the adequacy of grace to save from sinning in the practical wear and tear of everyday life.

Whether this produces the chronic grief of chronic defeat, or dull indifference to what is a habitual way of life, or even elation and buoyancy in the belief that the sinning doesn't really matter anyway, depends upon the soteriological foundations on which the sinning religion is based. An antinomianism which understands grace to mean deliverance from obligation to the moral law will of course foster a high-handed libertarianism of life-style, all within the framework of Christian profession and religious activity. Generally in the theological background is some form of "finished salvation" and "imputed righteousness" which makes salvation depend entirely on the objective validity of the Atonement, the benefits of which are unconditionally the nonforfeitable possession of the elect. In this

scheme the sins are already forgiven anyway, therefore need be no cause for serious concern.

Some few are sufficiently spiritually sensitive to know that holiness is the biblical standard, and that sinning should be avoided, certainly not taken lightly; but they experience no power by which they are enabled to avoid sinning, and in their doctrinal system they know of none. Their system postulates a failure in the scheme of divine redemption, which provides salvation from guilt now and sin's power and presence in the next life, but offers no promise of complete victory over sin now.

The "sinning religion" complex is rooted not only in an inadequate doctrine of grace, and a radically erroneous doctrine of the Atonement, but also in a faulty doctrine of sin. That man out of grace is a mass of corruption is undeniable, but that he remains such as a Christian makes mockery of the saving power of Christ, and insults the sanctifying efficacy of the Holy Spirit's influences. But this affront to the power of grace is due in part to (1) the hangover of Augustinianism's attachment of sinfulness to the physical body, and (2) the notion that sin is to be defined by the letter of the law rather than by the spirit. Those who cannot see the moral difference between sins and mistakes, or between the disease of sin and its scars, or between a carnal disposition and human infirmities, will of course have no place for any true freedom from sin.

But if "love is the fulfilling of the law" (Rom. 13:10), then the nonfulfillment of the law—i.e., sin—should be defined in terms of love. Love is a matter of heart—of motives, intentions, affections, priorities; not a matter of hair-splitting details of external performance. Sin cannot properly be ascribed to an attitude of true love or a deed truly done in love, even though the deed itself may be mistaken or even wrong. Of course the doer must be open to light respecting the rightness or wrongness of the deed; if he is not amenable, the deed becomes sin; but in such a case the defect is a defect of love. Since love "worketh no ill to his neighbour," it will naturally desire to know what may or may not be harmful to the neighbor—which is to say, love always listens, is "easy to be intreated" (the true wisdom, Jas. 3:17), therefore always sensitive, teachable, improving. And these are the focal points of blameworthiness or blamelessness, which means the focal points of sin. Any other view of sin destroys its moral content and reduces it to an accident or a misfortune, not a misdeed.

The indictments which can be leveled against a "sinning religion" philosophy of Christianity

are grave. (1) It inevitably breeds either chronic spiritual depression or presumptuous carelessness. If one expects to sin daily, he doubtless will; indeed, he will not be likely to struggle very hard to avoid doing so. (2) The attitude of impotence impresses itself upon the church, resulting in either an incubus of nominalism or a frenzy of churchly activities to cover up the spiritual poverty. (3) It gives the lie to commands and promises in the Bible. For instance, the doctrine of a sinning religion is totally irreconcilable with 1 John 3:1-10. But the NT is teeming with passages of similar import (cf. Matt. 1:21; John 17:15; Rom. 6:1-2, 11-22; 8:1-4; 2 Cor. 7:1; 1 John 2:1; et al.). Christians are commanded to "make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof" (Rom. 13:14). Our doctrine of sin should allow for successful obedience to this command. If it does not, we had better change it.

Perhaps the fourth indictment is the most sobering of all. (4) The doctrine of a sinning religion imprints on the entire redemptive scheme the stamp of abysmal failure. The Savior is unable to save from the *one* enemy—sin—*where* we most need salvation—on earth—*when* we most need it—now. Satan remains stronger than Christ, sin stronger than grace, and the believer's death must be appended to the Cross to make the Blood adequately effective in its sanctifying efficacy.

While Wesley refused to use the term "sinless perfection," and Wesleyans generally disavow it, there is a sense in which sinless perfection is the only kind Wesleyans do believe in. The term is objectionable because of its unintended connotations. But if it is proper for Wesleyans to profess belief in "perfect love," and if sin is defined in terms of love, then, while "faultless perfection" would miss the mark, "sinless perfection" does not really merit the reproach generally heaped upon it.

Notwithstanding that digressing consideration, the conclusion is that for Christians to talk about continual or even frequent sinning is no credit to them, and certainly a dishonor to their Lord. Only one biblical advice is to be given to sinners: Stop it!

See SIN, HOLINESS, SINLESS PERFECTION, INTENTION, PERFECT LOVE, MISTAKES, INFIRMITIES, LIABILITY TO SIN, CALVINISM.

For Further Reading: Purkiser, *Conflicting Concepts of Holiness*; Brockett, *Scriptural Freedom from Sin*; Sweeten, *Sinning Saints*; Taylor, *A Right Conception of Sin*; Fletcher, *Checks to Antinomianism*. RICHARD S. TAYLOR

SINS AGAINST THE SPIRIT. Sins against the Holy Spirit may be listed as (1) grieving Him (Eph.

4:30); (2) quenching the Spirit (1 Thess. 5:19); (3) resisting the Spirit (Acts 7:51); (4) attempting to commercialize the power of the Spirit (8:19-20); (5) trifling with the Spirit (Heb. 6:4-6); (6) despising the Spirit (10:29); and (7) blaspheming the Spirit (Matt. 12:31-32).

When the above scriptures are examined in context, it becomes clear that warnings against grieving, quenching, trifling, and despising are directed to Christians. These sins represent progressively grave stages in apostatizing. To grieve the Spirit is to make Him sad because of conduct unbecoming to a Christian which dishonors Christ (Eph. 4:25-32). Furthermore, to grieve the Spirit by careless insensitivity to His rebuke and guidance is to deprive ourselves of that degree of His power so much needed and which He desires to give. A grieved Holy Spirit is forced to stand on the sidelines of life.

Quenching the Spirit is putting out the fire. The promised baptism with the Spirit included "and fire" (Matt. 3:11); and when He came at Pentecost, it was to the accompaniment of symbolic "tongues as of fire" (Acts 2:3, NASB). Some people want the Spirit, but not His fire, and as a consequence they become cold and powerless. Where the Spirit is honored, there will be intensity, fervency, emotion, joy. Both the prayers and the preaching will be "hot," animated not with the wildfire of fanaticism but the energizing, purifying, controlled fire of the Spirit.

Trifling and despising are related both in meaning and in biblical context. To experience the awakening and regenerating ministration of the Spirit, then turn away is to trifle with divine grace and expose oneself to final apostasy (Heb. 6:4-6). The language of 10:28-29 is even stronger. To turn from Christ back to Moses is to insult the "Spirit of grace" who was the Agent in the Virgin Birth, in the anointing and enabling of Christ in His earthly ministry, and through whom Christ "offered Himself without blemish to God" for our redemption (Heb. 9:14, NASB).

Only the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is specifically designated unforgivable. However, all sins against the Spirit are fatal if persisted in. This is true because in the "economic" roles of the members of the Trinity it is the Spirit with whom the human race is in immediate contact. It is through the Spirit that awakening, repentance, and faith are possible; it is by means of the Spirit that we reach the Son and the Father. To cut ourselves off from the Spirit is to cut ourselves off from God.

Some maintain that even though we do grieve the Spirit, the "seal" remains unbroken; the Spirit

will never leave the heart in which He has taken up residence. If so, the above warnings are without meaning. Sins against the Spirit are sins, and like all other sins bring eternal condemnation unless forsaken and forgiven. As Robert Shank says, "The Holy Comforter cannot continue to dwell in men who close their hearts against His loving ministry" (*Life in the Son*, 118).

See SIN, HOLY SPIRIT, ECONOMIC TRINITY, PERSONALITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, UNPARDONABLE SIN, SEAL.

For Further Reading: Shank, *Life in the Son*, 103-18; Stauffer, "When He Is Come," 170-76; Steele, *The Gospel of the Comforter*, 232-45, 267-71.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

SITUATION ETHICS. See NEW MORALITY.

SKEPTICISM. Skepticism is an attitude of doubt and wariness toward dogma. In its milder form it is a safeguard against credulity, but in its more radical forms it denies the possibility of certain knowledge. As a philosophical stance skepticism has its roots in Greek thought; perhaps its most famous modern exponent was David Hume (1711-76).

Skepticism gained prominence in the 17th century as a reaction against the well-meaning Scholasticism which sought to "remove doubt wherever possible" from religion by depending upon reason rather than revelation (Rowen, *A History of Early Modern Europe*, 600). In this attempt the stress was shifted from the faith element in Christianity to reason; but reason was inadequate to prove miracles and other supernatural aspects of biblical revelation. As a result the pendulum swung to skepticism. Thus the effort to protect religion from doubt by substituting reason for revelation became counterproductive.

While devout Christians may by temperament or on principle be skeptical in scientific and other secondary areas of knowledge, they cannot advertise themselves as skeptics in relation to the core of biblical claims. As an epistemological position skepticism is irreconcilable with Christian theology, which postulates historical veracity for the claims of biblical revelation and demands complete and open intellectual commitment.

See UNBELIEF, DOUBT, EPISTEMOLOGY, TRUTH, FAITH.

For Further Reading: Beecher, *Lecture on Scepticism*; Rowen, *History of Early Modern Europe*; McDowell, *Evidence That Demands a Verdict*. MERNE A. HARRIS

SLAVE, SLAVERY. The most common NT word for slave is *doulos* and designates one who is in subjection to a master, whether the master be a per-

son or a passion or influence. Both John and Paul refer to those who are slaves to sin or to righteousness (John 8:34; Rom. 6:16). The writers of the Epistles refer to themselves as *christou doulos*, Christ's slave (cf. Gal. 1:10; 2 Pet. 1:1; Jude 1).

Slavery as an institution has existed from antiquity. Men were usually enslaved as punishment for misbehavior, as captives in war, or to fill the need for laborers. Aristotle saw all barbarians (non-Greeks) as slaves by nature rather than by circumstance. Plato's ideal state was dependent upon a large slave class.

The NT does not condemn slavery directly. Rather it accepts slavery as a contemporary social fact but deals with master-slave relationships so as to render slavery meaningless if not unjustifiable. Slaves and masters are brothers. In Christ all are one, there is no bond or free (Gal. 3:28; Eph. 6:9; Philemon).

The Apostolic Church looked upon slaves as brothers and equals. The post-Apostolic Church admitted slaves to all rights of the Church, some becoming priests and even bishops. Church collections were often used to purchase freedom for slaves, and the freeing of slaves was considered praiseworthy (Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, 168-70).

See SOCIAL ETHICS, MAN, BROTHERHOOD.

For Further Reading: Westermann, *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*, 327-51; Maclaren, "Peter," *Expositions of Holy Scripture*, 215-24.

M. ESTES HANEY

SOCIAL ETHICS. The Christian is always concerned with the question, What does God require of me? But he is also confronted with the problem of what society requires. How he reacts to such social requirements in harmony with God's will constitutes the field of social ethics.

Man is by nature a social creature. Everything he does affects others; that is, all his actions have social consequences. And what is right or wrong morally is usually influenced by community standards. Thus man usually acts as a group member and behaves according to what his group approves or disapproves. And when he acts, he is faced with concern for his person-to-person relationships, his relationship to society, and his own personal responsibility in his social behavior.

Christianity is both personal and social. It is impossible to be saintly in isolation. And this personal/social matrix in which we are born and nurtured exhibits several problems which confront the believer. First of all, there is the tension which exists between the interests of the individ-

ual versus the demands of society or the state. The Christian must decide whether in obeying God he is also right in obeying man, that is, the state. He must render unto Caesar, it is true, but what is Caesar? God commands us to obey the ordinances of man. Is there any place to draw the line between conformity and nonconformity? This the Christian must face.

A second area of problems concerns man's relationship to others, the problem of group decisions. Sometimes one must go along with group opinion which is different from his own; sometimes one must stick by his own decision when it is contrary to that of his group. Both human wisdom and the leadership of the Holy Spirit are essential.

A third problem area concerns the relations of group to group. The familiar church and state relationship is a good example of this problem. The ecumenical movement to unite denominations into one group is another.

A fourth area of problems lies in the plural nature of society. In the Middle Ages the unity of society was effected by the overwhelming influence of the church. Today, religious diversity, ethnic heterogeneity, cultural variety, and the other cultural varieties unloosed by the Renaissance and the Reformation have made social pluralism the character of Western civilization.

All these complexities tend to make social ethics a most difficult area for Christians. Fortunately, such need not be the case. The Bible, and particularly the NT, contains teachings which apply to every social situation. The example and teachings of Jesus, the attitude of always considering the good of others, the importance of holy motives for all personal conduct, plus simple faith that one is trying to obey God will make every social decision a moral one. In these conditions one can always be right ethically even when judgment is immature or even mistaken.

See CHRISTIAN ETHICS, ETHICS, DUTY, WORK (WORKS), SOCIAL HOLINESS, NONCONFORMITY, WORLD (WORLDLINESS), LIFE-STYLE.

For Further Reading: DeWolf, *Responsible Freedom*; Wirt, *The Social Conscience of the Evangelical*; Muelder, *Moral Law in Christian Social Ethics*; Smith, *Revivalism and Social Reform*.
OTHO JENNINGS

SOCIAL HOLINESS. This is holiness in its interpersonal and societal relationships. When John Wesley said that he knew of no holiness but social holiness, he was repudiating the monastic premise that holiness was possible only in isolation, with complete concentration being given to the relation of the soul with its God. This, in

Wesley's view, was a perversion of Christianity, for it completely missed the social emphasis of the Bible. Holiness was possible in the midst of everyday life, including the home, the marketplace, and the factory; in fact, holiness which was not practiced in the normal affairs of life was illusory.

Social holiness perceives that Christian love is more than minimal legal righteousness but a practical concern with the total person, and with the social structures which affect the person. Wesley raised money for the poor, found jobs for the unemployed, provided medicine for the sick, started schools for the unlearned, and arranged loans for the destitute. But he also opposed evil systems, such as the institution of slavery.

However, while traditionally holiness people have not minimized the importance of the political process, their major energies have been expended in evangelism. This reflects their realistic view of human sinfulness, which provides no basis for trust in social reform alone, apart from the sanctifying influences of the gospel.

See SOCIAL ETHICS, HOLINESS, SIN.

For Further Reading: Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism from 1865-1915*; Mouw, *Political Evangelism*; Thompson, *John Wesley as a Social Reformer*.
MERNE A. HARRIS

SOCIAL WELFARE. The term *social welfare* is synonymous with the term *social work* when the reference is to functions of federal, state, and local governments. In private and/or religious programs, terms like *charity* and *benevolence* are commonly used. So far as publicly supported programs are concerned, there were few examples before the New Deal programs of the 1930s and afterward. But the concept of charity among Christians is as old or older than Christianity itself.

Traditionally, Christians have been taught to love and care for their families, neighbors, and even strangers. The words of Jesus, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me" (Matt. 25:40), are often cited as a principle of charitable consideration.

The welfare movement of today has its roots in the Christian concept of charity. The early colonists had strong religious influences. Theoretically there should have been affluence enough to care for all the needy. However, the sinful complications of the day plus the growing number of different sects, together with the weaknesses of the religious organizations, soon made their efforts at charity inadequate.

The result was that the colonies tried various adaptations of the Elizabethan Poor Laws which they had known in England. These programs were administered by the colonial officials in one way or another, and thus became the first examples of public responsibility for social welfare.

Not all social work, however, is accounted for by public funds and agencies. Numerous church auxiliaries, plus parachurch groups, such as World Vision and World Human Fund, dispense money, goods, and services on a huge, worldwide scale. The Salvation Army is famous for its effective social service. Among the nonchurch movements the best known is United Way, sponsored by community businesses for the support of local charitable agencies.

Since social work/welfare has been defined theoretically as the art of applying professional skill to help people to learn how to help themselves solve their problems, there is good reason to think that social work at its best should be a Christian service of love to mankind. For this reason there exists an organization known as the National Association of Christians in Social Work. The members are professionals who have dedicated themselves to applying Christian principles in connection with their work in social welfare.

See SOCIAL HOLINESS, SOCIAL ETHICS, LABOR.

For Further Reading: Geisler, *Ethics: Alternatives and Issues*, 178-95.

OTHO JENNINGS

SOCINIANISM. This is the name given to the Unitarian teachings of Faustus Socinus (1539-1604) and later persons who taught similarly. The Racovian Catechism (1605), based on his writings, outlines his Unitarian and generally liberal teachings. His Arian-like denial of the deity of Christ and the Holy Spirit contributed to the Latitudinarian liberalism within the Church of England in the 17th and 18th centuries.

See LATITUDINARIANISM, LIBERALISM, UNITARIANISM.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

SOCIOLOGY. In its primary sense, sociology is the analysis of social structures, orders, and styles, in contrast to the personal or individual. Sociology describes the interaction of persons in community; racial characteristics; aberrant behavior such as delinquency or criminal activity; marriage and family; the statistical evaluation of group activity and population trends; and it develops "labels" or "types" which describe various groups having similar interests.

Sociology assesses religious groups and behavior. Sociology of religion is one approach to the

study of religion. It considers denominational patterns, theological commitments, regional religious differences, and religious attitudes. Describing an area of the United States as the Bible Belt is a sociological label. The sociologist of religion describes religious values but does not as sociologist make value judgments about religious attitudes. While theology is a normative science which sets forth standards of value for life and behavior, sociology is a descriptive science which systematically describes theological viewpoints, groupings, etc. The discipline of sociology has no competency to judge the worth of a theological concept like "revelation."

One of the most valuable results of sociology is the way it classifies religious diversity. As the botanist classifies plant life for purposes of study, the sociologist classifies religious patterns, orders, and opinions. H. Richard Niebuhr's *Christ and Culture* is a classic example of the sociology of religion. Niebuhr proposes types of interaction between the church and the world. The "Christ Against Culture" type describes those Christians who oppose the world's structures—for example, politics—seeking to avoid contact with its evil influences. Descriptions of the various types of Christianity—liberal, conservative, fundamentalist, evangelical, holiness, or Pentecostal—are as often sociological types as they are descriptions of theological differences. Charles Jones's *Perfectionist Persuasion* is a fine sociological study of the holiness movement in America.

Andrew Greeley's *Denominational Society* is an example of the sociological study which assesses structural, organizational, and religious differences. Studies like these offer insight through statistics, graphs, and surveys. Jones is particularly helpful.

See SOCIAL HOLINESS, SOCIAL ETHICS, SOCIAL WELFARE.

For Further Reading: *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*; Moberg, *Inasmuch*; Wach, *Types of Religious Experience*; Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture*.

LEON O. HYNSON

SON OF GOD. This term is used in Scripture primarily to signify the unique relation of God's only begotten Son to the Father and the spiritual relationship made possible for all men to God through the atoning work of that Son.

To understand the term in any particular passage, one needs to be familiar with its usage throughout the Scriptures. It seldom occurs in the OT. It is more frequently found in the Synoptics. It is almost ever present by implication in

John. It is commonplace in Paul and the rest of the NT.

Three expressions are found in the OT which are translatable by "son[s] of God": *ben elohim*, *ben elim*, *bar Elahin*. The last occurs in Dan. 3:25 and refers to the supernatural presence that the three Hebrews found accompanying them in the fiery furnace. The second occurs in Ps. 29:1 and 89:7. Here the term seems to indicate supernatural beings, but not divine, who are part of the divine court. The first term occurs in Gen. 6:2, 4, and Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7. The references in Job are clearly to supernatural beings who appear before God. It is sometimes translated "angel." The references in Genesis are debatable. It is this writer's conviction that it refers to some in the lineage of Seth who were characterized by a spiritual relationship to God not common among the sons of Cain. This anticipates the second usage of this term in the NT. The line between the Creator and the creature is so sharply drawn in the OT that the thought of a procreative relationship between Yahweh and any of His creatures is completely alien. The preservation of that distinction is basic to a clear understanding of the use of the Fatherhood of God and the Sonship of Jesus in the NT.

In the Synoptic Gospels Jesus is identified as the "Son of God." Mark does this in the title line of his Gospel (1:1). The angel who announces to Mary that she is to have a child informs her that he is to be called "the Son of God" (Luke 1:35). The voice from heaven at the Baptism calls Him "my beloved Son" (Mark 1:11). The same voice on the Mountain of Transfiguration repeats that identification (9:7). Demons whom Jesus exorcises recognize in Him the divine Son (5:7). Satan in the Temptation demands that He prove that He really is (Matt. 4:3, 6). Peter affirms this at Caesarea Philippi (16:16). The priests put His claim to Sonship at the heart of their argument for His crucifixion (26:63). The centurion at the Crucifixion bears the same witness as that with which Mark begins his Gospel (Mark 15:39; cf. 1:1).

Jesus, however, rarely used the designation of himself. He preferred the term "Son of man" or simply "Son." He did not deny His divine Sonship. He acts in the Gospels as if this were a saving secret which He will wait for men through faith and illumination to discover, rather than simply repeat a proposition in which they have been indoctrinated. It is in moments of intimacy in the Synoptics when He acknowledges His identity (Matt. 11:25-26) or else in ambiguous parable when He tests men (21:33-46; 22:1-14).

So the centurion sees (Mark 15:39) what Israel's leaders had no hearts to understand (14:60-65).

John's usage is another story. The Father-Son relationship is almost omnipresent in John as Jesus' view of His relationship to God. Usually, though, He uses just "Son" without qualification or the term "Son of man." Only three times does one find the expression "Son of God" used by Christ of himself (5:25; 10:36; 11:4). There is no question, though, for His hearers as to what He meant. Nathanael (1:49), Martha (11:27), and the apostle himself identify Him (1:18; 20:31). More dramatically, the religious leadership is ready to destroy Him because He claimed equality with God (5:18; 19:7). They understood His claim to a unique and generative relationship with God. To help us understand this, John uses the expression "only begotten" (1:14, 18; 3:16, 18).

John not only establishes the unique and divine Sonship which Jesus enjoys with the Father, but he introduces the kind of sonship which others may enjoy with the Father (1:12). He develops this further in his First Epistle (3:1-2). This sonship is spiritual and imparts new life but is not a generative relationship. It comes as a gift to those who discover the nature of the unique relationship of Jesus Christ to the Father and believe in the only begotten One (John 20:31).

Paul now is free to use the term "Son of God" of Jesus Christ to indicate His deity and is able to use the same term "son of God" of the believer to reflect his relationship by faith through grace into the spiritual family of God. Christ's Sonship speaks of essential and eternal nature. Our sonship is a divine gift of adoptive relationship and spiritual regeneration which does not alter our nature as creatures. This twofold usage of the term occurs consistently throughout the rest of the NT writings.

See CHRISTOLOGY, ETERNALLY BEGOTTEN, ETERNAL GENERATION, SON OF MAN, ADOPTION, REGENERATION.

For Further Reading: Nineham, *The Gospel of St. Mark*; Baker's *DT*, 117-23; Kittel, 8:359-97; Botterweck and Ringgren, eds., *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, 2:157-59; GMS, 303-20.

DENNIS F. KINLAW

SON OF MAN. In the OT, this phrase is characteristically a poetic synonym for "man" as a weak creature before God and yet possessing great dignity compared to the rest of creation (cf. Num. 23:19; Ps. 8:4; 144:3; 146:3; Isa. 51:12; 56:2; Jer. 49:18; 50:40; 51:43). Likewise the plural refers to "humankind" (e.g., Ps. 4:2; 33:13; Prov. 8:4, 31; Eccles. 3:18f; Isa. 52:14; Dan. 5:21; 10:16; Joel

1:12; Mic. 5:7). "Son of man" occurs over 90 times in Ezekiel (e.g., 2:1, 3, 6, 8) as Yahweh's designation of the prophet. Daniel is similarly identified in Dan. 8:17 (cf. 10:11, 19). Although "the son of man" in Ps. 80:17 is used synonymously with "man," in its context it appears as a collective symbol for the nation of Israel.

In the important apocalyptic vision of Daniel 7, after four beastlike kings are stripped of their rule, "one like a son of man" is given everlasting dominion (vv. 13 ff, RSV) by the Ancient of Days. In the subsequent interpretation this one is identified with "[the people of] the saints of the Most High" (vv. 18, 22, 25, 27, RSV), i.e., Israel. The pre-Christian date and influence of the non-canonical developments of Daniel 7's Son of man figure have been vigorously disputed (cf. the *Similitudes of Enoch*; 4 Ezra 1 and 13; and the *Jewish Sibylline Oracles* 5). A resemblance exists with pre-Christian Oriental myths of the Primal Man and Adam speculations.

The rather inelegant Greek expression *ho huios tou anthrōpou*, "the Son of man," is a very literal translation of the Hebrew *ben ad-am* and Aramaic *bar nas-ha/nash/enosh*. The expression occurs 81 or 82 times in the Gospels; of these 69 are in the Synoptics. There are no real exceptions to its exclusive use by Jesus (cf. Luke 24:7; John 12:34). The four other NT instances (Acts 7:56 [cf. Luke 12:8]; Heb. 2:6-8; Rev. 1:13; 14:14) refer to Jesus, employing OT quotations.

In Jesus' time "Son of man" was sometimes used idiomatically to avoid the pronoun "I," but it apparently was not a current messianic title. Its titular use in the Gospels is therefore unique (cf. e.g., Mark 8:27 = Matt. 16:13; Mark 8:31 = Matt. 16:21). The evangelists never find it necessary to explain the enigmatic expression, and no one is ever reported to have found Jesus' self-reference difficult (but cf. John 12:34).

Three groups of Synoptic Son of Man sayings have been distinguished: (1) Apocalyptic sayings which refer to His future coming (e.g., Mark 8:38; Matt. 24:27, 37, 39; Luke 12:8 ff; 11:30; 17:30); (2) Present sayings which refer to Jesus' earthly activity (e.g., Mark 2:10, 28; Matt. 8:20; 11:18 ff); and (3) Suffering sayings which predict Jesus' passion and resurrection (e.g., Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33 ff; 14:21, 41).

John employs "Son of man" as one of many essentially equivalent Christological titles. Paul's "Second Adam" doctrine (cf. Rom. 5:12-21; 1 Cor. 15:21 ff, 45-49; Phil. 2:6-11) is perhaps an attempt to reconstruct the "Son of Man" concept for a non-Jewish milieu. In later Hellenistic Christianity "Son of Man" comes to be con-

trasted with the title "Son of God" to indicate Jesus' humanity (cf. Epistle of Barnabas 12:10; Ignatius' *Letter to the Ephesians* 20:2).

See CHRIST, SON OF GOD, CHRISTOLOGY, MESSIAH.

For Further Reading: Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History*; Colpe, "ho huios tou anthrōpou," Kittel, 8:400-477; Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, 137-92; Fuller, *The Foundation of New Testament Christology*; Johnson, "Son of Man," IDB, 4:413-20; Ladd, *The Presence of the Future*; Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*; GMS, 306-12.

GEORGE LYONS

SON OF PERDITION. See PERDITION, SON OF PERDITION.

SORCERY. According to the biblical view, sorcery is an attempt to use spirit-world powers to influence either people or events and is regarded as a grave sin in the same category with idolatry.

Sorcery is a complex topic, and a comprehensive overview will lead to a survey of magic and witchcraft as well. Sorcery may be associated with divination, which is soothsaying in its broadest sense, i.e., the revelation of secrets from the past, present, and future. Sorcery used in this way is associated with the supernatural, though no attempt may be made to influence events by supernatural means. In biblical times the sorcerer may have used demonic powers to deceive an inquirer or impress him with his own mystical powers.

Sorcery is especially attractive to primitive peoples where there is an ignorance of natural law. However, the view that world affairs are governed by the unseen and irrational is also found among civilized people.

Sorcery is noted in the OT in such references as Exod. 22:18; Lev. 20:6; and Deut. 18:10-14. A survey of these verses strongly impresses the reader that sorcery is associated with idolatry and is always condemned even to the point of the death penalty. Not only is this condemnation found in the Torah, but the prophets also note that the wrath of God comes upon Israel because of openness to magic (Isa. 47:9).

The significant fact for the believer and the curious is that there is no doubt about the spiritual reality behind occult powers. These powers can only be resisted and defeated through the power and blood of Christ.

See SATAN, SATAN WORSHIP, DEMONS (DEMON POSSESSION), OCCULT (OCCULTISM), SPIRITUALISM (SPIRITISM).

For Further Reading: Hauck, "Sorcery and Soothsaying," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious*

Knowledge, 2:6-9; Kitchen, "Magic and Sorcery," *NBD*, 766-71; Kittel, 4:356-59.

LARRY FINE

SORROW. See SUFFER, SUFFERING.

SOTERIOLOGY. Soteriology (*soteria* = salvation + *logos* = word) is that branch of Christian theology which treats the doctrines of salvation, including (1) atonement for sin—the provision of salvation through Christ; and (2) salvation from sin—the application of salvation by the Spirit.

Christ's death on the Cross atones for man's sin as a conditional substitute for the penalty due the sinner. Thus the Atonement is vicarious, substitutionary, and sufficient for all. It is foreshadowed in OT sacrifice and prophetic prediction and is motivated by God's love. Atonement is termed propitiation (1 John 2:2; Rom. 3:25), redemption (v. 24; 1 Cor. 6:20; Gal. 3:13), ransom (Matt. 20:28; 1 Tim. 2:6); and reconciliation (Rom. 5:10-11; Col. 1:20-22).

Atonement has been provided for all (2 Cor. 5:14-15; Heb. 2:9; 1 John 2:2). Its unconditional benefits include the continued existence of our race, man's restoration to salvability, God's prevenient grace leading man to repentance, the salvation of infants, and continued intercession by Christ. The conditional benefits of the Atonement are all God's saving ministries to the soul.

The Holy Spirit administers the plan and provision of redemption. Through the Spirit and the Word God's gracious call is available to mankind (Rev. 22:17). God's prevenient grace provides mercy (Rom. 2:4), the Spirit convicts of sin (John 16:8), draws (6:44), and works with man's free will in every step the soul takes toward God.

Repentance for sin is essential to salvation (Luke 13:2-5; Acts 3:19; 17:30), along with saving faith (Rom. 1:16; 10:10; Eph. 2:8). Repentance is proved by godly sorrow for sin (2 Cor. 7:9-10) and forsaking sin (Matt. 3:8). This turning from sin to God is called conversion (18:3; Jas. 5:19-20).

Justification is the gracious, judicial act of God declaring the repentant sinner forgiven, released from the penalty of his sins, and accepted as righteous. It is received by grace (not by man's works) through faith (Rom. 3:24-25; 5:1; Eph. 2:8) and through Christ's shed blood (Heb. 9:12).

Regeneration is the mighty change produced by the Holy Spirit by which man is born of God (John 1:12-13), is born of the Spirit (3:5-6), passes from death to life (5:24), is made alive (Col. 2:13), is made a new creation (2 Cor. 5:17), becomes a child of God (John 1:12), and receives a new nature (2 Pet. 1:4). The evidences of regen-

eration are the witness of the Spirit with the believer's spirit (i.e., a twofold witness) (Rom. 8:16; 1 John 5:6, 10), victory over sin (3:9; 5:4, 18), God's overflowing love (Rom. 5:5), love for God's Word (1 John 5:2-3), love for the unsaved (2 Cor. 5:14); love for other Christians (1 John 4:19—5:1), spiritual joy (Rom. 5:2, 11; 14:17), and peace with God (5:1; 14:17).

Adoption is God's declaratory act receiving us into His family and giving us the privilege of sonship, filial confidence, and eternal inheritance with Christ (Rom. 8:15-17; 1 Pet. 1:4).

Initial sanctification occurs at regeneration. Entire sanctification (the infilling of the Spirit) occurs at that moment subsequent to regeneration when the believer totally surrenders in consecration (Rom. 12:1-2) and faith (Acts 26:18). Its instantaneous nature is indicated by the aorist tense used in the verses referring to this experience of grace. The Spirit cleanses (Acts 15:9; 2 Cor. 7:1; Titus 2:14) and fills with God's holy love (Rom. 5:5; 1 Pet. 1:22). Progressive sanctification is growth in spiritual maturity, aided by the Spirit (2 Cor. 3:17-18; Eph. 4:13).

See ATONEMENT, SALVATION, SANCTIFICATION.

For Further Reading: Wiley, *CT*, 1:24; 2:217-517; Ralston, *Elements of Divinity*, 193-472; Harvey, *A Handbook of Theological Terms*, 224. WESLEY L. DUEWEL

SOUL. The soul is the personal self. Generally the term is used in distinction, even in contrast, to the physical body; at other times it represents the entire person, including the body.

The term "soul" is found 494 times in the KJV. All but two cases are translations of the Hebrew *nephesh* in the OT and its Greek equivalent, *psuchē*, in the NT. Purkiser points out that *nephesh* is used 756 times in the OT but is translated "soul" in only 428 instances. Other meanings are "life," "self," "person," "desire," "appetite," "emotion," and "passion" (GMS, 71). Both *nephesh* and *psuchē* are bewilderingly flexible, and move from simple animal life to the immortal spirit of man.

Two problems especially plague any discussion of "soul." One is the relation of soul to spirit, while the other is the propriety of speaking of the soul as immortal. In respect to the first problem it can be said that most scholars, from Augustine down to Laidlaw, Delitzsch, and James Orr, have tended to see soul as the life of a personal spirit inhabiting a physical body. It is thus the connecting link between matter and pure spirit. In the vivid phrase of Augustine soul is "the watchtower whence the spirit looks forth." Biblically this distinction between soul and spirit

is sometimes stressed (e.g., Heb. 4:12), but at other times spirit and soul are used interchangeably (e.g., Luke 1:46-47). On the whole, however, in the NT especially, spirit is that aspect of the soul which can be said to be Godward in its nature, while soul is that aspect of the spirit which is outward and manward.

This distinction is implied by Paul's contrast between the "natural man" and the "spiritual" person in 1 Cor. 2:13-15. The natural person—obviously the unregenerate—is the *psuchikos* or "soulish" person. He is alive in soul but not in spirit. His horizontal life is intact, but the vertical dimension of his nature is dead (or dormant). The person's spirit must be quickened by the Holy Spirit in regeneration.

The question of the soul's immortality has been befogged by the intrusion into Christian tradition of the Platonic doctrine of the soul. This identifies the soul as the preexistent and indestructible personal being which temporarily is subjected to the prison house of an evil body, a body to be escaped as soon as possible. Biblically the body is not evil, and God's design for human beings is that they shall in the resurrection resume their normal spirit-body unity. But in the meanwhile the spirit returns to God, to await the resurrection (Eccles. 12:7; Luke 23:46; Acts 7:59; 1 Cor. 5:5; Heb. 12:23; cf. Phil. 1:22-24; 2 Pet. 1:13-14). Therefore, to speak of the immortality of the soul is a popular way of speaking which is not technically accurate, excepting as soul and spirit may be used interchangeably.

That there is an essence of the person which survives death is implied also in the OT teaching on *sheol* and the NT equivalent of *hades*. Even Alan Richardson, who plays down Platonic dualism, is forced to concede that the Hebrew concept of man includes a possible separation of soul (spirit) from the body "in the unreal and shadowy world existence of Sheol, the underworld of departed spirits" (*A Dictionary of Christian Theology*, 316). And Delitzsch says: "It is thus a contradiction against Scripture, to make man a being, so to speak, of one casting. Neither is the body the precipitate of spirit, not the spirit the sublimate of matter. Both views derange the limits of creation drawn by Scripture" (*Biblical Psychology*, 106).

The position of Oscar Cullmann that the prospect of life in the future belongs to the order of redemption, not to the order of creation, can be misleading. If there is no created immortality in human nature, in any sense, then how can death be said to be the consequence of sin? It would rather belong to the order of nature. Further-

more, on what basis could Christian theology postulate future existence for the wicked? Resurrection, according to both Daniel and Jesus, is shared equally by the righteous and the evil: "And many of those who sleep in the dust of the ground will awake, these to everlasting life, but the others to disgrace and everlasting contempt" (Dan. 12:2, NASB; cf. John 5:28-29; Matt. 25:46; Heb. 9:27; Rev. 20:11-15). What kind of "redemption" would it be to be brought back to life out of nonexistence, only to be sent to hell?

"The sting of death is sin" (1 Cor. 15:56)—not the peril of nothingness, but the peril of knowing that sin creates postdeath consequences. Those who believe that death ends all do not necessarily fear it; to them it is often seen as welcome escape. Those who suffer the "fear of death . . . all their lives" (Heb. 2:15, NASB) are apprehensive, not of nonexistence, but of sensing that death ends probation and brings judgment. It is from this fear, and from this judgment, that redemption is needed. True, a resurrection unto eternal life belongs to the order of redemption, but not postdeath existence itself. It is the certainty of postdeath existence, made sure by creation and made terrible by sin, that constitutes the awful need for redemption, and makes redemption so glorious.

See MAN, DIVINE IMAGE, HUMAN NATURE, SPIRIT, BODY, DUALISM, DICHOTOMY, TRICHOTOMY, IMMORTALITY, RESURRECTION OF THE BODY, PERSON (PERSONALITY).

For Further Reading: Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychology*; Orr, *Christian View of God and the World*, 137-39; Cullmann, *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Body?* Purkiser, ed., *Exploring Our Christian Faith*, 215-20, 362-65; GMS, 69-76, 257-59, 262 ff, 649-58.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

SOUL SLEEP. Does man remain in the grave until the day of resurrection, or does man go immediately into the presence of the Lord at the moment of death? The answer to this question revolves around one's view of the nature of man. Is man made up of body, spirit, and soul; of body and soul; or of body-soul? Is man tripartite, bipartite, or a unity? If man is tripartite, or bipartite, one might claim that the body goes back to earth and the soul (and/or spirit) goes immediately into the presence of the Lord. This view further claims that the body is raised on resurrection day to rejoin the soul in a new soul-body form which becomes everlasting and lives in this form forever in the presence of the Lord.

If man is a unity, the question of soul sleep arises. Where does the soul go at death? Some claim that man sleeps in the grave awaiting the

day of resurrection. On the day of resurrection, it is held that the body-soul is raised, is transformed in the twinkling of an eye, and lives ever after in the presence of the Lord. What does the Scripture say?

From the idea of man's being quickened from the dust of the earth and in light of his return to the dust came the image of death as "sleeping in the dust of the earth." Sleep as an image for death is used by Jeremiah (51:39, 57) to describe the unending death of the Babylonian conquerors of Judah; by Jesus (John 11:11) to indicate the death of Lazarus; by Luke (Acts 7:60) to tell of the death of Stephen; and by Paul (1 Thess. 5:10) to note the death of believers in Christ.

The OT intimates that sleeping in the dust of the earth was not the ultimate fate for mankind. Dan. 12:2 states that the dead rest in their graves until aroused at the resurrection (cf. Matt. 22:29 ff).

However, the NT does not permit us to rest in an ambiguous position in this matter. The Scriptures clearly imply that upon death the believer is immediately in the presence of the Lord (2 Cor. 5:6-8; Phil. 1:23). Whether the story of Dives is interpreted as parable or event, the teaching is unmistakable that both Lazarus and the rich man were in full possession of their mental faculties; yet their state was preresurrection.

And Paul writes two seemingly disparate ideas in seeking to comfort the church at Thessalonica. When Jesus returns, "God will bring with Jesus those who have fallen asleep in him" (4:14, NIV), yet also "the dead in Christ will rise first" (v. 16, NIV). Admittedly v. 14 is capable of a different interpretation. But if Paul intends what he seems to be implying, he is saying that the spirits of the departed are already with Jesus and will share in His second advent, but that in that event they will be reunited with their bodies—now glorified—thus recovering their wholeness. There is therefore a conscious bliss now (thus ruling out "soul sleep"), but the state is incomplete until the resurrection occurs. While saying no to soul sleep, therefore, we must concede a transitional state marked by an attenuated form of being. The body-soul unity marks man on earth, therefore, and will also mark him in a postresurrection heaven; but the earthly body is a temporary mode of being and does not belong to the *esse* (2 Cor. 4:16-18).

See INTERMEDIATE STATE, IMMORTALITY, RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

For Further Reading: Bonnell, *I Believe in Immortality*;

Shaw, *Life After Death: The Christian View of the Future Life*.

FRED E. YOUNG

SOUL WINNING. This is a term that has come into prominence in the Church in recent decades. Although Christianity has always emphasized sharing the Good News, recent times have seen a rise in interest in this area. The decline of main-line denominations has caused them to look toward evangelicals to observe their reason for growth—which is due, in great part, to various soul-winning efforts.

Briefly defined, soul winning is the act of bringing people to a place of personal acceptance of Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior. It is the larger term of which *witnessing* is a part. Witnessing is the sharing of one's faith or Christian experience with another. Soul winning goes one step further by asking the person shared with to do something about what they have heard—to act by repenting and inviting Jesus Christ into his or her life.

The term *soul winning* is often used synonymously with evangelism. In mass or public evangelism a group of people are presented the challenge of the gospel and then invited to act by praying at an altar, or in a prayer room, or in their seats. In personal or private evangelism, the plan of salvation is presented on a one-to-one basis. The same invitation is given to respond to the gospel call.

Actually, the term *soul winning* is a figure of speech. It is not man who wins people to Christ. The changing of a heart and life is an activity of God through the Holy Spirit. It is the Spirit who burdens the evangelist with the desire to share his faith; who interprets the words of the speaker to the listener; who convicts of sin, grants forgiveness, and bestows newness of life. The Book of Acts alone has some 41 references to the work of the Spirit in the lives of men.

The theological basis for soul winning stems from the very nature of God himself. He has always sought the fellowship of His human creation. Man was designed to worship Him, but the relationship was severed by sin. It is God who has initiated the means by which that relationship can be reestablished. He chose to send His Son to earth and to Calvary's cross on man's behalf. He sent the Holy Spirit to be the Paraclete to the Church. From first to last, salvation has its rootage in the initiative of God.

Having said that, however, it is important to realize that God has ordained that Christianity be a spoken religion (Matt. 28:18-20; Rom. 10:14). People are reached by others sharing

their faith (Matt. 4:19). Philip is pictured in the NT as sharing his newfound faith with Nathanael, and later the other Philip (the deacon) shared with the Ethiopian eunuch. NT personages are vitally involved with bringing others to Christ. The soul winner shares Christ in the power of the Spirit, but he leaves the results with God (1 Cor. 3:6). Man cannot be praised for his part in the activity nor held responsible if the person rejects the gospel message.

The deepest motivation for soul winning comes from the soul winner's love for God. It must be love for God, even more than concern for the lost, that impels him. There are many organizations and agencies that care about people. The tragedy of the People's Temple cult in 1979 will ever underscore the fact that caring for people is not enough. Caring is certainly an incentive for soul winning as are church growth and other legitimate concerns; but they are not the deepest motivating force. That motivating force must be a love for God so deep and sound that the soul winner desires to help others to find that relationship, apart from whatever other incentives there may be.

The methodology for soul winning has created considerable discussion in the Church. Scores of procedures have been developed by those who wish to share their faith with others. These range from intricate evangelism plans containing memorized Scripture and illustrations to simple one-line statements that are designed to elicit thinking in the direction of spiritual matters. The discussion has centered around whether or not these programs are manipulative and, therefore, lead to shallow commitment. The key issue to remember is that Christ was the first soul winner—"The Son of man came to seek and to save the lost" (Luke 19:10, RSV). If the soul winner would be Christ's envoy, he must study the Master's characteristics and His spirit until those characteristics and that spirit are reproduced in him; remembering always that only the Holy Spirit can use methods in the awakening of sinners.

See EVANGELISM, MISSION (MISSIONS, MISSIOLOGY), TESTIMONY (WITNESS).

For Further Reading: Coleman, *The Master Plan of Evangelism*; Olford, *The Secret of Soul Winning*; Wood, *Evangelism: Its Theology and Practice*, 9-48.

D. MARTIN BUTLER

SOVEREIGNTY. See DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY.

SOWING AND REAPING. This phrase is a reminder of a fundamental law of life, viz., we reap what we sow. The biblical declaration of this law

is Gal. 6:7—"Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." The law is threefold: reaping follows sowing, what is reaped is determined by what is sowed, and reaping is certain. It may be called the law of consequences.

What is explicitly being affirmed is that there is a moral order as well as a natural order, and that a fundamental principle of both is that effects are the products of causes. In the natural order the farmer who sows wheat can expect to reap wheat, not corn. It is a simple but predictable and inviolable "mechanism" of action and reaction, cause and effect—i.e., sowing and reaping. The same mechanism operates in the spiritual and moral sphere, and is equally predictable and inviolable.

We witness daily the operation of this law. Here is a teenager who has found a job, but he lacks transportation, because he can't get a driver's license, because he failed his driver training course in high school, because he fooled around and, as a consequence of not studying, failed his exam. Here is a chain reaction, beginning with carelessness and ending (yet not ending—for the effects flow on) with embarrassment. This is a tiny sample of real life throughout the world around us.

The Scripture relates this law to God, who established it. "Be not deceived; God is not mocked." Wesley says that "to think to reap otherwise" than we sow is to mock God (*Notes*), for such thinking supposes we can outwit God and His law. But God stands back of the order which He has ordained. Both in the natural world and in the moral sphere the law is an expression of God's own holiness. The immutability of God's character makes His reactions and operations predictable and sure. Nowhere is this declared more precisely than in Rom. 11:22—"Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off."

The particular biblical expressions of this law—those cases which demonstrate and exemplify the law at its ultimate level of gravity—are the two fundamental life options: sowing to the flesh or sowing to the Spirit. We experience the law of consequences in many ways which are not ultimate, such as eating unwisely and producing stomach discomfort. But if we choose a life-style which pampers the self, which is marked by indulgence and appetite and impulse, we can expect to reap decay of body, soul, and mind, and ultimate damnation. If we choose to seek the things of the Spirit, to subordinate the

physical to the spiritual, to set our "affection on things above" (Col. 3:2), and do it day after day as a consistent commitment and way of life, we may be equally sure of "life everlasting" (Gal. 6:8), plus greater richness of life now.

The biblical concept of sowing and reaping presupposes true freedom of choice, but not freedom of consequences. The contrasting life-styles are not predetermined by heredity or environment, certainly not by divine decree. They are true options. But the end result is not optional.

Yet the biblical concept of sowing and reaping must not be confused with either fate or Karma. Fate by definition is outside of personal control or cause. The term relates to what is *destined* to occur by unknown forces or causes; as such it is essentially pagan. Those who ascribe everything to fate live in pessimistic fear and helplessness.

Karma, a doctrine deeply imbedded in Hinduism, Buddhism, and Jainism, recognizes the basic law of action and its fruit. But it falls short of the biblical doctrine in at least two respects. First, it presupposes that much that occurs in this life is the fruit of a previous life; and that this life determines the happiness or unhappiness of the next. While this latter is similar to the Christian doctrine, it is salvation by works apart from the intervention of a living Savior. The Christian doctrine is not that "life everlasting" is the product of sowing to the spirit (one's own) but to the Spirit. The acknowledgment that Paul is speaking of the Holy Spirit is the dividing line between a pagan works-salvation and the way of redemption through Christ.

Second, Karma lacks the Christian mode of escape. By repentance one can cease sowing to the flesh and begin sowing to the Spirit. While he may still suffer some consequences of the old life, much will be softened by the power of God, and the ultimate outcome changed. The Atonement is man's sole hope of breaking the merciless chain.

See MORTAL (MORTALITY), WORK (WORKS), FORGIVENESS, NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS, PROVIDENCE.

For Further Reading: CC, 6:415 ff; BBC, 9:117 ff; WBC, 5:360 ff.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

SPEAKING IN TONGUES. See TONGUES, GIFT OF.

SPIRIT. In man spirit describes that vital life force which, even though it is invisible in its essence, nevertheless energizes and directs all that constitutes the sphere of his human existence. The spirit is the seat of man's self-consciousness, emotions, and will.

In reference to God, spirit describes what He is

in His essence: "God is spirit; and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and truth" (John 4:24, NASB). It is this fact that both God and man are spiritual beings which enables them to enjoy a personal relationship. Though Jesus has ascended to the Father, His Spirit is mediated to human hearts by the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit of God.

The Bible also recognizes the presence and power of demonic spirits, able to tempt, possess, and subjugate the human spirit. Satan, however, has more than met his match in Jesus, who came to destroy the works of the devil.

In the NT the "spirit concept" is not to be understood in a Platonic sense as in contrast to the body or to nature. Rather, the Spirit is the supernatural power of God that stands in contrast to all that is human. That which belongs to the sphere of human existence is bounded by time, limited by finitude, and is always already passing away. So the one who lives "according to the flesh" (Rom. 8:4, NASB), i.e., centers his affections upon the human and natural order, is under the sentence of death.

That which is of the Spirit, however, is unbounded, unlimited, and eternal. So the one who lives "according to the Spirit" (Rom. 8:4, NASB), i.e., fixes his heart upon God and that which is spiritual, in harmony with the tutelage of the Holy Spirit, is the one who knows true life and peace.

To live in the Spirit does not mean a disembodied existence, nor does it imply a denigration of that which constitutes the full range of human existence—body, mind, and soul. It does mean, however, that God's Spirit possesses, controls, and directs man's spirit in such a way that his energies are focused upon God, others, and eternal values.

See GOD, ATTRIBUTES (DIVINE), MAN, SOUL, HOLY SPIRIT.

For Further Reading: GMS, 257-60, 484-507; Wiley, CT, 1:313-15; 2:303-33; Taylor, *Life in the Spirit*, 109-48.
C. S. COWLES

SPIRIT, HOLY. See HOLY SPIRIT.

SPIRITS IN PRISON. See DESCENT INTO HELL.

SPIRITUAL DEATH. See DEATH.

SPIRITUAL GIFTS. See GIFTS OF THE SPIRIT.

SPIRITUAL WARFARE. The modern pulpit accent is on comfort, affirmation, celebration, encouragement, peace, and personal happiness. Very

little is said about the fact that Christians are in a real warfare with a real enemy. Less still is being offered to teach believers how to wage a spiritual war. But the Christian life is not intended to be a picnic or a dress parade; nor are Christians promised exemption from hand-to-hand conflicts with the enemy. There is a "gory" side to the Christian life for which most are ill prepared.

The war is being waged on three fronts, the personal, corporate, and cosmic. On the personal front the biblical counsel is to "resist the devil" (Jas. 4:7) and to give no "place to the devil" (Eph. 4:27). In the matter of disciplining the offending church member at Corinth, Paul was anxious that the forgiveness be as prompt and ready as the discipline had been, "lest Satan should get an advantage of us" (2 Cor. 2:11). He follows with the statement "for we are not ignorant of his devices." But the tragedy is, most of us are. No more profitable effort could be made than to study in depth these and other biblical references, that we might acquire an understanding of the subtle and devious ways Satan, through demonic suggestion, influence, and maneuvering, presses his attack on the individual Christian. The mind, body, possessions, feelings, and interpersonal relations, are all the objects of vicious assault. Declaration of our faith in public testimony, combined with a reliance on the power and merit of the blood of Christ, are two means of overcoming (Rev. 12:11). To valiant fighters the promise is: "He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son" (21:7).

The warfare on the corporate front is the battle for souls, first in evangelism and Christian missions, and second, in the disciplining of converts, that they may not be lost. In contemporary concern about church growth always lurks grave danger of monumental naivete. It is easy to forget that the church will not succeed by adopting Satan's weapons and failing to utilize those God has provided (2 Cor. 10:4). Timothy was urged by Paul to "war a good warfare" (1 Tim. 1:18). He was to do it by remembering and adhering to "the prophecies once made about you" (NIV) and by "holding on to faith and a good conscience" (v. 19, NIV). Sadly some have tried to substitute fleshly methods for spiritual, even abandoning a good conscience; but in the end they have "shipwrecked their faith" (NIV) and that of others.

To speak of the cosmic front of the war is to be reminded that the forces of Satan are locked in deadly combat with the forces of the kingdom of God. The history and causes of this conflict cannot here be discussed. This conflict was utterly

real to Jesus and to His apostles, including Paul, who declared: "For our struggle is not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers, against the authorities, against the powers of this dark world and against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realms" (Eph. 6:12, NIV; cf. 1 John 5:19, NASB). The vastness and violence of the conflict is portrayed vividly and dramatically in the Book of Revelation.

Christ is "Christus Victor" and has actually won the war, though for the present Satan is permitted to continue a rearguard action. Oscar Cullmann made famous the concept of "D day"—the decisive turning point, which assured the final outcome.

Christians therefore should be wary, and avoid presumption, yet be bold and confident, knowing that "greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world" (1 John 4:4).

See SATAN, KINGDOM OF GOD, TEMPTATION, PAGANISM, NEW COVENANT, ESCHATOLOGY, PRINCIPALITIES AND POWERS.

For Further Reading: Bunyan, *The Holy War*; Jessop, *The Ministry of Prevailing Prayer*; Lewis, *Screwtop Letters*; Aulén, *Christus Victor*; Cullmann, *Christ and Time*; Smith, ed., *The Tozer Pulpit*, 4:119-31; Booth, "It's Cowardly Service vs. the Real Warfare," *Popular Christianity*.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

SPIRITUALISM, SPIRITISM. Spiritualism is a religion which maintains that communication with the dead is possible, and such communication is the center of the religion. It maintains that after the death of the body the spirit lives on in the spirit world. A medium, a person on earth supposedly sensitive to vibrations from the spirit world, holds meetings called séances to seek messages from the spirits.

Although this belief is an ancient one, the modern spiritualist movement in America began in 1848 in Hydesville, N.Y., when the Fox sisters heard strange knockings and interpreted them as sounds coming from spirits of the other world. Interest in spiritualism peaked in the early 20th century, then declined, but interest in the occult has recently been renewed. Spiritualists consider themselves Christians and have churches, ministers, and doctrine. Christ, however, is not considered to be God, but the "great medium." Worship services are much like Protestant worship services, with the addition of messages from spirits of the dead.

A biblical example of communicating with the dead is the episode of Saul talking to Samuel in the house of the witch of Endor (1 Samuel 28). Asking a medium to do such a thing was specifi-

cally prohibited, and this act itself was part of the reason for Saul's death (Deut. 18:9-14; 1 Chron. 10:13-14). The conversation on the Mount of Transfiguration between Christ and Moses and Elijah (Matt. 17:1-8) cannot be classed as an example of spiritism, for it was a unique action of God in His revelation of Christ as Son and Savior.

Although it may be possible, God has forbidden any attempt on our part to communicate with the dead through mediums (Lev. 19:31; 20:6; 1 Tim. 4:1; et al.). Spiritualism itself says little or nothing about communication with God because its interest is in man, not God.

See SORCERY, SATAN, DEMONS (DEMON POSSESSION), OCCULT (OCCULTISM).

For Further Reading: "Spiritism" and "Spiritualists," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 13:576-77, 593-94; Wright, *Christianity and the Occult*, 105-60; Martin, *The Christian and the Cults*. RONALD L. KOTESKEY

SPIRITUALITY. Spirituality may be most simply defined as the character or quality of spiritual-mindedness as opposed to worldliness and sensuality. In NT context an infusion of the Holy Spirit is always presupposed for a person to be considered spiritual. Paul affirms that to be spiritual is to be totally controlled by the Spirit (Rom. 8:1-17).

Although there is a difference in the Spirit's activity between the Old and New Testaments, it is helpful to look at two OT models of spirituality, especially since these are confirmed by NT writers. The first is the "friend of God" concept which was modeled by Abraham (Isa. 41:8; 2 Chron. 20:7). Several factors immediately present themselves as one thinks of Abraham. The first is suggested by James, "Abraham believed God" (2:23). Abraham is not remembered because he dressed differently or acted in a peculiar fashion or was a bit "spooky." His image is embedded in biblical memory because he believed God despite humanly insurmountable obstacles.

The picture received is not one of a super-human personality who never made mistakes, but of a man who believed through all delays and all apparent modifications of what he believed God's will to be. Here is a man, very much a man, with all of the desires of a man, one in every way representative of the human race, who was able to demonstrate a faith in the veracity of God that could not be shaken. God had given him a staggering promise which could not possibly have been fulfilled in his lifetime, but he "staggered not . . . through unbelief" (Rom.

4:20)—even when God asked him to sacrifice the child of the promise (Gen. 22:1-11). As a friend of God, Abraham demonstrated constant trust, instant obedience, unwavering loyalty, costly magnanimity, and consistent service. An intense study of the choices of his life reveals a coherence and consistency compatible with the quality of life which can properly be designated as "spiritual."

A second OT concept helpful in understanding the term *spirituality* is "A man after God's own heart" as applied to David (1 Sam. 13:14; Acts 13:22). This could be said of him because of the intensity of his devotion to God. With the exception of his sin with Bathsheba his life was marked by a spontaneous turning to God for guidance, deliverance, and strength, in every situation. God could say of him, "a man . . . which shall fulfil all my will" (Acts 13:22). And in respect to his grievous sin, there was profound sorrow and repentance. His prayers are models of humility, remorse, and contrition. Such qualities as a forgiving spirit, a nonretaliatory attitude toward undeserved wrongs, and a quickness to confess errors and sins make him in the biblical sense a consistent example of a truly spiritual person.

As one turns to the NT, the apostle Paul appears as a model of spirituality. He assures us that he speaks words taught of the Holy Spirit, "comparing spiritual things with spiritual" (1 Cor. 2:13-14). The qualities of spirit observed in Abraham and David—obedience, and a spirit malleable in the hand of God—begin to flow together as one studies the life of Paul and considers the sharp contrast he makes between the spiritual and the worldly (Rom. 8:1-17).

It has been suggested by some that the possession of spiritual gifts is a mark of spirituality. Paul, who has more to say about spiritual gifts than any other biblical writer, emphatically declares that it is love, not gifts, that marks the spiritual person. This is the full intent of 1 Corinthians 13. In actual experience some naturally gifted persons tend to exercise their gifts for other than purely spiritual purposes while claiming solely spiritual aims for themselves. A natural credulity in human nature makes the "gift test" a persuasive measure for spirituality, while in reality it becomes a deceptive type of logic leading to erroneous conclusions. It was not the gifts that the apostle possessed which made him a spiritual person, but it was his courage in the face of grave physical suffering and danger, and his tenacious persistency in fulfilling the calling of God in his life (Acts 20:18-35).

Not all Christians are spiritual. "Ye which are spiritual," Paul writes to the Galatians (6:1), implying that some among them are not. The same differentiation is made in writing to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 2:6-15). The primary hindrance to spirituality is carnality (3:1-4). The possession of gifts did not prove the Corinthians spiritual nor make them such.

See HOLINESS, DEVOTE (DEVOTION), PRAYER, OBE-DIENCE, FAITH, SECOND WORK OF GRACE.

For Further Reading: DeWolf, *Responsible Freedom*, 144-78; Lovelace, *Dynamics of Spiritual Life*, 61-80; Wiley, CT, 3:65-70.

FLOYD J. PERKINS

STANDING AND STATE. In general "standing" and "state" may be distinguished as follows: "state" is one's real moral and spiritual condition; "standing" is one's relationship of acceptance or rejection, or position in the mind of others. With the Christian, a good state is dependent on the work of Christ in him; a good standing (with God) is dependent on being justified through faith in the work of Christ for him.

The so-called "standing and state" theory implies that one's standing and state do not need to match; that one may have a good standing with God without a righteous state. This theory has its roots in the post-Reformation conception of justification as developed in the theological streams originating in the thought of Martin Luther and John Calvin. To Luther, justification was not a change in the nature or character (state) of man, nor was it an overcoming in him of sin; it was a change in his relation to divine justice. Through justification the righteousness of Christ was imputed to man as his own righteousness. The expression of this concept is similar in Calvinism. Man's sin is removed by imputation to Christ.

Thus, the "standing and state theory" joins "hand in hand with the doctrine of imputed righteousness" (Taylor, *A Right Conception of Sin*, 40). The practical consequence of this doctrine is to remove anxiety for sinful acts or deep concern for one's sinful state. Believers are reckoned as righteous or holy by their "standing" in Christ. God does not take notice of their actual "state" because "he sees them only through Christ" (Wiley, CT, 2:459). The believer's sin is not actually removed as in a change of "state" but remains in the believer to be covered over by Christ's imputed holiness. Thus "holiness and righteousness are only imputed, never imparted" (Wiley). The responsibility of the believer, according to this theory, is to recognize what has already been accomplished in Christ.

Proponents of this view note 1 Cor. 1:2-9 as a

reference to "standing" and v. 11 and 3:1-4 as a reference to "state" (Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, 7:293). That the Corinthians illustrate the possibility of a temporary partial disparity between standing and state is obvious; but it must be denied that this disparity is normative, or that its continuance will have no ultimate fatal effect on the standing.

The concept of changing one's standing by the imputation of Christ's righteousness without a corresponding change in one's state or moral nature is essentially to deny the possibility and necessity of personal holiness. John Wesley expressed concern about the doctrine of imputed holiness in his sermon "A Blow at the Root." Wesley comments as follows: "Wherever this doctrine is cordially received, it leaves open no place for holiness. It demolishes it from top to bottom, it destroys both root and branch. It effectually tears up all desire of it, all endeavor after it" (*Works*, 10:366).

The concepts of standing and state are sometimes advanced under the rubric of "declarative grace" (standing), and "operative grace" (state). God's declarative grace in justification is followed by operative grace in sanctification; but according to some interpreters, the fixedness of the declarative grace is unrelated to the success or failure of operative grace.

See IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS, IMPARTED RIGHTEOUSNESS, GRACE, HOLINESS, ETERNAL SECURITY, OBE-DIENCE, PERSEVERANCE.

For Further Reading: Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, 7:295; Taylor, *A Right Conception of Sin*, 26-42; Wesley, *Works*, 10:364-69.

LARRY FINE

STATE, THE. That the state is ordained of God is clear from the general testimony of the biblical record and is made explicit by Paul in Rom. 13:1, as it was implicit in Christ's teaching (Mark 12:17). However, H. Orton Wiley correctly suggests that "the sovereignty of the civil authority lies in the state itself, and not in any king or ruler whatsoever. This is established by the fact that the state exists before all rulers, and by the additional fact, that rulers are at the most, but its instruments" (CT, 3:96). Thus the state, and not wicked Nero, was ordained of God when Paul wrote Romans 13. Without the state, whatever form it may take, society would destroy itself in anarchy.

Two conflicting views of state exist. One holds that the state was instituted by God after and because of the Fall, and without the entry of sin the state would have been unnecessary. However, the other view, known as the naturalistic, regards

the state as based upon the law of God operative over Adam before the Fall, both permissively and prohibitively. When Adam sinned, he violated the law of God's previously existing governmental law. This view sees the state as inherent in the very nature of man and society by reason of the fact that man bears God's personal image, marred and perverted by the Fall, but never annihilated.

Further, in support of this view is the fact that the family which was instituted before the Fall was organizationally constituted with Adam as its head. The family is the basic God-ordained unit of society, upon which every form of the state ultimately rests. In the biblical view the entire human race is the God-ordained "extended family" from creation (Acts 17:26).

While certain fundamental principles are laid down by Christ and Paul, no political theory as such is given. Though recognizing and approving the state in His famous command in Mark 12:17, Christ makes only occasional and incidental references to the state or political orders. H. D. A. Major states that "Jesus lays down the fundamental principles which must guide His disciples in the future crises in which human authority and divine authority make conflicting claims" (*The Mission and Message of Jesus*, 148).

Paul sees the purpose and function of the state as limited to the maintenance of order, the execution of justice, the prevention and punishment of crime, the promotion of peace, and the general advancement of the welfare of its citizens. The state in the biblical view is always subservient to God's sovereignty (Acts 5:29; cf. 4:19).

See CITIZENSHIP, CITY, CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE, CIVIL RELIGION, CIVIL RIGHTS.

For Further Reading: ZPEB, 2:790-98; IDB, E-J:457-62; *Baker's DT*, 501-2; Wiley, CT, 3:96-98.

CHARLES W. CARTER

STEWARDSHIP. Stewardship is an open acknowledgment that man is a creature who is the chief object of divine beneficence, both in creation and through redemption. From the beginning, man received dominion over God's creation both as a gift and a task, and thereby a close personal relationship was established between God and man. Man was given a wide range of freedom, but not without guidance of law. Man from the outset was amenable and responsible. In its historic meaning, stewardship is always personal.

"Stewardship" is the English word used to translate the NT word *oikonomia*. The Greek word is a compound of *oikos*, meaning "house,"

and *nomos*, meaning "law." It thus refers to the management of a house or household affairs.

Through Jesus himself we discover what God the Father is like and learn His benevolent attitude toward all mankind. The apostle Paul, however, seems to be our special teacher in the NT concerning the practical theology of stewardship. The real issues of stewardship do not come before us clearly until we learn the message of redemption in the gift of God's own Son, our Savior. Paul summarizes this truth in a word picture which makes the entire universe as a landscape: "Through him [Jesus] God chose to reconcile the whole universe to himself, making peace through the shedding of his blood upon the cross—to reconcile all things, whether on earth or in heaven, through him alone" (Col. 1:20, NEB).

When Jesus came as Redeemer, He came as a man, "born of a woman." He appeared on the arena of man's defeat to provide for man's salvation. In what could be the most daring venture of redemption, Jesus committed to His disciples (on the eve of His departure) the agency of redemption. To be sure, the superintendency and power were afforded by the personal indwelling Holy Spirit. On the issue of transfer of power Jesus said, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you" (John 20:21). This becomes the assignment of each succeeding generation of Christians.

Paul was careful to ground his gospel message and mission on God himself. He witnessed with clarity to one of the young churches he founded, "But just as we have been approved by God to be entrusted with the gospel, so we speak, not to please men, but to please God who tests our hearts" (1 Thess. 2:4, RSV).

But God requires stewardship of all men, everywhere, no exceptions. "God is Lord, but he is not a landlord who can be cheated, cajoled, and treated shabbily" (Kantonen, *Stewardship* 73, 51). Jesus himself told the parable of the talents. The man who begged off had been given but one talent for investment and service. He buried his talent and then returned it without increase on the day of reckoning. He moaned, "Lord, I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strawed" (Matt. 25:24). The man said he was afraid and therefore hid his talent in the earth. His lord, however, identified the trusted man as, "You lazy rascal!" (NEB). John Wesley in his *Notes* on the passage addresses an apostrophe to the faithless servant: "No. Thou knowest Him not. He never knew God who thinks Him a hard master."

The basic issues of stewardship cover every area of our lives—not the religious only. The familiar trilogy is simple and far reaching: (1) Time; (2) Talent; (3) Treasure. Someone observed (tongue in cheek?), "The Terrible Trilogy." We would agree, but amend to read, "terribly" important and practical. Stewardship affords an edge to the Christian's witness and bears fruit both here and hereafter. It was Augustine who concluded: "The reward of God is God himself."

See TITHE (THE), SERVICE, CONSECRATE (CONSECRATION), MONEY, REWARDS, INTEGRITY.

For Further Reading: Kantonen, *A Theology for Christian Stewardship: Stewardship 73*; Young, *Giving and Living*.
SAMUEL YOUNG

STIGMATA. In Christian history, the bodily marks of Christ's wounds upon the hands, feet, side, head, or back of certain persons. Sometimes bleeding occurred. The term can refer to the pain only, without the wounds. Several hundred cases have been catalogued. The earliest well-known instance was that of Francis of Assisi. In 1224 his friends reported seeing the stigmata on his hands, feet, and side. Some modern examples have been attested by medical examination.

Stigmata were associated with the medieval stress upon participation in and identification with Christ's sufferings. When spontaneous rather than deliberate, the wounds appeared during an emotional state of ecstasy or in connection with some mystical revelation.

Among Catholics, popular opinion ascribed stigmata to divine miracle, but officially the church has refrained from this view. There seems to be no reason not to attribute the phenomena themselves to natural but abnormal organic functions, given the conditions of intensive mental absorption, hysteria, and suggestibility. Similar phenomena have been observed outside the sphere of Christian faith.

See MYSTICISM.

For Further Reading: NIDCC; *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*; ERE.
ARNOLD E. AIRHART

STOICISM. Stoicism was an ancient philosophical perspective launched by Zeno of Citium, who began teaching in Athens 300 B.C. He lectured on the Painted Porch (*Stoa Poikele*), which gave the word *Stoic* to his school.

Following Zeno, many Hellenistic thinkers expanded his teachings into a rather comprehensive world view. Roman philosophers such as Cicero (106-43 B.C.), Seneca (4 B.C.-A.D. 65), Epictetus (60-138 A.D.), and Marcus Aurelius (121-80 A.D.) absorbed and articulated Stoic philosophy.

In Greco-Roman society, Stoics advocated a metaphysical *monism*. Some thought only matter to be real; others advocated pantheism; all believed reality is one. Thus Stoics said much about Nature, a vast, organic, purposeful system of which men and women and other creatures are but parts. Those with religious sensitivity (and many were deeply religious) thought God was the thoroughly immanent "rational spirit" who structures and guides all things and is inseparable from them.

In ethics, Stoics admonished people to live wisely and righteously. They sensed an orderliness and benevolence in Nature and thought human beings should follow her instruction and example. The "natural law" could be discerned and followed. Virtues such as prudence, courage, justice, and temperance make one good. Stoics frequently warned against the deceptive allure of riches and pleasures, teaching that simplicity and moderation, and indifference to pleasure or pain, help one live the good life.

Much about Stoicism attracted Christians in the Early Church. The Stoic ethic, based upon the natural law, fused easily with the Scripture's call for righteous living. Early thinkers such as Tertullian clearly used Stoic ideas as a framework for Christian theology. In political philosophy, the "idea of human rights," says L. Harold DeWolf, "or 'the rights of man' has come down to us from Stoics through the long tradition of natural law" (*Responsible Freedom*, 313).

Stoicism further refers to a general attitude toward life. Those who "keep a stiff upper lip," those who believe in rigid self-discipline, those who resign themselves to "fate" mediated through natural events, all reflect a stoical approach to life. While not conscious of historic Stoicism, such people nevertheless live according to some of its tenets.

Much that is true in Stoicism can be ascribed to the Holy Spirit, "the only fountain of truth" (Calvin). Yet while a philosophy of life, it is not a way of salvation. For that men must turn from noble resignation to simple trusting, in the Christ whose cross was foolishness to the Greeks and an offense to the Jews (1 Cor. 1:23); but to those who believe, the true "wisdom from God—that is, our righteousness, holiness and redemption" (v. 30, NIV).

See VIRTUE, SEVEN CARDINAL VIRTUES, CHARACTER, SUFFER (SUFFERING), PLEASURE, ETHICS, CHRISTIAN ETHICS, SOWING AND REAPING.

For Further Reading: Copleston, *A History of Philosophy*; Zeller, *The Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*; Epictetus, *The Discourses of Epictetus*; Aurelius, *The Meditations of*

Marcus Aurelius; Cave, *The Christian Way*, 107-17; De-Wolf, *Responsible Freedom*, 21, 122-24, 313.

GERARD REED

SUBLAPSARIANISM. See INFRALAPSARIANISM.

SUBMISSION. See OBEDIENCE.

SUBSTANCE, SUBSTANTIVE. The English word *substance* comes from the Latin *sub*, "under," and *sto* or *stans*, "to stand." It is thus that which stands under, or behind, mere appearance (the phenomenal). In Greek the word is expressed by *ousia* which means that which truly is: essence or reality. A long line of thinkers, including such giants as Philoponus of Alexandria, John Scotus, Descartes, Aquinas, Locke, Kant, and Berkeley, have struggled with the concept of substance since Aristotle wrote his *Categories* and his *Metaphysics*. Conclusions expressed by these writers as to what is basic in the universe vary from a fundamental natural entity to a mere mental thought more hypothetical in nature than factual.

In the face of all practical and observational evidence that change prevails in life, Aristotle declared that there must be some "ground" that is inalterable, and that ground he called substance. Personalistic philosophies have found this changeless substance in personhood. At least a convincing demonstration, close at hand, of an essence which survives change is individual identity or personal being, which remains the same through continuous earthly change in appearance, personality, external relations, and even character. The ego or self which is the identifying essence of a particular child is the same self which identifies the old man or old woman as the same person.

In the absolute sense, substance can be ascribed only to God, for according to Christian theology only God is absolute being, underived, uncreated, unconditioned, and essentially unchanging (cf. Mal. 3:6; Exod. 3:6; Heb. 13:8). As such God is the Ground of all lesser or secondary substances.

The term *substance* was also made the key in Early Church history to the doctrine of the Trinity. The formula was *tres personae, una substantia*, "three persons, one substance." The three Persons shared the same nature or essence; the Godhead was one. Thus the substance of God comprised the unity and at the same time was the ground of the threeness.

Confusion arises from the fact that in practical

usage substance has gone full circle, from the immaterial reality of the Greek philosophers to concrete, material reality. Cotton, wood, gold, et cetera, may be the substance of an object, determining its qualities though not altogether its form. An understanding of the nature of sin is befogged by this confusion. Sin as a nature is neither an immaterial entity in itself (the Greek concept of substance) nor a lumpish, materialistic entity.

In respect to the Greek concept, sin is the perversion of being, not being itself. All true being apart from God is derived from or created by God and as such essentially good. But one form of true, and essentially good, being is a free moral agent, either angelic or human. Such an agent has the power to pervert God's gifts to selfish ends; even to pervert his own nature to sinfulness of inclination. But this is a condition, not an entity.

But in respect to the popular meaning of substance, sin is not a physical thing. Wood says: "It is a confusion of categories to think that Wesley believed that sin was a physical-like substance which was extracted through the circumcision of the heart. . . . Wesley was simply using the metaphorical language of Paul when he described in a concrete-functional way that the being of sin was cleansed in entire sanctification" (*Pentecostal Grace*, 168). Sin can be said to be substantive only in the sense that it (whether actual or original) is a real factor in human life rather than imaginary.

See BEING, ONTOLOGY, REALISM, SIN, RELATIONAL THEOLOGY.

For Further Reading: O'Connor, "Substance and Attributes," *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 8:36-40; Wood, *Pentecostal Grace*, 161-68. FLOYD J. PERKINS

SUBSTITUTION. See VICARIOUS.

SUFFER, SUFFERING. All theology recognizes that people undergo experiences (*pathos*) which distress, afflict, injure, chasten, and bring on pain and death. Suffering may be physical, mental, or spiritual. The Bible relates this fact of human suffering to the Fall, to man's sin against God (Gen. 3:14-19; Rom. 8:18-25).

The burden of suffering has often fallen upon God's people (Exod. 1:11; Ps. 90:9-10). This occasions several problems, since God's people believe that He is in charge of all human life. It is relatively easy to conclude that sin will result in suffering. But why do the righteous suffer? Why does God permit His people to undergo afflictions?

One problem—that of the origin of pain and suffering—is expressed in the ancient dilemma: either God is good but powerless to prevent suffering and evil, or He is all-powerful but malevolent—not wishing to rid the world of it. Christian theodicy has wrestled with this problem from early times.

While naturalism has often used this dilemma as a justification for its agnosticism, the Bible does suggest that God controls and regulates suffering (Job 1:12). He has a plan and purpose in life for every person. That plan may include prosperity for the wicked and suffering for the righteous.

Since God chose a cross, a means of suffering, by which to redeem mankind, it may well be that He will permit the righteous to suffer for redemptive reasons. This is the meaning of "taking up the cross" for Christians (Matt. 16:24).

The plan and purposes of God includes several explanations of why people suffer. Some suffering is caused by Satan and his cohorts—but Satan is limited by God's sovereign will (Job 1:12; 2:6). Some suffering is disciplinary; God uses afflictions to educate those who will learn (Job 35:11; 36:10 ff). Some suffering can only be resolved in the mystery of the Infinite. God, who knows all, does not explain to people all of His workings (Job 38—39; John 9:4).

Another problem is the nature of sin and suffering. While idealisms and non-Christian religions deny the real nature of suffering, equating it with man's finiteness, Christian theology sometimes relates suffering to sin. Suffering is real because man lives in rebellion against God. Man creates many suffering situations because he refuses to take God's way of life. Although not all suffering is caused by sin (John 9:1-4), Christian theology always takes seriously the doctrine of divine punishment upon sin (Lev. 26:14 ff; Ezek. 18:4). Some suffering is a punishment for sin.

The greatest problem faced by a theology of suffering is its elimination. Here non-Christian philosophies have no real solution, while the Bible offers the plan of a Redeemer God who has wrestled with the problem of sin and finally eliminates all suffering for those who trust Him (Rev. 21:4).

The Christian gospel reveals a God who knows the fact and the meaning of suffering. The Cross of Calvary is the sublime and majestic picture of a Redeemer who bears our griefs and carries our sorrows (Isa. 53:4), in order to reconcile people to God. The fact of human suffering can be borne by the hope of its ultimate banishment

(1 Cor. 15:25-26). God's plan for the banishment of suffering and sin centers in the triumphal return of the Son of God to defeat the powers of sin and Satan and restore God's creation to its created harmony (Rev. 22:1-4).

See EVIL, PROVIDENCE, CHANCE.

For Further Reading: Hopkins, *The Mystery of Suffering*; Lewis, *The Problem of Pain*; Jones, *Christ and Human Suffering*; Lewis, *The Creator and the Adversary*; Weatherhead, *Why Do Men Suffer?* Hick, *God and Evil*.

BERT H. HALL

SUICIDE. Suicide is death which is voluntarily self-inflicted. Factors contributing to suicide are anxiety, envy, suffering, and depression. Alienation and guilt are emotions frequently mentioned with hopelessness and doubt (Farberow and Shneidman, *The Cry for Help*, 290-302). Suicide occurs when there appears to be no available path that will lead to a tolerable existence. Demonic suggestion and oppression doubtless are significant factors in some cases. Secular students of suicide would of course take no account of this possibility.

Some religions (Hinduism and Buddhism) condone suicide as a cog in the wheels of Karma and reincarnation. A depressed predestinarian may justify his actions and lay his misfortune at the feet of Providence. Stoics and Epicureans see suicide as an honorable exit out of life.

In the OT five cases of suicide are recorded: Samson (Judg. 16:30); King Saul and his armor bearer (1 Sam. 31:1-6); Zimri, another king of Israel (1 Kings 16:15-19); and Ahithophel, advisor to Absalom (2 Sam. 17:23). In the NT there is the single case of Judas, who also died by hanging after he failed to right the wrong in betraying Jesus (Matt. 27:3-5; Acts 1:18). The cases cited have behind them stories of greed, hate, and loss of faith in God (revenge in the case of Samson).

The Bible has no direct injunction against suicide. The word is not even mentioned in Scripture. However, the sixth commandment would imply its prohibition, and both Judaism and Christianity have opposed the practice. From Deut. 20:1, 6-9, the rabbis and fathers have argued that it is unlawful for anyone to take his own life. The act shows lack of faith in God and betrays an absence of a proper sense of responsibility and stewardship, both toward God and toward others.

Judgment upon the suicide must be left entirely with God. He alone sees the motivation and intentions. He alone sees the degree of sanity possessed at the time of the action, therefore the moral responsibility.

See MAN, DIVINE IMAGE, STEWARDSHIP, LIFE, PASTORAL COUNSELING.

For Further Reading: Lum, *Responding to Suicidal Crisis: For Church and Community*; Farber, *Theory of Suicide*; Farberow and Shneidman, *The Cry for Help*.

ISAAC BALDEO

SUNDAY. Since the days of the primitive Church, Sunday has been the specifically Christian day for worship. The word comes from *dies solis* (*helios* day), second of the seven-day planetary week. The day corresponds with the Jewish first day.

Evidence indicates that Sunday as the specific day of worship began in the primitive Gentile church. But Eusebius says that the early Jewish Christians "celebrated rites like ours [the Jewish] in commemoration of the Savior's resurrection"—probably on Sunday and in addition to their Jewish Sabbath.

Until the end of the first century, the Eucharist was celebrated weekly on Sunday evening. But at the beginning of the second century, probably due to an imperial ban against night assembly, the Sunday evening service was terminated; and celebration of the Lord's Supper was incorporated into an already existing predawn service that consisted of prayers and hymns. The predawn hour made it possible for the Christians to get to their places of employment on time for what was a common day of labor in the Roman Empire. Two specifically Christian names were given to the day by Christians: "The Lord's Day" (cf. Rev. 1:10), and "the eighth day" (the latter was probably associated with the day on which baptisms occurred).

Not until after Constantine designated Sunday as a day of rest throughout the empire (in A.D. 321) did the Christian day of worship also become a day of rest.

See LORD'S DAY, SABBATARIANISM, PURITAN (PURITANISM).

For Further Reading: Rordorf, *Sunday*; Cowan, *The Sabbath in Scripture and History*.

ALBERT L. TRUESDALE, JR.

SUPEREROGATION. This is a concept of Roman Catholic theology describing virtuous acts surpassing that required by duty or obligation. The doctrine first appeared toward the close of the 12th century and was modified and enlarged by Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century. It is based on the doctrine of salvation by grace and works rather than by grace alone. It also depends on a distinction made between the precepts and the counsels of the church. Precepts refer to works

commanded; and counsels, to works only advised (Matt. 19:21)—especially the monastic counsels of poverty, chastity, and obedience.

The total merits of Christ exceeded what was necessary for man's salvation. In addition, the saints did and suffered more than was required for their own salvation. These superabundant merits go into a treasury of merit and are at the disposal of the Roman Catholic church. At the discretion of the pope, these merits may be dispensed to those who lack sufficient merit for salvation. This led to the system of indulgences so pointedly rejected by Luther.

The treasury of merit is also based on a concept of the community of grace. Protestantism rejected any form of salvation by works, holding salvation to be by grace alone. It also rejected the community of grace, contending that grace is individually bestowed and not transferable, and rejected the concept of works of supererogation (*New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 11:165-66).

See MERIT, WORK (WORKS), JUSTIFICATION, CATHOLICISM (ROMAN), INDULGENCES.

For Further Reading: *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 13:810; Heick, *A History of Christian Thought*, 1:289.

M. ESTES HANEY

SUPERNATURAL, SUPERNATURALISM. Christian theology has always emphasized that there are many experiences, events, and manifestations that cannot be ascribed to natural causes. To describe these phenomena, Christians have used the word *supernatural*. These events or experiences must be explained by reference to something beyond the natural realm or sense experience. The word *supernatural* is not specifically used in Scripture, but it has an important function in defining scriptural emphases. When God speaks to men and women, when Jesus Christ descends to human level in the Incarnation, when Jesus is raised from the dead, these may properly be designated supernatural events, since they are totally inexplicable by human sources of understanding. Such events express God's immediate and special action within the sphere of nature, but not according to nature's usual order.

Religious naturalism rejects the idea of transcendence, or the God who is above and beyond us. "God" is whatever saves a person from evil, but "God" cannot be defined as a supernatural person. To the naturalist, to talk about God in heaven doesn't make sense, since this God cannot be weighed or subjected to empirical methods. Thus "God" is reduced to something

temporal, present in the world, never external to the natural order. "God" becomes the projection of human wishes and hopes. In an extreme naturalism "God" is an aspect of the total reality called nature. Supernaturalism, on the other hand, insists that God is above man and free to act upon and within nature however He pleases.

It is of course necessary to protest a supernaturalism which pushes God and man so far apart that no means of communication exist. Jesus did come from heaven to reconcile God and man. Supernaturalism does not contradict this reconciliation, but in fact presents a God who is great enough to bring the supernatural and the natural into interaction.

One expression of 20th-century theology has spoken of God as so remote that no point of contact between God and man could be expected. Another theological school in its radical forms stresses that God is so near as to be virtually identified with nature. Both views are extreme and are out of touch with biblical faith. Christian faith insists upon the realm existing above nature, but places equal insistence upon the ways in which God is present through Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit in the realm where humanity dwells.

See MIRACLE, PROVIDENCE, DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY, TRIBUTES (DIVINE), IMMANENCE, THEISM, RATIONALISM.

For Further Reading: Cauthen, *The Impact of American Religious Liberalism*; Carnell, *The Case for Orthodox Theology*.
LEON O. HYNSON

SUPERSTITION. Superstition is an unwarranted and irrational regard for rituals, signs, and omens. Primitive folklore is full of beliefs in the portent of certain events, such as a black cat crossing one's path, or in the power of a good-luck charm. Superstition may also take the form of blind trust in the performance of certain rituals apart from sound biblical authority or compliance with ethical conditions. When the Israelites pinned their faith in their Temple worship and sacrificial system as a sure security against misfortune, their religion had become a superstition. Divinely prescribed rituals are not designed as forms of magic, by which the supernatural can be manipulated for our protection or our advantage.

Even the Christian sacraments can become superstitions when participants rest in the efficacy of the ceremony without regard to its doctrinal meaning or its inherent ethical demands. The Bible itself can be used as a talisman and certain verses as charms. Soldiers have sometimes believed they would be protected from harm by

having a Testament in their pocket. In such forms of superstition the symbol has been accepted as a substitute for reality, scientific cause-and-effect principles have been disregarded, and credulity has been mistaken for faith. The antidote to superstition is a growing relationship with Christ himself, a life of holiness and obedience, and an intelligent approach to biblical and theological principles.

See FAITH, PRESUMPTION. RICHARD S. TAYLOR

SUPPLICATION. This is prayer as petition, as entreaty, as earnest request, on behalf of oneself or on behalf of others. See Acts 1:14; Eph. 6:18; Phil. 4:6; Heb. 5:7.

See PRAYER, INTERCESSION, PRAISE.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

SUPPRESSION. The theory of suppression teaches that the believer's sin nature is never cleansed away. Constant warfare with the carnal self ("old man") is normal. The Spirit's power enables suppression of carnality but no deliverance.

Many NT words express suppression: *krateō*—to be master of (Matt. 18:28); *pnigō*—to choke (v. 28); *deō*—to bind (Mark 3:27); *katapauō*—to restrain (Acts 14:18); *katechō*—to hold down (Rom. 1:18); *hypōpiazō*—to hit beneath the eyes (1 Cor. 9:27); *doulagōgeō*—to enslave (v. 27); *sunechō*—to constrain (2 Cor. 5:14); and *sugkleiō*—to shut up (Gal. 3:22). However, none of these are used in reference to carnality. Rather, the Spirit used *katargeō*—to destroy (Rom. 6:6); *sustaurōō*—to crucify with (v. 6); *eleutheroō*—to free (8:2); *ekkathairō*—to cleanse thoroughly (1 Cor. 5:7; 2 Tim. 2:21); *apotithēmi*—to put off (Eph. 4:22); *katharizō*—to cleanse (5:26); and *apekdusis*—the putting off (Col. 2:11).

Scripture teaches cleansing from all sin (Ezek. 36:25-27; Eph. 5:25-27), crucifixion of "the old man" (Gal. 2:20), and the sanctifying infilling of the Spirit in a crisis moment of total consecration and faith (John 17:17-20; Acts 2:38-39; 19:2; Rom. 12:1-2; 1 Thess. 5:23-24). The Greek aorist tense of the verbs teaches this (John 17:17; Acts 15:9; Rom. 12:1; 1 Cor. 1:21-22; Gal. 5:24; Eph. 1:13; 1 Thess. 5:23; Heb. 13:12; 1 John 1:9), as do Bible commands and promises for purity in this life (Luke 1:73-75).

The believer aided by the Spirit should discipline body, mind, emotions, and will to (1) obey God's Word, (2) overcome temptation, (3) maintain self-control, and (4) control and sanctify legitimate bodily appetites, aspirations, imaginations, passions, instincts, drives, temperament, strengths, and weaknesses. This is the

role for biblical self-control or suppression (Gal. 5:23; Acts 24:25; 1 Cor. 7:9; 9:25-27; 2 Tim. 1:7; Titus 1:8; 2:5; 1 Pet. 1:13; 4:7; 5:8; 2 Pet. 1:6).

See CLEANSING, ERADICATION, DISCIPLINE, TEMPERANCE.

For Further Reading: Taylor, *Holiness the Finished Foundation*, 65-81; Carter, *The Person and Ministry of the Holy Spirit*, 168-72; Grider, *Entire Sanctification*, 20-24. WESLEY L. DUEWEL

SUPRALAPSARIANISM. See INFRA-LAPSARIANISM.

SURRENDER. When used in a militaristic connotation of forced subjection, "surrender" is an unacceptable idea for expressing Christian experience. Yet the Scriptures abound in words like commitment, yielding, submission, obedience, and servanthood, which do not imply the loss of free moral agency, but precisely its exercise. If surrender is used in the sense of a free self-conscious decision, then it agrees with the essence of these biblical expressions. It thus becomes a synonym of consecration, as in the song "I Surrender All."

As a spiritual act of self-giving, surrender can nevertheless be ambiguous. Surrender may be distorted because of self-interest, as in the instance of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1-6). It may be a manipulative device whereby the weak gains an advantage over the strong, as in the case of passive resistance. Surrender to a morally questionable person or cause may not only be useless, but destructive as well. The Scriptures recognize the possibility of surrender to sin, Satan, and the flesh (cf. Rom. 6:12 ff.).

God as He has revealed himself in Christ Jesus is not only the only unambiguous object of self-surrender, but the ultimate Example as well. "For God so loved the world that he gave [up] his only Son" (John 3:16, RSV; cf. Phil. 2:5-11; Rom. 5:8). Self-surrender to God does not cancel human freedom but exercises it in its ultimate expression; it does not destroy the self but releases it from bondage to inordinate self-love and sin.

See CONSECRATE (CONSECRATION), OBEDIENCE, DEATH TO SELF.

For Further Reading: Wiley, *CT*, 2:471-87; Ellul, *The Ethics of Freedom*, 112-32, 236-69. C. S. COWLES

SWEDENBORGIANISM. This cult is also called New Church or Church of the New Jerusalem. The first society was begun (1783) in London by Robert Hindmarsh, a Methodist, after reading the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg (1688-1772). Swedenborg, the son of the Lutheran bishop of Skara, Sweden, and a brilliant scientist,

wrote extensively on scientific, philosophic, and theological subjects. His theological writings are based on reputed mental travels in the spirit world. These began with "a violent fever in 1743" (Wesley, *Works*, 13:62, 426). To Swedenborgians, he is God's seer through whom God is ushering in His New Church, and whose writings are either inspired interpretations of the Word or *The Word*.

God, the spiritual world (heaven and hell), and the physical world all have correspondence. The Word (most of the OT and only the part of the NT not including the Epistles and Acts) has an exact correspondence with the spiritual world and God. Perfect understanding of this correspondence is gained through symbolic interpretation, revealed by Swedenborg from his mental travels. He differs from orthodoxy in the following: God is the Grand Man, and thus all existence, as well as man, is in God's image. Angels and demons were formerly men. The Trinity exists only as manifestation. Jesus is the same as God the Father and is to be worshipped as such. Heaven and hell are extensions of this physical life including social structure, and are chosen according to one's desires: either concern for others, or self-satisfaction including sexual. The separation in the afterlife occurs as each increases in the direction of his dominant desire. Salvation is by good works. "Faith alone" is strongly opposed.

See CULTS, ORTHODOXY, WESLEYANISM.

For Further Reading: Block, *The New Church in the New World*; DeBeaumont, "Swedenborg," *ERE*, 11:129-32; Van Dusen, *The Presence of Other Worlds*; Wesley, *Works*, 13:62, 425-48. DAVID L. CUBIE

SYMBOLIC ESCHATOLOGY. See ESCHATOLOGY.

SYMBOLICS. See CREED, CREEDS.

SYMBOLISM. The concepts *sign* and *symbol* have an extremely wide range of application even within a purely religious context. Consider the following very incomplete list: A red face is a sign of anger; immorality is a sign of the times; the road is not clearly sign-posted; this fire is a sign that someone has camped here; the Cross is a symbol of Christianity; the house was a symbol of prison in your dream; the hero symbolizes goodness. Common to most uses of the concept is the idea of a symbol as something which by convention stands in place of or suggests something else. Some writers have, however, suggested that one can draw a distinction between conventional and intrinsic symbols. The con-

ventional symbol has no connection with what it symbolizes other than the fact that by arbitrary convention it has been agreed to allow it to represent a particular symbolizandum. On the other hand, the intrinsic symbol has an inherent relationship to what it symbolizes: in Paul Tillich's language it participates in that which it symbolizes.

The English word *symbol* derives originally from the Greek *symbolon*, which meant a sign or token which authenticated one's identity, as in a soldier's *symbolon*. This term was appropriated by Christian theology to mean creed or summary of faith, something which established one's allegiance. Thus Christian theology is often divided into *philosophical* theology, which deals with the philosophical presuppositions of the faith; *symbolic* theology, which treats the key assertions and doctrines of Christianity in a systematic fashion; and *applied* theology, which addresses itself to the practical implications of symbolic theology for the ecclesiastical community.

The problem of the use of symbols in theology is today most often connected with the problem of religious language, that is, the question of how the predicates (love, goodness, wisdom, power, etc.) used in connection with God function in theological assertions such as "God is love" or "God is infinitely wise." Traditionally, Christian theologians have argued that such predicates are cognitive in the sense of conveying meanings about God which are either true or false. Several contemporary theologians have argued, however, that religious predicates are in fact non-cognitive, in that they are not to be construed as true or false. Instead, religious language is symbolic.

The leading exponent of this theory is Paul Tillich, who distinguishes between a sign and a symbol. Both point to something beyond themselves, but a sign does so because of a convention while a symbol "participates in that to which it points" (*Dynamics of Faith*, 42). A flag, to use Tillich's example, which, it should be noted, is certainly not without its problems, is a symbol because it is not conventionally instituted and participates in that which it symbolizes. Tillich's conception of religious symbols is not clear, but he seems to suggest that: (1) religious symbols have a twofold purpose in that (a) they "open up levels of reality which otherwise are closed to us," and (b) "unlock dimensions and elements of our soul" (*ibid.*); and (2) religious faith is a state of being ultimately concerned and thus can only express itself symbolically. There is only one

nonsymbolic statement that can be made about God, that He is Being itself.

While Tillich's doctrine of religious symbols is perhaps the best-known modern attempt to understand the role of symbols in Christian theism, it is certainly not a carefully elaborated idea which is free from difficulties. Many Christian thinkers, for instance, would feel extremely uneasy about construing all religious language as noncognitive, particularly as this seems to suggest that theological propositions are ultimately nonmeaningful.

See TRUTH, REVELATION (SPECIAL), CREED (CREEDS), PROPOSITIONAL THEOLOGY, HISTORICAL THEOLOGY, RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE.

For Further Reading: Bevan, *Symbolism and Belief*; Ramsey, *Models and Mystery*; Tillich, *Dynamics of Faith*.
JOHN C. LUIK

SYNCRETISM. Syncretism refers to the reconciliation or union of conflicting religious beliefs. The syncretist believes that every religion offers a legitimate way to God, so he attempts to harmonize Christianity with non-Christian religions. Syncretists attack the "parochialism" of Christianity, its claim of exclusive redemption. They say the way should be left open for other religions to develop their own formulae for redemption.

Of course, interaction with members of other religions can be helpful and stimulating. We can learn from those who disagree with us, but we cannot agree that they have their own way of salvation apart from the death and resurrection of Christ.

Syncretism has been attempted since ancient times. Even though Moses pointed out that there was none other beside God, at times Baal was worshipped in the Temple in Jerusalem even to the extent of sacred prostitution (Deut. 4:35-40; 2 Kings 23:4-14). The apostle Peter made it clear that Jesus is the only Way to salvation (Acts 4:12), and the apostle Paul pointed out that Jesus Christ was the only Foundation (1 Cor. 3:11). While respect for the views of others is expected of Christians, it should not be permitted to lead to an undermining of the truth that Jesus Christ is the only Way to God (John 14:6).

See HEATHEN (FATE OF), SALVATION, NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS, CHRISTIANITY.

For Further Reading: Anderson, *Christianity and Comparative Religion*; Newbigin, *The Finality of Christ*; Visser 't Hooft, *No Other Name*; Anderson, ed., *The Theology of the Christian Mission*, 179-228.

RONALD L. KOTESKEY

SYNERGISM. This term is a compound of the two Greek words: *syn*, meaning "together" or "with," and *ergein*, meaning "to work." Theologically it has reference to the cooperation of the divine and human for the salvation and character building of man. It sets forth the doctrine of the cooperation of the human will with divine grace, and views faith as a personal response to a prior act of divine solicitation to salvation by God—the invitation being extended to whoever will respond. Such passages as Rev. 22:17; Rom. 10:13; Isa. 1:18; 55:3; Matt. 11:28; Rev. 3:20; Joel 2:32 (cf. Acts 2:21); Isa. 55:6-7; Ezek. 33:11; 2 Pet. 3:9; John 1:12; Mark 1:15; 1 John 1:9; etc., presuppose the ability of man to respond to and cooperate with God's grace working in him both to will and to do God's pleasure (Phil. 2:12-13).

Salvation, as a divine-human covenant, presupposes a mutual cooperation between man and his God. Hence it is both of divine grace and of human choice. The act of believing unto salvation is always man's own. But man is not saved by his own efforts apart from the grace of God working in him. Yet synergists do contend that the human will is a *causa concurrens* to one's personal salvation.

The term *synergism* became definitely fixed as a theological concept in the 16th century. It was applied to the more mature views of Philip Melancthon and his followers, who contended that the human will can cooperate with the grace of God for man's regeneration. They referred to the human will when aided by divine grace as a *vera causa regenerationis*, though not as a primary cause.

The Lutheran position was stated as follows: "There are three concurrent causes of good actions, the Word of God, the Holy Spirit, and human will assenting to and not resisting the Word of God." And the Augsburg Confession declares: "Although God does not justify men through their merits, nevertheless the merciful God does not act on man as a block but draws him so that his will co-operates, provided he has come to years of discretion" (Art. 20).

In this position Melancthon seemed to recall some of Augustine's strong statements in the treatise entitled *The Spirit and the Letter*. One of them reads: "To yield our consent, indeed, to God's summons, or to withhold it, is (as I have said) the function of our own will. And this not only does not invalidate what is said, 'For what hast thou that thou didst not receive?' (1 Cor. 4:7) but it really confirms it. For the soul cannot receive and possess these gifts, which are here referred to, except by yielding its consent. And

thus whatever it possesses, and whatever it receives, is from God; and yet the act of receiving and having belongs, of course, to the receiver and possessor."

In the 17th century James Arminius stated the operations of grace to be upon the whole man, not merely his will, when he declared: "It is an infusion both into the human understanding and into the will and affections" (*Works*, 1:253, Declaration of Sentiments). Moreover he called it "preventing [preceding] and exciting, following and cooperating grace." Nor does he look upon God's grace as "a certain irresistible force," for he says, "I believe, according to the Scriptures, that many persons resist the Holy Spirit and reject the grace that is offered." In his refutation of William Perkins he insists: that "the free will of man is the subject of grace. Hence it is necessary that the free will should concur with the grace, which is bestowed, to its preservation, yet assisted by subsequent grace, and it always remains in the power of the free will to reject the grace bestowed, and to refuse subsequent grace; because grace is not the omnipotent action of God, which can not be resisted by the free will of man" (*Works*, 3:509).

In the 18th century, Wesleyans talked and wrote about the prevenient grace of God operating upon all men to move them, if they will cooperate with it, unto saving faith and personal salvation. Their contention being that:

It is the continuous cooperation of the human will with the originating grace of the Holy Spirit that merges prevenient grace directly into saving grace. Arminians hold that through the prevenient (preparatory) grace of the Spirit, unconditionally bestowed upon all men, the power and responsibility of free agency exists from the first dawn of the moral life. This unconditional benefit of Christ's atonement came unto all men as a "free gift" (see Rom. 5:18; and more fully vv. 15-19). Furthermore, they hold that man, by co-operating through faith with prevenient grace, fulfills the conditions for saving grace (cf. John 1:12-13). This, of course, is contrary to true Calvinism, which insists that "common grace" never merges into "saving grace," nor is the universal call or summons to salvation to be identified with "effectual calling," wherein "irresistible grace" regenerates the elect to actual personal salvation.

We may affirm, then, that conviction of sin and the divine summons to salvation are involuntary but not therefore compulsory. For, as Brightman declares: "All the rest of the Universe

cannot compel a free act" (*Person and Reality*, 185).

Synergism arose as an ethical protest against religious fatalism which threatened to submerge the conscience of man and disarm the Church in her fight against moral corruption, license, and anarchy. That attitude which sings: "The Lord our God in His *own good time* shall lead to the light at last, all who are predestined and unconditionally elected to eternal life" serves to create the philosophy of irresponsible, unrepentant, and unregenerate living. The practical result of monergistic determinism is to paralyze the quest for morality and righteous living. It also makes God the author of sin.

Synergists do contend that the help of the Holy Spirit is necessary to enable man to accept and act upon the gospel. Thus human cooperation becomes a *causa subordinata* in regeneration. No man can truthfully say that he is compelled to sin by fate, or what is worse, by divine decree. The unconverted man still has the power because of prevenient grace, of either obeying or resisting God's call to salvation through the Holy Bible illuminated by the Holy Spirit and impressed upon him by the faithful and anointed preaching thereof. But to reject God's grace is an act of the human will and not a withholding of saving grace by an arbitrary divine decree or omission.

See MONERGISM, PREVENIENT GRACE.

For Further Reading: Arminius, *Works*, 3:281-525; Augustine, *Basic Writings of Augustine*, 2 vols.; Brightman, *Person and Reality*; Mackenzie, "Synergism," *ERE*, 12:158-64; Miley, *Systematic Theology*, 2:334-37; Pope, "Prevenient Grace and the Conditions of Salvation," *A Higher Catechism of Theology*, 207-21.

ROSS E. PRICE

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY. Systematic theology is the attempt by the church to describe the faith relationship with God in Christ in an ordered, structured, reasonable way. Human minds can-

not be satisfied with less than the attempt to understand revealed truth and Christian experience in an integrated, interrelated fashion. This is justified. God is One, and within His words and works are both unity and harmony. As a good map orients the traveler to the larger area and the connectedness of its parts, systematic theology aims at both overview and coherent detail respecting God, man, and the redemptive relationship between them.

Essential to the task are clarity of expression within the contemporary idiom, and dynamic interaction with the contemporary culture. The discipline itself facilitates the testing and correcting of the church's understanding as well as true communication of the faith. Because theologians are but creatures thinking about the Creator, the goal can be only approximated. The term *systematic theology* (German and Dutch scholars seem to prefer *dogmatics*) is not meant to imply that other forms of theological study are without an orderly system.

Systematic theology relies upon the work of biblical theology, which deals expressly with the Word of God to which the church must conform, as well as upon the work of historical theology, which traces the insights and movements within the church's teaching to the present time. In turn, systematic theology provides guidance for the work of pastoral theology.

Some organizing principle will become the key, consciously or not, to the systematic theologian's method. The starting point may determine it: God, or man, or the redemptive relationship. Any list of methodologies would include the Christological, Trinitarian, anthropological, covenantal, confessional, analytic, or synthetic.

See THEOLOGY, BIBLICAL THEOLOGY, HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Wiley, *CT*, 1:13-98.

ARNOLD E. AIRHART

T

TABERNACLE. See TEMPLE.

TALMUD. The Talmud, a word deriving from the Hebrew word *lamad* meaning "to study," is an encyclopedia of Jewish tradition arising out of and

supplementing the OT. The *ialmud* developed over a period of centuries through an oral process and was eventually preserved in writing. For the Jews the Torah was the central, authoritative document of their faith. It contained the revealed

will of God for them. With the loss of the Temple as the focal point of their worship, and the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., the Jews began to rethink and reorder their lives in keeping with the law of Moses. Out of this strong impetus came the Talmud which records the interpretations and applications of scriptural laws to the changing social situations in which the people found themselves across the centuries.

The Talmud developed in two layers, the first being the Mishnah, and the second, the Gemara. The Mishnah (derived from the Hebrew meaning "repeat" or "study") contains the Oral Torah. It is composed of six main divisions and 63 tractates which give case law on numerous matters relating to agriculture, feasts, the role of women, cultic practices, etc. The Torah gives the statute, while the Mishnah applies the statute to a particular situation in life.

The second layer or phase of the Talmud is the Gemara, the comments of the rabbis (the Amoraim, literally "speakers") on the Mishnah. These interpretations come from the period A.D. 200 to 500. Apparently the brevity and specific nature of the mishnaic laws, in due time, required further interpretation and new application. Essentially, the Gemara was a supplement to the Mishnah, and the two constitute the Talmud.

During the course of Jewish history two Talmuds were assembled, the Palestinian or Jerusalem Talmud and the Babylonian Talmud. The latter Talmud is more copious and elaborate in its notes and for that reason has become the more prized one. Both Talmuds were concluded about the fifth century A.D. It is to be understood, however, that much of the material contained in them reaches well back into pre-Christian times.

See PENTATEUCH, MOSES, MOSAIC LAW, JUDAISM.

For Further Reading: Neusner, *Invitation to the Talmud*; Steinsaltz, *The Essential Talmud*; Strack, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*; Trattner, *Understanding the Talmud*.
WILLARD H. TAYLOR

TARGUM. An Aramaic translation, paraphrase, or interpretative note of an OT passage is called a targum. When Aramaic, a northwest Semitic language, became the *lingua franca* of nearly all of southwestern Asia, it became necessary for translations to be made from the Hebrew to the Aramaic in order for the Hebrews to understand the old Scriptures. Thus, as suggested by Neh. 8:8, public reading of the Scripture included a verse-by-verse rendering of the text into Aramaic. Oftentimes this process became an exposition; in other words, someone "gave the sense" of what had been read. In time, these Aramaic

translations and expositions were written down. The two most famous targums date from the fifth century A.D. One is a translation of the Pentateuch, the Targum Onkelos, and the other a free rendition of the prophets, the Targum Jonathan. There are extant targums for all of the OT with the exception of Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah. Interestingly, parts of Daniel and Ezra, as found in the Hebrew text, are written in Aramaic.

See BIBLE.

For Further Reading: Bruce, *The Books and the Parchments*.
WILLARD H. TAYLOR

TEACH, TEACHING, TEACHER. The practice of teaching is probably as old as higher forms of animal life. It can be observed as mother birds or animals teach their offspring to forage, to defend, to socialize. With man it appears to be as old as history itself. Teaching is necessary to perpetuate and to propagate custom, code, culture, or skill. Where teaching takes place, by definition one or more teachers are involved in the teaching activity.

Teaching is recognized as both an art and a science. Persons who have the art or the gift of teaching may be creative and highly individualistic in their approach to the teaching-learning encounter. Likewise, those who have studied human growth and development, learning theories, and educational psychology may become skilled to an admirable degree. In fact, the science of teaching has become so proficient that man's behavior and choices can be subtly determined by subliminal instruction. Conscious and subconscious influences can be so effective that even personality change can be induced by electrochemical cortical stimulation or by "brainwashing" teaching techniques. The power of teaching and teachers cannot be overestimated for positive or negative impact upon man individually or corporately.

Teaching may be formal or informal, accidental, incidental, experiential, or systematized. *Teaching* may refer to the acts of instruction, the methods employed, the content of instruction, or the "body of truth" by which a group perpetuates itself as a distinct subculture.

The Bible is replete with references to teaching and teachers. Teaching and teachers in the OT were highly respected if not revered. The historical narrative, the Torah, and the wisdom literature alike stress the importance of both the role and the content of teaching. It was integral to the concept of a covenant people. The role and responsibility were imposed upon parents, priests,

prophets, leaders, and scribes. The term "Rabbi," loosely translated "Master," was reserved as title of address to a noteworthy teacher.

The NT terminology is rich in nuances of meaning. The verb *didaskō* perhaps has the broadest connotation of any word used. It may mean to perform, execute, demonstrate, or show; to apprise of or to prove; to instruct or teach. It is used to denote the passing on of information or knowledge, to teach a skill, or to clinch a point. It presupposes expertise in the teacher. It often depicts the teaching by God or the Holy Spirit to denote revelation or inspiration. It also defines relationship between teacher and pupil.

The verb *katēcheō*, "to sound from above," was more restrictive to recounting, narrating, informing, or instructing. It carried the didactic connotation. It is from this authoritative understanding that the Church developed and perpetuated the *catechisms* and the *catechetical* approach to teaching creeds, doctrine, and practice.

The term *paideuō* denoted upbringing, disciplining, directing character formation of the pupils (usually for children or youth). It came to mean a way of education, a cultivation, and a goal to be attained.

Another term, the noun *paradosis*, related to the transmission and reception of tradition. It often denoted exhortatory moral instruction.

Although preaching and teaching in biblical and Early Church records were generally separated in act and understanding, they were meant to be complementary offices and practices for propagating the gospel and nurturing the body individually and corporately. These offices and functions demand the best the Body of Christ can provide. Likewise, they demand the utmost in character, competence, and commitment that the teacher can achieve to deserve the privilege and responsibility as teacher in the Body and to the Body of Christ.

See CLERGY, ELDER, DISCIPLINE, CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, PERSON (PERSONALITY), PREACHING.

For Further Reading: Harper and Sanner, eds., *Exploring Christian Education*; Leypoldt, *Learning Is Change*; Augustine, "Concerning the Teacher"; Kittel, 2:135.

CHESTER O. GALLOWAY

TELEOLOGICAL ESCHATOLOGY. See ESCHATOLOGY.

TELEOLOGY. See THEISTIC PROOFS.

TEMPERANCE. The Greek NT term most often translated "temperance" is *egkrateia*, and it means

self-control or continence. In 1 Cor. 7:9 it refers to control of sexual desire. In Gal. 5:23 it applies to all the "flesh-works" listed in vv. 19-21 (*Interpreter's Bible*, 10:569). In 1 Cor. 9:25 it refers to the discipline of the athlete who controls even the lawful and good desires for the sake of a higher goal, and so he "is temperate in all things."

Temperance or self-control was one of the four cardinal virtues of classical Greek thought. Aristotle uses the word to describe a man in whom reason prevails over passion, one in whom passions and instincts, though not extirpated, have become servants rather than masters. Temperance is the ideal of perfecting the self into a harmonious whole (*IDB*, 5:268). The motive for self-control was to demonstrate that reason and self-will are sovereign.

In Pauline thought self-control is not an end in itself but a means to the glory of God and a normal expression of the Spirit-filled life (Gal. 5:16-24). "The evil things of the old self are dead with Christ and the lovely things of the Spirit are manifest" (Barclay, *Daily Bible Study Series*, Gal. 5:23).

A more limited and technical use of the term confines it to a movement to eliminate the use of alcoholic beverages. After the first temperance society was formed in 1789 at Litchfield, Conn., the word "temperance" came to stand for total abstinence in the use of intoxicating beverages and rigid control of the production and sale of these beverages. Under the advocacy of such organizations as the Women's Christian Temperance Union, total prohibition was the goal for the American society.

While the legal prohibition was not retained, and the 18th Amendment was repealed, the conviction against the use of alcoholic beverages has become deeply rooted among evangelicals. This position is based more on the application of biblical principles than numerous proof texts. In this a parallel can be seen with the gradual quickening of a conscience against slavery. Modern alternatives as beverages, a gargantuan liquor and wine industry devoting billions to increase consumption, the high social cost of alcoholism, the technological demands on modern society, the proven tendency of alcohol to enslave, our advanced knowledge concerning its physical effects—all point to a vast difference between biblical times and ours, and constitute overwhelming arguments for total abstinence.

See SEVEN DEADLY SINS, DRUNKENNESS, SEVEN CARDINAL VIRTUES.

For Further Reading: Maclaren, *Exposition of the Holy Scriptures*, Gal. 5:22-23. M. ESTES HANEY

TEMPLE. The Temple of Jerusalem was the center of worship for the Jewish people. The Temple was the only place a sacrifice could be offered, and it was the dwelling place of God on earth.

The Jerusalem Temple was patterned after the Tabernacle which was used in the wilderness and through the early history of Israel. David had the vision for a permanent place of worship, but it was Solomon who had the Temple built and dedicated. As in the Tabernacle, the Temple was built to specifications providing for an outer court, an inner court, the holy place, and the holy of holies. The furniture of the Temple was the same as the Tabernacle's: the altar, table for shewbread, candlestick, the altar of incense, a veil, and the ark of the covenant.

Symbols of Things to Come. Each part of the Temple and every piece of furniture for the Temple held symbolic significance. The Book of Hebrews identified these as "patterns of things in the heavens" (9:23). "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true" (v. 24). The candlestick and the shewbread point to Christ, the Light of the World, and to Christ, the Bread of Life. Christ is symbolized in the altar of incense as the continual Intercessor to God. As Jesus died upon the Cross, the veil of the Temple was rent in two (Mark 15:38), thus indicating that the division between the holy place and the holy of holies was removed, giving all mankind direct access to God. Christ became the High Priest who offered the sacrifice for sin once and for all.

The Body. The Bible also speaks of our bodies as temples. Paul asked, "What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?" (1 Cor. 6:19). In the Book of Hebrews the body is referred to as the temple not made with hands (Heb. 9:11).

The Church. The true meaning and purpose of the Temple finds its fulfillment in the Church of Jesus Christ (Eph. 2:21; cf. 1 Pet. 2:5-6). The designation is also applied to a local body of believers (1 Cor. 3:16-17; 2 Cor. 6:16). Paul warns the Corinthians: "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are" (1 Cor. 3:17). A. T. Robertson comments: "The church-wrecker God will wreck" (*Word Pictures*, 4:99).

See CHURCH, TYPE (TYPOLOGY).

For Further Reading: NBD, 1242-49.

JAMES L. PORTER

TEMPTATION. The idea of temptation is expressed in the Hebrew by the noun *massah*, usually translated "temptation," and the verbs *nasah* ("tempt") and *bachan*, usually translated "try" or "prove." The corresponding Greek terms are the noun *peirasmos* and the verbs *peirazō* and *dokimazō*. The biblical concept of temptation is not primarily the notion of enticement to sin as the English word suggests, but more basically the idea of "testing" or "proving." The intention is "to prove the quality of a person." Improvement of one's life may be the purpose by exposing latent defects in one's character.

Numerous scriptures depict God as "testing" people, that is, leading them into situations in which their faith or lack of it is exposed. A most familiar example is Abraham's "sacrifice" of Isaac (Genesis 22). These times of trials have purifying (1 Pet. 1:6-9), patience-inducing (Jas. 1:2-4), and assuring effects in the life of the believer (Rom. 5:3-5). Satan is the eternal foe of believers, and he seeks to destroy their faith in devious ways. The classic examples in the OT are Adam and Eve (Genesis 3) and Job (Job 1:12; 2:6). In His earthly life Jesus was confronted by the tempter (Matt. 4:3; cf. 1 Thess. 3:5). Paul refers to his "thorn in the flesh" as a "messenger of Satan, to harass me, to keep me from being too elated" (2 Cor. 12:7, RSV, here and subsequently).

1. God is not the provocateur of temptation, but He may permit it to come into a believer's life as in the case of Job. James cautions, "Let no one say when he is tempted, 'I am tempted by God'; for God cannot be tempted with evil and he himself tempts no one" (1:13). The petition in the Lord's Prayer, "And lead us not into temptation" (Matt. 6:13; Luke 11:4), is a request not to be put to the test. It recognizes the need to preserve one's freedom, but at the same time it acknowledges that situations can develop which may cause one to "enter into temptation."

2. Human desire accommodated by the will leads to sin. James clarifies this point: "Each person is tempted when he is lured and enticed by his own desire. Then desire when it has conceived gives birth to sin" (1:14-15).

3. God's intention is to provide "the way of escape" for His people whenever they are tempted in order that they may endure it (1 Cor. 10:13).

4. The fact that Christ was tempted "in every respect" (*ta panta*) "as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. 4:15) would support the fact that temptation is not sin. Yielding to the enticement offered is the point of sinning.

Watching that one "not enter into temptation" is the exhortation for the Christian (Matt. 26:41).

Also no opportunity should be given to the tempter to gain a foothold in one's life (Eph. 4:27). The devil, the adversary, "prowls around like a roaring lion, seeking some one to devour"; and for that reason the Christian must resist him with a passion but with a consciousness that "the God of all grace" will strengthen him after a little while of suffering (1 Pet. 5:8-10).

See TRIBULATION, VICTORY (VICTORIOUS LIVING), SIN, FORGIVENESS, BACKSLIDING, TEMPTATION OF CHRIST, SPIRITUAL WARFARE, SUPPRESSION.

For Further Reading: Bonhoeffer, *Temptation*; Packer, "Temptation," *NBD*; Seesemann, "peira," "peirao," et al., Kittel, vol. 6; Taylor, *Life in the Spirit*, chap. 12.

WILLARD H. TAYLOR

TEMPTATION OF CHRIST. We think of the temptation of Christ only in terms of Matt. 4:1-11 and Luke 4:1-13, where the Savior, after fasting for 40 days in the wilderness, was "tempted of the devil." This was obviously a personal encounter with Satan. But Christ was also tempted by many different means during His earthly life and ministry. The Jewish leaders tempted Him often, enticing Him to work miracles simply for exhibition. The "contradiction of sinners" was a real test to the purity of the Son of God (Heb. 12:3). The absence of faith on the part of His followers must also have been a great temptation to Christ. These, with many more, became the repetitive temptations that would try the spirit of any man, and certainly became a test to the Son of God. Was it this that Jesus referred to in Luke 22:28—"Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations"?

Temptation is the devil's chosen work. He is the tempter, *ho peirazōn*. Satan tempts either by inflaming the evil lusts which lurk within, or by external enticement.

In the cases of Adam and of our Lord the temptations were of the latter kind, because there was no evil lust in Adam before the Fall, and certainly none in Christ during His earthly life. Therefore, when the devil tempted Christ, he had nothing in Him (John 14:30).

There is an interesting parallel in the temptations of Adam and of Christ when studied in the light of 1 John 2:16: "For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world." The three identifying qualities of temptation confronted both the first Adam and the Second Adam (Christ) in their temptations.

First Adam (Gen. 3:6)—

a. "The lust of the flesh"—"Tree was good for food."

b. "The lust of the eyes"—"pleasant to the eyes."

c. "The pride of life"—"desired to make one wise."

Second Adam, Christ (Luke 4:1-13)—

a. "The lust of the flesh"—"If thou be the Son of God, command this stone that it be made bread."

b. "The lust of the eyes"—"And the devil, taking him up into an high mountain, shewed unto him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. . . . All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them."

c. "The pride of life"—"If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down from hence: for it is written, he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee."

Sin and death came from the first Adam's yielding to temptation. Righteousness and life came from the Second Adam's rejecting temptation. The first Adam was tempted and fell. The Second Adam was tempted and conquered.

Adam became the victim because he failed to heed the Word of God. Christ became the Victor because He used the Word of God as a defense against Satan.

Some have suggested that the temptation of Christ is mythological and allegorical and was not a real struggle. If we accept the Bible as the Word of God, then we must lay aside such untenable hypotheses, accepting the Matt. 4:1-11 record as a historical narrative of the life of Christ.

As the incarnate Son of God, was it possible for Him to have yielded to the temptation and sinned? Was Christ impeccable? At least two affirmations are true: (1) His temptation was real. There is no question about the reality of His temptation; (2) He could not have sinned and remained the Savior.

The strength with which the Master resisted temptation is available now to His people who are made partakers of His divine nature (Matt. 6:13; 1 Cor. 10:13; Heb. 4:15-16; 7:25; 1 Pet. 4:1-2).

See SINLESSNESS OF CHRIST, TEMPTATION.

For Further Reading: Abbott, *A Dictionary of Religious Knowledge*, 928; Benton, *Church Cyclopedia*, 724; Blunt, *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*, 734 ff; Baker's *DT*, 514 ff. DONALD R. PETERMAN

TEN COMMANDMENTS. See DECALOGUE.

TESTIMONY, WITNESS. Testimony is an open declaration or profession of faith or agreement and

an evidence given primarily to the actions and revelations of God.

In the OT, to give a testimony is to repeat or to affirm, to reprove or admonish in reference to the pronouncements or covenants of God. The Hebrew root form is to bear witness (Ruth 4:7). To testify to God's action called for decision and action on the part of His people (Josh. 24:15, 22).

The ark of the covenant is called the ark of the testimony (Exod. 25:22; Josh. 4:16) because it contained two tables of stone upon which God wrote the Ten Commandments (Exod. 25:16). This became God's witness against Israel's sin (Deut. 31:26).

Some testimonies were tangible memorials or ceremonies to mark transaction and agreements. Jacob raised a heap of stones as a boundary between him and Laban (Gen. 31:44-55).

Two witnesses were required to establish a charge against a person (Num. 35:30). Anyone committing a grave crime had to be denounced by witnesses (1 Kings 21:13). A sin which the prophets denounced was witnesses who could be bought for money (Amos 5:10-13; Isa. 5:23).

In the NT, testimony takes on a wider meaning of a proclamation in word, deed, or suffering. Our word "martyr" focuses on the affirmation of one's belief in the gospel by personal suffering. Stephen was stoned to death as a result of his testimony and is usually considered the first Christian martyr (Acts 6:8—7:60). Jesus is said to have been a faithful and good witness unto death (Rev. 1:5).

During the past three centuries, testimony became a way of telling how one came to be saved. It was a particular part of Methodist class meetings and has been continued by many of their conservative followers to the present time.

"Witness" has sometimes been distinguished from "testimony" as telling of God's deliverance or action in one's life in the presence of those who are unconverted. As such, testimony is confined to affirmation of such action among those who are already Christians.

Witnessing is at the heart of the Great Commission, for the Church advances by a kind of proclamation that is linked with personal testimony. Twice in Acts Paul tells of his conversion (in addition to Luke's narrative in chap. 9). In fact, the promised power of the Holy Spirit had effective witnessing as its primary objective and manifestation (Luke 24:45-49; Acts 1:8).

See GREAT COMMISSION, EVANGELISM, MISSION (MISSIONS, MISSIOLOGY), PREACHING, SOUL WINNING.

For Further Reading: *IDB*, 4:1864; Harmon, ed., *Ency-*

clopedia of World Methodism, 2:2327; Lawlor, *Wake Up and Witness*; *HDB*, 743, 820-21. J. OTTIS SAYES

TEXTUAL CRITICISM. This discipline studies the manuscripts of a work whose original (autograph) is not available, seeking to determine the wording of the original. Textual criticism of the Scriptures is entirely consistent with a belief in their divine inspiration, truthfulness, and providential preservation. It is necessary, because God's providential care has not prevented the occurrence of various differences in the manuscripts.

Before the appearance of the Greek NT in print, differences in texts were little noted. The first printed Greek New Testaments were therefore produced from whatever manuscripts were readily available. The so-called Textus Receptus was of this sort; it owed its preeminence to its being first on the scene rather than to the intrinsic quality of its text.

Textual criticism began when manuscript differences were studied carefully. For unintentional variations (from errors of sight, hearing, memory, or judgment), a careful comparison of manuscripts yielded clues as to the original wording. Intentional changes, made by copyists or editors, were made in order to provide explanations, solve difficulties, eliminate apparent discrepancies, or correct supposed errors. This often produced additions to the text which were passed on to other manuscripts. The textual critic, seeking the original wording, therefore looks favorably on (1) the shorter reading, (2) the apparently more difficult reading, or (3) the reading which is more characteristic of a given author. Across the years textual criticism has developed into a highly technical science.

The process of textual criticism has yielded a very dependable text, undoubtedly close to the original. At the same time it gives remarkable testimony to God's providential preservation of His Word through the centuries; the Church has never been without a dependable witness to the message of salvation, whatever form of Scripture it possessed at that time.

See BIBLE, BIBLICAL INERRANCY, CRITICISM (NT), CRITICISM (OT), EXEGESIS, HERMENEUTICS.

For Further Reading: Greenlee, *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*; Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*.

PHILIP S. CLAPP

THANKSGIVING. See PRAISE.

THEISM. Christian theism is the belief in one personal God, Creator and Preserver of everything,

who is both immanent and transcendent. Classical arguments for God (Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas pioneered the arguments) do not hold the same cogency as in earlier days because modern science, working with verifiable sensory data, has captured the mind of technological man.

Theism is seen in contrast to deism, the belief that God is there but not here, not involved in His world. Deism overextends God's otherness (separateness) and denies revelation (God breaking into history).

Theism, likewise, contrasts with pantheism, which overextends God's hereness (immanence). Pantheism believes that God not only is *in* His creation (in the sense of putting His creative stamp on it), but that He *is* the creation. Pantheism robs God of His objective personhood.

Theism stands in direct opposition to atheism, the belief that there is no God (atheism: *a* = against; *theos* = God). In our century the late Bertrand Russell, the British mathematician and philosopher, was an intellectual leader of atheism.

Christian theism differs, too, from polytheism, the belief in many gods, as in Hinduism, the religion of countless divinities.

Theism also separates itself from agnosticism, the belief that one cannot really know if there is a God (agnosticism: *a* = against; *gnosis* = knowledge).

The most powerful proponents of theism in our time, by virtue of their appeal to the modern mind, do not work with historic theistic proofs (as noted above) so much as with inferential materials and contemporary images. This is seen in the writings of Francis Schaeffer, C. S. Lewis, Sheldon Vanauken, et al. Such authors are read widely not merely because of their "popularity"; in point of fact, their works are characterized by depth of insight and a remarkable breadth of knowledge. That very depth and breadth, cogently expressed, make their apologetic literature challenging and prove that one vast segment of modern man is seriously concerned to find the truth about God. One cannot read C. S. Lewis' *Problem of Pain* or *Mere Christianity*, for example, without careful attention.

Couple these apologetic works with the testimonial and devotional literature coming off the presses, and one begins to understand the mindset of contemporary man. The sensory and technological, whether understood in depth or on the surface, spills over into Christian literature. Actually, contemporary Western man does not so much ask, Does God exist?—he often assume

that—as he asks, What kind of a God exists? And how can He help me live a meaningful and coherent life?

Christianity teaches that God is Spirit (John 4:24)—self-aware, free, and not made of parts as something material. He is omnipresent—that is, everywhere. He is unchangeable and unchanging; He is not passive but active; He is dynamic; He can create and move and do and achieve. Practically, this all means the God who is there is also here, involved in His world and ever ready actually to help His children.

See GOD, TRINITY (THE HOLY), SPIRIT, PERSONALITY OF GOD, DEISM, PANTHEISM.

For Further Reading: "Theism," *The Harper Dictionary of Modern Thought*, 631 ff.; Lewis, *Mere Christianity*; Wiley, CT, 1:217-440; Lockyer, *All the Doctrines of the Bible*, 11-36; GMS, 48-66, 207-50.

DONALD E. DEMARAY

THEISTIC EVOLUTION. Theistic evolution is the view that God created by means of the evolutionary process. It is thus a combination of theism and evolution. But the view poses contradiction, because the idea of creation is directly opposed to the concept of evolution. There is no revelation in the Bible that would indicate that evolution had a part in God's creation method. Creation was an act of Deity in bringing this world and its inhabitants into existence.

Theistic evolution is quite plainly in radical opposition to all the fundamental teaching of biblical Christianity. God did not use evolution to finish a good work; He did not surrender the creative process to the chance and randomness postulated by evolution.

Evolution is essentially development from innate processes out of prior materials that appeared by chance and random variations, through natural selection, not under God's direction.

From the very beginning the hypothesis of evolution has failed. In 1859 Charles Darwin published *The Origin of Species*, which overturned the world of thought, shifted the whole attitude of science, and caused upheaval to the very foundation of religion and morality for his followers. He wrote that life had not been created in distinct kinds, but had developed in all its variations, including man, from a single cell.

He was in error in the big three issues. In the first place he wrote that natural selection could improve indefinitely. Geneticists now agree that once selection within a species has reached homozygosity (a pure state), then selection has no further influence. Secondly, Darwin thought that

life had been spontaneously generated. Many scientists have tried to generate life without success. Life comes from preexisting life which was created as it is revealed in the Bible.

Darwin missed it in the third big one by stating that acquired characteristics were inherited. This issue has been proven false many times and is perhaps the greatest blow to Darwin and evolutionists today. If acquired characteristics were inheritable, then evolutionists would have at least one working basis for organic evolution. They are now leaning heavily on mutations and chromosomal aberrations as the answer for evolution, which do bring changes within species, but harmful in most cases.

God did not use such a failure as organic evolution as a method of bringing into existence His world. As evolution fails, so theistic evolution fails. The failure of evolution as an alternative for origins strengthens our faith in Him as Creator. "In the beginning God created" (Gen. 1:1). The existing universe and the different kinds of plants, animals, and man did indeed arise through separate acts of special creation by God; so theistic evolution has no place in truth. The Christian ideal hopes for a concentration on nature that leads not away from but toward God.

See DARWINISM, EVOLUTION, CREATION, CREATIONISM, MAN.

For Further Reading: Smith, *Man's Origin, Man's Destiny*, 167-84; Hoover, *The Fallacies of Evolution*; Clark, *Darwin: Before and After*. DWIGHT J. STRICKLER

THEISTIC PROOFS. Historically the human attempt to know God has given rise to four main ways of reasoning about the ultimate reality. In philosophical (or natural) theology, these are known as "theistic proofs" or "arguments for God's existence."

1. The *ontological* argument (from the Greek *ontos*, "of being") is a statement of the basic assumption of the rationality of existence. This mode of argument was first clearly stated by Anselm (1033-1109) and was characteristic of the great medieval system of Christian philosophy known as Scholasticism. It was later restated by Descartes (1596-1650), one of the formative thinkers of 17th-century rationalism.

For Anselm, the name God stands for the most real being there is. By definition God is the Being than which a more real one cannot be conceived. Therefore, to understand the name correctly is to understand that God does in fact exist, for what we think of as *most* real, we must think of as *really* real. The human mind can conceive of a perfect being, and a necessary part of this perfection

is that this perfect being should exist. The idea of perfection includes the idea of existence. A *perfect* being cannot not be. That which does not exist is less than perfect. Since therefore we can have the idea of a perfect being, that being must exist.

Descartes argued similarly, pointing out that to think of a right-angled triangle is to think of it as having a hypotenuse; you cannot think of a right-angled triangle as not having one. Likewise, you cannot grasp what "God" means unless you grasp the fact that He cannot not exist.

Some have suspected this argument of being a kind of verbal trick. Others have denied that it has logical force, regarding it simply as an assertion that God *ought* to be thought of in a certain way. But many Christian thinkers have seen that there is something at stake in this pattern of reasoning, for it gives logical expression to the *radical inescapability* of God. It expresses the fact that thinking cannot rid itself of a relation to reality. Whatever names might be substituted for God, there is always a final reality whose nonexistence is unimaginable.

2. The *cosmological* argument (from *cosmos*, "world") attempts to answer the question "Where did the world come from?" It can be stated as follows: "Everything that exists must have an adequate cause. The world exists. Therefore the world must have an adequate cause." The name for this adequate cause is God. The cosmological way of reasoning holds that we cannot doubt the ultimate foundation of the cosmos. We can, of course, doubt any particular version of it, but this very doubting presupposes the foundation itself. Here cosmological reasoning overlaps ontological reasoning. The difference is this: The ontological argument says that if we think of an ultimate foundation of everything, we must think of it as real. Cosmological reasoning declares that the cosmos constrains us to think of an ultimate foundation and points us in that direction. The Bible contains expressions of such an argument (e.g., Ps. 19:1-4; 94:9; Acts 14:17; Rom. 1:19-20). It was given most notable philosophical form by Thomas Aquinas (1225-74).

3. The *teleological* argument stresses something still more specific about the ultimate reality. It derives its name from the Greek *telos*, the "goal," "end," or "aim" of a process. It argues for God's existence from the appearance of design or purpose in the universe, because a sense of rational purpose in the development of the natural world speaks of an origin in an intelligent mind. Thus God is seen not merely as the ultimate

cause of all things, but also as giving directional order (goal-orientation) to the cosmic whole.

4. The *moral* argument is associated with the teaching of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804). Kant questioned the validity of the traditional Scholastic arguments. He held that *pure reason* cannot prove the existence of God. Instead, he rested the case for God's existence upon the "moral ought," stressing the universal fact of moral awareness. This way of reasoning finds God not in the "top of the mind" but in the "bottom of the heart." It is argued that there is within the heart of man a majestic voice which tells him he ought to do what he knows to be right (although one's perception of what in fact is right will vary, depending on background, experience, tradition, etc.). Since this moral ought is universal, it must have an ultimate source or Author. God is thus one of the three postulates of the *practical reason* (freedom and immortality being the other two).

These are the four major historical ways of reasoning about God. Theology recognizes that everyone cannot be *argued into* believing in God; belief is more likely to precede rather than follow an understanding of these arguments. Yet these ways of reasoning, with their varying degrees of cogency for different individuals, do help to clarify the meaning of God for the thinking mind. Though they cannot compel belief, they can clarify what is involved in believing and thus make one's belief (or even unbelief) more authentic.

See GOD, ATTRIBUTES (DIVINE), APOLOGETICS, THEISM, EPISTEMOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Barth, *Anselm: Fides quaerens Intellectum*; Burrell, ed., *The Cosmological Arguments: A Spectrum of Opinion*; Hartshorne, *Anselm's Discovery: A Re-examination of the Ontological Proof for God's Existence*; Hick, *Arguments for the Existence of God*; Hick and McGill, eds., *The Many-faced Arguments*; Kung, *Does God Exist?: An Answer for Today*. ROB L. STAPLES

THEOCRACY. A theocracy is a government in which God is the supreme Ruler and His laws serve as the basis for all civil, social, and political relationships. Though the word itself is not found in the Bible, the idea is fundamental to both Testaments. It is inherent in the emphasis on God's sovereignty in the creation; it is explicit in John's vision of the great white throne in the Book of Revelation.

Israel's unique relationship to God as His chosen people essentially formed the foundation for the development of OT thought: "You shall be my own possession among all peoples . . . and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Exod. 19:5-6, RSV). Yahweh, as

king, would "reign for ever and ever" (15:18). Even though the theocracy was later governed by an earthly king, his reign was mediatorial, for he served as the Lord's anointed. Ultimately, on "the day of the Lord" all rule will yield to God's sovereign reign, "and the Lord will become king over all the earth" (Zech. 14:9, RSV).

The kingdom of God in the NT reveals the development of the concept of theocracy. The Messiah is of the house of David, and He has brought near the reign of God. He has established a kingdom that is not of this world (John 18:36), and of which there will be no end (Luke 1:33). Though He has ascended to the Father until the fullness of times, He will one day come in His kingdom (23:42), and the earth will recognize that He is "the blessed and only Sovereign, the King of kings and Lord of lords" (1 Tim. 6:15, RSV).

Theocracy allows no place for secularism. All regulations of society are essentially theological. All human accountability is ultimately to God. History itself is moving inexorably toward His appointed conclusion.

See DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY, STATE (THE), KINGDOM OF GOD.

For Further Reading: Bright, *The Kingdom of God*; Gray, "The Hebrew Conception of the Kingship of God: Its Origin and Development," *Vetus Testamentum*, 6:268-85; Vriezen, *An Outline of Old Testament Theology*, English ed. (1958), 227-31. WILLIAM B. COKER

THEODICY. See EVIL.

THEOLOGICAL LANGUAGE. In Christian theology language possesses a significance beyond its ordinary function in communication. In the theology of the gospel, John described Jesus as the "Word" (Gr. *logos*), meaning the bridge by which God communicates himself to mankind. *Theology* is a compound word, combining *theos*, "God," with *logos*, "word," describing those things which comprise the entire field of study about God and His revelation.

Theological language requires great precision. Language is a complex phenomenon. A word may be given a univocal meaning, or it may be interpreted equivocally. This means it may have one meaning, or it may have several meanings depending on the intention of the speaker or the interpretation of the hearer. Language is formed from images, concepts, signs, and sounds.

Theological language participates in all the characteristics of language. It is not divine or angelic speech. Nevertheless, it is distinctive because it speaks about God. It is sometimes

referred to as "God talk" by philosophers. Language which speaks of or describes empirical objects is not adequate to speak about God. There is a visual and verbal correspondence between the word *table* and the physical object, at least on the level of common sense. Such a correspondence does not exist between the word "God" and the Reality who created the world. Therefore, theological language is particularly conceptual and symbolic. Theological language seeks analogies or comparative pictures with which to describe the supernatural realm. A parable may be defined as an "extended analogy" which pictures some aspect of God or spiritual insight. For example, in the parable of the prodigal (Luke 15), the father represents the love of God the Father. An analogy may be defined as "a word made flesh." When ideas are clothed in persons, the ideas become understandable. By looking at Jesus, "the image of the invisible God" (Col. 1:15), we see God in a veiled expression—God incarnate.

From the beginning of the Church's history, and especially in the era of the church fathers (up to the sixth century), theological language has possessed crucial significance. Using philosophical language drawn from the Greeks, the fathers reconstructed and redefined this language to convey to their age the meaning of Christian faith. The important concepts of God as "person," the Trinity, the divinity and humanity of Jesus Christ, and many more received their major theological formulation. Tertullian was the first to use the word *Trinity*. The term *person* (*persona*) originally meant "face" or "mask," but it became an analogy of the personhood of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, signifying unity in trinity, not diversity in trinity.

Some persons are so convinced of the inadequacy of theology to express divine truths that they fall back on a mystical union with God, while an extreme form of linguistic analysis (logical positivism) rejects theological language as nonsense. Either of these leaves the Church in virtual, if not complete, silence about the faith. This is an abdication of responsibility and in opposition to the Church's mandate to be a witnessing community in the world.

See POSITIVISM, EPISTEMOLOGY, METAPHYSICS, THEOLOGY, COMMUNICATE (COMMUNICATION), TESTIMONY (WITNESS).

For Further Reading: Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*; Michalson, *Worldly Theology*, chap. 3.

LEON O. HYNSON

THEOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY. See
SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

THEOLOGY. Theology may be defined as a systematic explanation of the contents of a religious faith. Such a general definition can apply equally to Jewish, Muslim, Christian, or a number of other theologies. Theology aims at a comprehensive and coherent exposition of the various doctrines that are essential to the particular religion in question. It seeks to give linguistic structure and conceptual wholeness to what can be known about God and His relationship to the world.

Christian theology is the methodical explanation of the contents of the Christian faith and is primarily a function of the Christian Church. It results from participation in and orderly reflection upon God's self-disclosure in Jesus of Nazareth; it is Christian faith brought to a particular kind of expression. Christian theologians work within this community and are responsible to it.

But Christian theology is not simply a re-statement of what the Church has believed in the past. Because the Church bears witness to Christ in the contemporary world, and because it too lives in the world, theology must remain a dynamic enterprise. Through theology the Church repeatedly answers the question—for itself and for the world—"What does it mean to confess that Jesus is the Christ?"

Christian theology is not primarily reflection on Christian faith as such but on the God who became redemptively incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth and who by the Holy Spirit creates faith in the Church.

Christian theology may be arranged into at least five classifications, normally called theological disciplines. They are: (1) *Biblical theology*; (2) *Historical theology*, which concentrates on the history of Christian thought, its thematic organization, and its continuing instruction for the Church; (3) *Systematic theology*, which is heavily influenced by biblical and historical theology, but whose assignment is to systematically state the contents of the Christian faith with reference to the general milieu of the time in which the theologian is working; (4) *Moral theology*, or Christian ethics, which aims at a systematic understanding of how the Church, and the individual Christian within the life of the Church, can bear witness to the new reality established by Christ; and (5) *Practical or applied theology*, which includes pastoral theology, missiology, and Christian education.

See BIBLICAL THEOLOGY, HISTORICAL THEOLOGY, SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY, PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Wiley, *CT*, 1:13-99; MacQuarrie,

Principles of Christian Theology, 1-36; Brunner, *The Christian Doctrine of God: Dogmatics*, 1:3-85.

ALBERT L. TRUESDALE, JR.

THEOLOGY, NATURAL. See NATURAL THEOLOGY.

THEOLOGY OF MISSIONS. See MISSION, MISSIONS, MISSIOLOGY.

THEOPHANY. A theophany is a mode of revelation, an appearance of God to human beings in a visible or audible form.

The OT records several such appearances: angelic visitors came to Abraham's tent, one of whom spoke as the Lord (Gen. 18:2-22); Jacob wrestled with a man whom he called God (32:22-32); Moses talked with "the angel of the Lord" at the burning bush (Exod. 3:2) and spoke with God face-to-face at Mount Sinai (19:20 ff); Gideon talked with the angel of the Lord (Judg. 6:11-24); Manoah received instruction from a personage whose name was Secret (Wonderful, RSV) (13:1-20); a dream theophany came to Solomon (1 Kings 3:5-15); Elijah heard "the still small voice" of God speaking to him while in a cave at Horeb (19:9-18); even Ezekiel saw "the likeness as it were of a human form" while on the banks of Chebar (Ezek. 1:26-28, RSV).

The NT records that God spoke to Jesus at His baptism (Matt. 3:17); that three disciples heard a voice out of the cloud at the Transfiguration (17:1-13); that Paul saw the risen Christ on the Damascus Road (Acts 9:1-9); and that John had a vision of the exalted Christ on the Isle of Patmos (Rev. 1:12-20).

In general, theophanies were brief and temporary, but the appearance of God in a pillar of cloud and smoke accompanying His people during the Exodus, and the Shekinah Presence in the Tabernacle and Temple were lasting phenomena.

The key theophany of "the angel [messenger] of the Lord" may be interpreted as a preincarnate appearance of the Messiah. Often the heavenly messenger is identified with the Hebrew name *Adonai* (Ps. 110:1; Mal. 3:1), a name which the author of Hebrews ascribed to the Son-Creator (Heb. 1:10-12; Ps. 102:25-27).

Since a theophany is a revelation of God's person and proclamation, it cannot be bounded by the laws of human psychology, although God undoubtedly used the sum and substance of human nature in making himself known. God is His own messenger as He reveals His person and will to man.

See REVELATION (SPECIAL), HEILSGESCHICHTE.

For Further Reading: *Baker's DT*, 520.

BERT H. HALL

THEOSOPHY. Theosophy is a highly complex religio-philosophical system that claims to give systematic expression to an "ancient wisdom" derived from many cultures and religions. The "ancient wisdom" has been held in trust and communicated by a complex of suprahuman masters. Theosophy purports to introduce its communicants to ecstatic and expanding forms of consciousness that ascend hierarchically into the cosmic levels of reality that supposedly lie behind the visible world. All elements of reality are parts of an ultimate harmony and are themselves expressions of intricate chains of consciousness. Entrance by the communicant into these transcendent realities is achieved primarily by interiorized myth and doctrine rather than through ritual or social interaction.

Theosophy teaches that the solar system emanated from the ONE, an eternal, unknowable, boundless, and immutable principle. The emanation occurred in a series of major cycles of divine activity and rest, of which the evolution of man through several worlds and races is a part.

In addition to a hierarchy of divine beings who are subordinate to the ONE, there is an earthly plane which is constituted and energized by seven rays or lines of activity that govern all aspects of terrestrial life, each of which is headed by a master.

Theosophy was founded in 1875 by Madame (Helena Petrovna) Blavatsky (1831-91), and Col. Henry Steel Olcott. Others who were significant in its formation were Annie Besant, C. W. Leadbeater, and W. Q. Judge.

See CULTS, OCCULT (OCCULTISM), NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS, TRUTH, SALVATION, Gnosticism, PRE-EXISTENCE OF SOULS.

For Further Reading: Ellwood, *Religious and Spiritual Groups in America*; Judah, *The History and Philosophy of the Metaphysical Movements in America*.

ALBERT L. TRUESDALE, JR.

THEOTHANATOLOGY. See DEATH OF GOD DOCTRINE.

THOMISM. The most general description of Thomism is that it is a theological/philosophical movement originating in the 13th century with Thomas Aquinas and continuing with great force into the 20th century. Thomism places primary emphasis upon attempting to understand and explain each generation's problems and needs in a systematic way with Aquinas' spirit, insights,

principles, methods, and conclusions as the key to understanding.

Thomas Aquinas (A.D. 1225-74), variously known as the "great dumb ox of Sicily" and the "Angelic Doctor," was the most outstanding philosopher and theologian of the medieval church. He was born in Italy, became a Dominican in 1244, studied under Albertus Magnus, and was a teacher at Paris.

Several of his teachings were almost immediately condemned as heresy, but this decision was later reversed. And in 1323 he was canonized by Pope John XXII; in 1567 he was declared by Pius V the "Fifth Doctor of the Church"; in 1879 Leo XIII gave Thomism "official" (though not exclusive) place in the Roman Catholic church; and in 1918 Thomas became an institution in the church with his being mentioned in the Code of Canon Law—this is the only name in the code—with the strong position urged that his system should be the basis of all theological instruction.

Thomism is the complex melding of Aristotle (no superficial baptism), Augustine, and general Catholic Christianity into a massive whole. It stands in opposition to a Neoplatonic projection of a world of reality beyond this (the medieval form of realism), with the world of human experience and action as a mere appearance or shadow of the truly real world beyond. In harmony with Aristotle he focused on the significance of the empirical and gave a Christian interpretation as focusing on knowledge of this world as infused with divine reality rather than separated from it.

In opposition to a world of pure process (cf. Heraclitus: all is flux) as well as to total rigidity (cf. Parmenides: reality is immobile), Aquinas took the middle road of accepting both being and becoming, both substance and process. God has no potentiality: He is *actus purus* or pure actuality. God does not change or become; however, all other beings change. And the point is that for Aquinas, both God and the world are real.

In opposition to extreme positions on the evils of human nature and culture, Aquinas held that man himself, his reason, appetites, and achievements are significant and positive. He attached positive values to the state, law, art, philosophy, and culture in general. This would be substantiated by his celebrated five ways (proofs of the existence of God) as well as his development of natural theology.

While Aquinas may have held that there are two orders of truth corresponding to the natural and supernatural dimension of reality, he also maintained that these two levels do not stand in

opposition. Rather, all realms of truth are held together and are harmonious with each other through coming from the one God who brings unity to all dimensions of His creation.

Aquinas' vast philosophic synthesis stands with those of Aristotle and Hegel as encyclopedic monuments to human rational effort.

See HISTORICAL THEOLOGY, REASON, REALISM AND NOMINALISM, SCHOLASTICISM, PLATONISM, RATIONALISM, PROCESS THEOLOGY, NEO-THOMISM, SUBSTANCE (SUBSTANTIVE).

For Further Reading: *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 14:126-38; *Sacramentum Mundi*, 6:249-55; *NIDCC*, 60-61; Schaeffer, *Escape from Reason*; Barrett, *A Christian Perspective of Knowing*, 60-86, 91.

R. DUANE THOMPSON

THOUGHT. See REASON.

TIME. Time and history are crucial concepts to Christianity, for time makes possible creation, the whole range of salvation history, the Incarnation, human freedom, and the movement of this age toward a significant goal. Without time such action would be neither possible nor meaningful. All would be locked up in a motionless system with no experiencer to contemplate it, enjoy it, or act upon it.

Thus time, in the most basic theological and philosophical sense, must not be conceived of as aligning with views of time held by science and technology. It must be thought of as the passage or duration comprehended within the matrix of the experiencing person. And while *chronos* may refer to the simple passage of such time or to time as measured by clocks and calendars, *kairos* refers to the importance of proper timing and fulfillment: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand" (Mark 1:15).

Time or the temporal may be seen as providing the potential for birth, life, growth, creativity, and perfection; on the other hand, it may be seen as a power enslaving man to wear and tear, fatigue, old age, and death.

The temporal is often contrasted with the eternal and thus takes on the character of the secular or this-worldly. It may also mean in some theological systems the order of change or process (the material world) as opposed to the timelessness of the eternal.

Time has a past, present, and a future; various types of mind tend to emphasize or exaggerate one or the other. Overemphasis on the past will produce traditionalism and authoritarianism. Overemphasis on the present may be tied in with a barren empiricism or hedonism (pleasure is the

highest good). Overemphasis on the future may create utopianism or a violent form of revolution.

A Christian can observe a significant coming together of past, present, and future in accepting creation, Incarnation, and inscripturation from the past within a present context which sees history as moving in a genuine direction toward a divinely projected goal. In his life and thought these all come together in his cooperation with God in the fulfillment of the divine goals.

See IMMUTABILITY, CHRONOS, PROCESS THEOLOGY, ETERNITY, LEISURE, ATTRIBUTES (DIVINE).

For Further Reading: *Sacramentum Mundi*, 6:257-62; Wood, "Space-Time and a Trinitarian Concept of Grace," *Pentecostal Grace*, 101-36; Cullmann, *Christ and Time*.
R. DUANE THOMPSON

TITHE, THE. In simplest terms the tithe is $\frac{1}{10}$ (or 10 percent) of our wages or salary, or net gain (profits) from our own business or investments, or any combination of these.

In ancient days Abraham was the first recorded example of paying tithes, when he so honored the priest of God, Melchizedek (Gen. 14:20). Also, Jacob, his grandson, volunteered to give a 10th of all that God gave him. It was more than a trader's bargain, however, for he did it in gratitude for God's promise of food and clothing, protection and guidance (Gen. 28:13-22).

Under the Mosaic covenant God taught His people to tithe the increase. Even the priestly tribe (Levi), who lived on one of the tithes, was taught to tithe the tithe (Num. 18:26; Neh. 10:38). In general the teaching was, "The tithe . . . is the Lord's" (Lev. 27:30). Malachi even accuses tithe withholders of robbing God (3:8).

Some have thought that on the advent of the new covenant all tithes were done away. But Jesus was careful to teach, "Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them" (Matt. 5:17, RSV). And to the Pharisees He said: "But woe to you Pharisees! for you tithe mint and rue and every herb, and neglect justice and the love of God; these you ought to have done, without neglecting the others" (Luke 11:42, RSV). Thus He endorsed the tithe, even while putting it in perspective.

But Jesus never encouraged a legalistic spirit which would tithe carefully, then be just as careful to go no farther. Actually He underscored "Plus Giving." A classical illustration is the scene where He called attention to the widow who put in two copper coins while the rich put in their much larger gifts. Jesus said: "I tell you . . . this poor widow has given more than any of them;

for those others who have given had more than enough, but she, with less than enough, has given all she had to live on" (Luke 21:3-4, NEB). And Paul quotes the positive insight of Jesus, "It is more blessed to give than to receive" (Acts 20:35).

Paul taught the Corinthians some basic principles in Christian giving. (1) Let everyone engage in giving (1 Cor. 16:2); (2) Give regularly (weekly); (3) Give proportionately "according as he hath been prospered" (v. 3, Wesley); (4) Give cheerfully (2 Cor. 9:7).

Proportionate, cheerful giving would imply the tithe as a minimum, never the maximum. It would be unthinkable for the Christian under grace, prompted by love, to give less than the Israelite was required by law.

Roy L. Smith observes wisely: "The value of the system [tithing] is not in the funds that it produces but in the spiritual integration that results" (*Stewardship Studies*).

See STEWARDSHIP, MONEY.

For Further Reading: Young, *The Tithe Is the Lord's*; *ISBE*, 5:2987.
SAMUEL YOUNG

TOLERANCE. This has special reference to one of James Arminius' teachings, which urged that his own view of conditional predestination be permitted in the Dutch churches—along with the unconditional view. It also refers to the view held by many who are liberal in doctrine and practices, that the promoting of varying views should be permitted within given denominations. There is a great difference, however, between divergent views which are essentially evangelical being tolerated by the government in a state church, and the toleration of evangelical and nonevangelical views within an autonomous, confessional denomination. There is a tolerance which is Christian, and there is also a tolerance which is betrayal—as the apostle Paul would agree (cf. Galatians).

See LATITUDINARIANISM. J. KENNETH GRIDER

TONGUES, GIFT OF. This gift refers to a 17th-century English word used to translate the Hebrew *lashon* and the Greek *glossais*, "language/languages" in KJV and subsequent translations; now, by wide usage, applied to the practice of glossolalia, speechlike sounds unintelligible both to speaker and hearer unless interpreted.

Languages or tongues as a phenomenon of the Holy Spirit are mentioned in two NT books, Acts (2:4-13; 10:44-46; 19:6) and 1 Corinthians (12:10, 30; and possibly 14:2-39).

Interpretations of the biblical phenomena differ widely:

1. Some hold that 1 Corinthians 14, interpreted as relating to ecstatic or unintelligible speech, is the normative NT gift of languages, and that Acts is to be understood in harmony with 1 Corinthians.

2. Others hold that Acts 2:4-13 represents the normative NT language gifts and that 1 Corinthians is to be understood as related to intelligible (although not locally understood) languages.

3. Others hold that the Acts and Corinthian phenomena are different: Acts reporting the use of intelligible languages, and 1 Corinthians relating to an esoteric language or languages used in prayer and praise but otherwise unintelligible unless accompanied by a parallel gift of interpretation.

Modern "Pentecostal" denominations regard glossolalia as the biblical evidence of the baptism with or "in" the Holy Spirit. Some nondenominational charismatics deemphasize glossolalia as an evidence of the Spirit's fullness, but regard its practice as a gift to be expected normally by those filled with the Spirit.

The languages of Acts 2 seem clearly to have been foreign languages understood without interpretation. Luke goes beyond the necessity of simple narration to insist three times on the intelligibility of the tongues (vv. 6, 8, 11). Intelligibility is also implied of the speaking at Caesarea and Ephesus (Acts 10:46; 19:6). Each instance represents a breaking out of the gospel beyond previous limits—to Gentile proselytes, and to converts directly out of paganism.

That Luke wrote Acts nine years after Paul wrote 1 Corinthians, and that Luke had firsthand knowledge of the situation at Corinth (e.g., 2 Cor. 8:18 as a possible reference to Luke), makes Luke's insistence on intelligibility a matter of crucial importance as indicating what NT language gifts really are.

First Corinthians 14 is the major biblical basis for the modern practice of glossolalia. Three chief interpretations have been offered:

1. First Corinthians 14 represents a practice introduced into Christian worship from the Corinthian background of pagan mystery religions.

2. First Corinthians 14 reports the practice of glossolalia understood as a genuine gift of the Spirit for use in devotion.

3. First Corinthians 14 relates to the polyglot background of Corinthian society in which the introduction of foreign languages locally unintelligible and untranslated resulted in confusion in Christian worship.

Even a casual reading of the chapter shows Paul's grudging permissiveness in regard to the Corinthian practices.

Isbell (cf. "For Further Reading") makes a good case for the theory that common English translations have misinterpreted Paul in 1 Cor. 14:39, which should read, "So, my brothers, earnestly desire to prophesy, and do not impede prophesying with glossolalia."

See GIFTS OF THE SPIRIT, BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT, SIGN.

For Further Reference: Robert H. Gundry, "Ecstatic Utterance' NEB?", *Journal of Theological Studies*, October, 1966, Charles D. Isbell, "Glossolalia and Propheticalia: A Study of 1 Corinthians 14," *WTJ*, Spring, 1976, 15-24; Kildahl, *The Psychology of Speaking in Tongues*; Purkiser, *The Gifts of the Spirit*; Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement in the United States*; Taylor, *Tongues: Their Purpose and Meaning*.

W. T. PURKISER

TORAH. See MOSAIC LAW.

TOTAL DEPRAVITY. Certain distinctions should be made among the terms *original sin*, *inherited depravity*, and *total depravity*. Strictly speaking, *original sin* refers to man's first sin, the disobedience of Adam and Eve, resulting in the Fall. *Inherited depravity* has reference to the fact that the sinfulness of man is passed on from one generation to the next. *Total depravity* describes the extent to which each person is affected by this racial corruption.

The concept of total depravity is often misunderstood. It "does not mean that man is totally bad; rather it means there is nothing in man that has not been infected by the power of sin" (*Handbook of Theological Terms*, 68). The mind is darkened, the will enslaved, the emotions alienated. "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint" (Isa. 1:5).

Theologians in the Reformed tradition often misunderstand and therefore misinterpret the Wesleyan view (e.g., *Baker's DT*, 164). Three questions emerge: (1) the meaning of natural inability in spiritual matters, (2) in what sense guilt attaches to original sin, and (3) the extent of total depravity.

Wesleyans take sin as seriously as the Scriptures do. They insist that sin is "exceeding sinful" (Rom. 7:13), that mankind is "dead in trespasses and sins" (see Eph. 2:1-3; 4:17-24), that apart from grace man is totally unable in spiritual things. "We believe that . . . through the fall of Adam he became depraved so that he cannot now turn and prepare himself by his own natural

strength and works to faith and calling upon God" (*Manual*, Church of the Nazarene).

It is helpful to make a distinction between guilt as *culpability*, or personal blameworthiness; and guilt as *liability* for consequences. The former was Adam's guilt alone, the latter belongs potentially to the race, if the remedy in Christ is rejected. It is remarkable that Louis Berkhof (Calvinist) and H. Orton Wiley (Wesleyan) use almost identical language on these subjects (see "For Further Reading"). Moreover, no responsible evangelical advocates total depravity in the *intensive* sense (that man is totally evil), only in the *extensive* sense: that the corruption of sin extends to the whole of man's being.

It is the testimony of both the OT and the NT that the image of God in man has been seriously marred (not destroyed) by the Fall. Man lost the moral image (holiness), while retaining the natural image (personality). The divine warning against disobedience had come to pass: "Thou shalt surely die" (Gen. 2:17).

The OT sees the sinfulness of man in such terms as "perversity," "crookedness," "stubbornness." "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked" (Jer. 17:9). Isaiah's vision in the Temple (Isa. 6:5), the Psalmist's prayer of confession and plea for cleansing (Psalm 51), and Ezekiel's vision of the need for the new covenant (Ezek. 36:25-27) are further examples of man's moral plight (Turner, *The Vision Which Transforms*, 24-31).

NT references are likewise numerous, but Rom. 5:12-21 brings the issue into focus—by one man (Adam) sin penetrated the race. Because all men have sinned, some in ignorance, others willfully, death and condemnation have passed to all men. Between Rom. 5:12 and 8:10, the phrase "the sin" appears 28 times. Paul sees this force as a "principle of revolt . . . against the divine will." It is an "inner moral tyranny . . . alien to man's true nature" (GMS, 291). That is, though it marks man's fallen nature, it does not belong to true human nature, as created. From this corruption proceed all the evils that trouble and harass mankind (Mark 7:20-23). Contravening all this darkness is the "gift of righteousness" available to all men through the Last Adam, Christ (Rom. 5:17).

See SIN, ORIGINAL SIN, PREVENIENT GRACE, DIVINE IMAGE, FALL (THE).

For Further Reading: Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 244-54; GMS, 285-302; Wiley, *CT*, 2:119-30.

A. ELWOOD SANNER

TRACTARIANISM. This is the popular name for the Oxford Movement. This movement, headed

up by J. H. Newman of Oxford, published *Tracts for the Times* between 1833 and 1840—and thus was designated Tractarianism. The movement emphasized the authority of ecclesiastics such as bishops, based importantly on the apostolic succession doctrine, and purity of doctrine generally (based on the church's received creeds). The movement suffered decline when its leader, Newman, left Anglicanism and became a Roman Catholic—a rather natural development, based on his interests.

See APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION, ANGLO-CATHOLICISM.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

TRADITION. Tradition is the beliefs, values, and customs transmitted from one generation to the next, assuring the continuity of the culture or the institution and providing each emerging generation with the stabilizing influence of its heritage. It provides an understanding of the foundations of the community and of the relationship between the individual and the larger fellowship in which he participates.

The idea of tradition is negative in much of modern Protestantism. This is partly due to the general tenor of the recent humanistic period which tends to equate antiquity with obsolescence. It is also partly due to the tension between the Reformation doctrine of *sola scriptura* and the pronouncements of Roman Catholicism.

Evangelicals are particularly wary because Scripture speaks negatively of human traditions. Jesus told the Pharisees that they had nullified the Word of God through their traditions (Mark 7:13); Paul warned the Colossians against the traditions of men (Col. 2:8); and Peter reminded his readers that they were not redeemed by the futile traditions handed down from their fathers, but through the blood of Christ (1 Pet. 1:18-19).

Modern Bible scholars approach the Bible as the repository of traditions which developed in Israel and the Early Church. These traditions grew out of various situations in the community and came to be accepted as authoritative for the community. This obviously denies the divine inspiration of the Bible and negates any ultimate authority for the Bible.

Tradition plays an important role in the Church and should not be disregarded. The creeds, which formulate the essentials of Christian faith, the interpretation of Scripture, and the theological statements of historic orthodoxy, are traditions, even though they are rooted in Scripture. They reflect the Holy Spirit's ministry of illumination and have a subordinate authority. All traditions are subject to the Word of God.

See INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE, HERMENEUTICS, PROTESTANTISM, BIBLICAL AUTHORITY.

For Further Reading: Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 19-82; Barrett, *Jesus and the Gospel Tradition*; Cullmann, *The Early Church*, 53-99; Stott, *Christ the Controversialist*, 65-89. WILLIAM B. COKER

TRADUCIANISM. This is the belief that the soul is procreated by parental conception along with and in the body. Natural generation thus includes both the spiritual, immaterial faculties of human personality as well as those purely physical organs which can be observed and verified scientifically. This is most in harmony with the Hebrew concept of man as a body-mind unity, and also most congenial to the biblical concept of inherited sinfulness. The alternatives to traducianism are (1) *preexistence*, i.e., that souls or spirits exist before conception either in the ideal world or in a previous incarnation, and are infused into the embryo or fetus at some point before or at birth; or (2) *creationism*, i.e., that God creates a personal soul for each conception. Since the creation of a sinful spirit by God is inconceivable, creationism implies that inbred sin is solely physical.

See SOUL, GENETICISM, CREATIONISM, ORIGINAL SIN, PREEXISTENCE OF SOULS.

For Further Reading: Wiley, *CT*, 2:26-29, 104; Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 196-201.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

TRANSACTIONAL ANALYSIS. Transactional Analysis (TA) is an approach to interpreting reactions and relationships which has gained widespread acceptance in its practical applications to counselling. As a method of analyzing interpersonal behavior it is widely used in marriage counselling.

Developed as a model by Eric Berne, Transactional Analysis is based on the hypothesis that at any given time we are functioning at either the parent (P), adult (A), or child (C) ego state level. The "parent" level is viewed as the nurturing, correcting aspect of human response. The "child" level represents the carefree, irresponsible, uninhibited level. The "adult" ego state corresponds with the responsible, rational, reasonable level of response.

Using these concepts, any conversation or social interaction can be identified in terms of these three levels. The P-A-C formula is used not only to analyze and interpret communications, but to explain crossed communications which produce misunderstandings and conflict. Communications may be "complementary" or "crossed," "simple" or "ulterior" transactions. Complementary

transactions produce agreement and understanding. Crossed transactions usually occur when the participants are operating from different ego states. Simple transactions are communications at the verbal, conscious level. Ulterior transactions are those where the verbal communications have other motivational implications.

The P-A-C formula is also used to identify the unconscious elements and influences from the past on present responses—i.e., to identify irrational elements such as prejudice, internalized parental expectations, and childhood ways of responding. These unconscious elements are described as the "archaic" child or parent, and are seen as "contaminating" or complicating responses to present events and relationships. The archaic parent is made up of attitudes received as a child, primarily of a controlling, manipulative nature. The archaic child is dependent and immature.

The P-A-C formula is an easily understood concept. It can be used to compare the neurotic, psychotic, and sociopathic syndromes in terms easily grasped by the layman.

The concepts are used not only to enable diagnosis and recognition of problem responses, but also in therapy. A growing body of literature traces its practical applications. Though originating in a Freudian psychological approach, it is not necessarily antithetical to the Christian understanding of human nature, in that it sees man rooted in a basic "not O.K." feeling and in need of "okayness."

It is exactly at this point, however, that the sub-Christian, and therefore dangerous, nature of TA is seen. For the "okayness" sought and provided is entirely humanistic and horizontal. There are no conceptual structures for handling sin and guilt or even for their recognition. The real root of dislocated interpersonal relationships is not misunderstanding (as important as that is), but sin. There can be no true "okayness" which ignores God, His forgiveness, and the vertical dimension. To foster an illusion of "okayness" when the spiritual need is not only untouched but ignored, is to perpetrate a deceptive panacea and imperil eternal destiny.

See HUMANISM, HOLINESS, GUILT, GROW (GROWTH), CARNALITY AND HUMANITY, SIN.

For Further Reading: Berne, *Games People Play*; Harris, *I'm O.K., You're O.K.*; Reuter, *Who Says I'm O.K.*

JAMES M. RIDGWAY

TRANSGRESSION. See SIN.

TRANSCENDENCE. Transcendence is affirmed of God by theists. It is God's primacy over, but also

His wholly otherness from, the universe which He has created. The transcendence of God rules out any form of pantheism, but may be viewed as complementary to immanence.

To be unsure about the transcendence of God is to be unsure about the character of God. With no absolute basis of judgment, human behavior is beyond condemnation, a notion clearly perceived by Ralph Waldo Emerson who developed a philosophy of religion which saw man as essentially good. The divine transcendence means that above man and all earthly affairs is an independent Creator, Preserver, Observer, Law-giver, and Judge. Man is dependent on this God for his very being, and every action is subject to God's scrutiny and evaluation. Because God is transcendent He is free to act upon and within His creation without being assimilated by it or subjugated to it.

The transcendence of God is thus positively related to existence and character. For it is the majesty of His power which moves us to declare as did the Psalmist: "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge" (Ps. 19:1-2).

See THEISM, IMMANENCE, ATTRIBUTES (DIVINE).

For Further Reading: Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 61; DeWolf, *A Theology of the Living Church*, 117-23; Wiley, *CT*, 1:223, 279, 284-89. MERNE A. HARRIS

TRANSCENDENTAL MEDITATION. Transcendental Meditation (TM), also known as the Science of Creative Intelligence (SCI), is a movement founded by Maharishi Mahesh Yogi, whose claim is that TM brings relaxation and creative thinking. While claiming to be neither a religion nor a philosophy, but a science, it is root and branch a part of Hinduism. Its founder was born Mahesh Brasad Warma in 1918 in India. Upon completing his B.A. in physics at Allahabad University, he became a disciple of His Divinity Swami Brahamanda Saraswati, popularly known as Guru Dev (Divine Leader), who commissioned him to find a simplified form of meditation and spread his master's teaching to the West.

In 1959 he arrived in California with his meditative technique, founded the Spiritual Regeneration Movement, and gained followers in the entertainment world. When in the late 60s the movement declined, a secular image was developed. Now coordinated under the World Plan Executive Council (WPEC), it presents a scientific image through such peer groups as Student International Meditation Society (SIMS), American

Foundation for the Science of Creative Intelligence (AFSCI) for those in business, and International Meditation Society (IMS) for the general public.

While TM's appeal is that it is a science for increasing relaxation and mental productivity, it actually is an expression of Vedantic Hinduism. The meditator is inducted into this TM with a prayer in Sanskrit to the various Hindu gods, including a succession of grand masters, now elevated to deity, by the presentation of offerings of fresh flowers, fresh fruit, and a clean white handkerchief, and by the bestowment of a *mantra*. This supposedly neutral sound, repeated as the vehicle of meditation, is frequently the name of a Hindu god.

See CULTS, OCCULT (OCCULTISM), ORTHODOXY, MEDITATION.

For Further Reading: Boa, *Cults, World Religions, and You*, 156-66; Ellwood, *Religious and Spiritual Groups in Modern North America*, 231-35; Means, *The Mystical Maze*, 133-46; Maharishi Mahesh Yogi, *Transcendental Meditation*, formerly titled: *The Science of Being and the Art of Living*; Lewis, *What Everyone Should Know About Transcendental Meditation*. DAVID L. CUBIE

TRANSFIGURATION. All three of the Synoptics record the "transfiguration" of Jesus on a mountain and in the presence of Peter, James, and John (Matt. 17:2; Mark 9:2; Luke 9:28-36). There He "took on the form of his heavenly glory" (Arndt, Gingrich).

The early tradition of the Church identified Mount Tabor as the Mount of Transfiguration, but many scholars today consider Mount Hermon, much higher and nearer to where Jesus was at that time according to the account, to be a more likely possibility. Luke tells us that Jesus took the three disciples there to pray. In the presence of His disciples, the body of Jesus was changed into the splendor of His preexistent glory, with His clothing and even His face (cf. Matthew) taking on a brightness far surpassing any earthly glow (see Mark 9:3, NASB). Then Moses and Elijah (Mark reverses this order) appeared and talked with Jesus, which Luke explains was a discussion concerning His soon-coming exodus.

Moses and Elijah are usually viewed as simply representing the law and the prophets of the OT. Yet their presence appears to be more an "attendance" on Jesus, and some have even suggested they had come to salute their successor. A further reason for their coming could be that Elijah was identified as the "forerunner" prophet (cf. Mal. 4:5) and was thus making an eschatological appearance.

As on so many occasions, Peter totally mis-

understood the significance of what was happening. His suggestion that "tabernacles" be built for Jesus and His two guests suggests a *finality* of mission rather than the *preparation* that it was. Then a cloud overshadowed them, concealing from the disciples the three who were conversing. But the cloud, often seen in the OT as the tabernacle of God, proved to be a vehicle of divine self-revelation as well as self-veiling (cf. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*). From it God spoke: "This is My beloved Son, listen to Him!" (Mark 9:7, NASB). Here is the same basic language given to Jesus (Luke and Mark) and to those in attendance (Matthew) at His baptism.

As might be expected, the three disciples were terrified, but the touch of Jesus (Matthew) brought them assurance. He then instructed them to keep secret what they had experienced.

The event is similar to the language of theophany in the OT. Matthew clearly identifies their experience as a vision (17:9, the Greek term being *horama*). Mark's statement that "all at once they looked around . . ." (9:8, NASB) suggests the actions of people recovering from a vision.

Of greatest importance is the significance of the event. For whose benefit did it occur? Was it only for the disciples? Although we shall see that this was undoubtedly the primary purpose, it also ministered to Jesus. Shortly before, He had received human confirmation of His messianic mission at Caesarea Philippi. Could it not be that, at least in part, the mission of Moses and Elijah was to bring to Jesus assurance from another world as He faced the Cross? They did discuss His exodus! Jesus was human, and the Cross was a terrifying and ugly prospect.

The context is important for understanding the message of the Transfiguration. In all three accounts, the experience follows closely the Great Confession. Jesus' first prediction of His passion on that occasion brought a scandalous response from Peter. Significantly, Jesus warned that whoever is "ashamed of me and of my words" (Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26; cf. Matt. 16:27) would one day face Him as an eschatological judge. But He had encouraging words for those who listened to His words. "And He was saying to them, 'Truly I say to you, there are some of those who are standing here who shall not taste of death until they see the kingdom of God after it has come with power'" (Mark 9:1, NASB).

In the days of the Early Church, this most difficult promise of Jesus was seen fulfilled in the Transfiguration. Peter, James, and John were "some of those . . . standing here," and what they

experienced could well be understood as seeing the kingdom of God. This is a choice example of "proleptic revelation." In the Transfiguration the disciples *saw* (although they did not then understand) in anticipation, or prefigurement, the coming Resurrection. Even further, the Resurrection would be seen as a preview of the Parousia. Thus Cranfield says that "both the Resurrection and the Parousia may be said to have been proleptically present in the Transfiguration" (288).

Such an interpretation gives the fullest possible significance to the Father's words: "Listen to Him!" They sound a solemn warning to those who reject or ignore the message of Jesus, while at the same time they bring the strongest assurance to those who believe. As Jesus faced the climax of His humiliation, for a brief moment the veil was drawn and we see Him in all His glory—transfigured.

See CHRIST, THEOPHANY, KINGDOM OF GOD.

For Further Reading: Lane, "Mark," *New International Commentary*; Cranfield, "Mark," *The Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary*; Tasker, "Matthew," *Tyndale Bible Commentary*; Ramsay, *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ*. RICHARD E. HOWARD

TRANSIGNIFICATION. This is the view that in the Eucharist there is a transformation in what the bread and wine signify—so that they come to signify the body and blood of Christ. It is a recent variation in the Roman Catholic theory of transubstantiation. Pope Paul VI officially opposed the variant view and disallowed its being taught by Roman Catholic scholars. It was only to be expected that the pope would oppose the teaching, because it was a basic divergence from their official view: that the substance of the elements is transformed into the actual body and blood of Christ.

See TRANSUBSTANTIATION, IMPANATION, CONSUBSTANTIATION. J. KENNETH GRIDER

TRANSMIGRATION OF SOULS. See REINCARNATION.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION. Transubstantiation is the Roman Catholic doctrine that the bread and wine of the Eucharist become the actual body of Christ when they are blessed by the words of the priest: "This is my body and my blood." This teaching leans heavily on Aristotelian and medieval scholastic conceptions and would be impossible to state in terms of any modern metaphysics.

The word *transubstantiation* is a compound of two Latin particles (*trans* = "across" and *substan-*

tia = "substance") and suggests that the invisible substance or essence of the bread becomes the essence of the body of Christ and the substance of the juice or wine becomes the essence of Christ's blood. The "essential substance," not visible to the eye, is to be contrasted to the unchanged "accidental properties," visible to the five senses, such as color, taste, and smell. Although the "accidents" remain the same, the miracle of this transference takes place at the moment of blessing by the priest.

The Protestant church has never accepted this teaching. Indeed the chief divisions of the 16th century were over the interpretation of the Lord's Supper.

There are three dominant views among Protestants regarding the Lord's Supper. Martin Luther, closest to the Roman position, taught "consubstantiation" (*con* meaning "with"), the reality of Christ's body and blood is in the elements "like light is in your eye." John Calvin taught a spiritual presence which was received or known only by the elect. Ulrich Zwingli, the Swiss Reformer, taught a symbolic presence in which the sacrament is barely more than a mental remembrance, a picturesque way of recalling Calvary.

Most Wesleyan theologians have held to a position closer to Calvin, with the stipulation that the spiritual blessing is not reserved for only a few.

See CONSUBSTANTIATION, SACRAMENTS, SACRAMENTARIANISM, HOLY COMMUNION, EUCHARIST, REALISM IN THEOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Parris, *John Wesley's Doctrine of the Sacraments*, 62-96; Wiley, *CT*, 3:138-210; Lawson, *Comprehensive Handbook of Christian Doctrine*, 179-81.

JOHN A. KNIGHT

TRIBULATION. The concept of tribulation is a prominent doctrine in the NT and in some quarters today. It practically becomes a test for one's orthodoxy. The word for "tribulation" occurs no less than 19 times.

According to the NT, the Christian can hope for nothing in this world except tribulation. Indeed, the basic summons of Jesus to follow Him means to take up one's cross in discipleship (Mark 8:34; 10:21). This is often interpreted as carrying burdens, but a cross is not burden; it was an instrument of death. When a man follows Jesus, he can expect nothing but tribulation which leads to death. When the seed of the kingdom of God is sown in the ground, tribulation may come upon hearers who have received the word only superficially. This is the message of the seeds falling among thorns. Weeds spring up

and choke the word (Matt. 13:21). In John Jesus said, "In the world you have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world" (John 16:33, RSV). Luke wrote Paul's reminder that "through many tribulations we must enter the kingdom of God" (Acts 14:22, RSV).

Paul constantly suffered tribulations, but he gloried in them because only by experiencing them could he complete his apostolic mission (2 Cor. 7:4; Eph. 3:13). Addressing the seven churches in Asia, John speaks of himself: "Your brother, and companion in tribulation" (Rev. 1:9). Believers are to react in such a way that they glory in tribulation (Rom. 5:3), and therefore they can be patient in tribulation (12:12).

The NT teaches that at the end of the age there will occur a time of great tribulation. "For then there will be great tribulation, such as has not been from the beginning of the world until now, no, and never will be. And if those days had not been shortened, no human being would be saved; but for the sake of the elect those days will be shortened" (Matt. 24:21-22, RSV). In other words, the persecution which will come at the end of the age in the Great Tribulation will be qualitatively no different from what the Church has to expect from the world throughout her history. The only difference will be the intensity of the tribulation, not its method.

This is spelled out in the Revelation. The beast (Antichrist) will be "allowed to make war on the saints and to conquer them" (Rev. 13:7, RSV). But in a later vision, John sees a victorious Church standing before the throne of God. We are told that these are the people who had conquered the beast and its image. Here is a superficial contradiction: The beast conquers the saints, but the saints conquer the beast. What can this mean? The point is that the martyrdom of the saints is their victory. The beast tries to compel them to worship him. When they refuse, they are martyred. But their martyrdom is proof of their loyalty to Christ. Luke records a similar saying of Jesus: "Some of you they will put to death . . . But not a hair of your head will perish" (Luke 21:16, 18; cf. Rev. 14:9-13).

The revelation above shows us that the time of Great Tribulation will also be a time of the outpouring of God's wrath. But at the threshold of that time, John sees 144,000 who are sealed in their foreheads that they may not suffer the wrath of God. These afflictions are not human, but the outpouring of the wrath of God upon the beast and his worshippers (16:2). The Church will not suffer the wrath of God.

See RAPTURE, SECOND COMING OF CHRIST, REVELATION (BOOK OF).

For Further Reading: Smith, *Prophecy—What Lies Ahead?* 27-31; Ludwison, *A Survey of Bible Prophecy*, 184-87.
GEORGE ELTON LADD

TRICHOTOMY. This, defined as division into three parts, contrasts with dichotomy, division into two parts, as a theory of the correct analysis of the human being. Each considers man to consist of a material part, the body, and an immaterial part or parts. Both accept the reality of soul or spirit. The essential question between them is whether soul and spirit are one or two, identical or different.

Trichotomy is most often based on "spirit and soul and body," as used in 1 Thess. 5:23. Dichotomists question whether that verse is an analytical statement of man's being, or whether it is not rather a descriptive statement meaning the whole human being, like Mark 12:30, which names four parts without requiring a fourfold division of man. Verses mentioning only a twofold division include Gen. 2:7; Eccles. 12:7; Matt. 10:28; and 1 Cor. 7:34. Trichotomists, differentiating between soul and spirit, have the problem of deciding which of these is the locus of mind, or consciousness.

Both trichotomy and dichotomy are to be contrasted with those materialistic, naturalistic theories which claim that all mental life, spirit, soul, and similar concepts are but names for phenomena inherent in the highly developed matter of complex human brain cells, and have no existence apart from matter.

See MAN, HUMAN NATURE, DICHOTOMY.

For Further Reading: Cross, *An Introduction to Psychology: An Evangelical Approach*, 15; Symposium, *What, Then, Is Man?* 319.
PHILIP S. CLAPP

TRINITY, THE HOLY. This is the audacious Christian understanding that God consists of three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, who share a common nature or essence. It is the understanding that God is tripersonal, but, at the same time, one in substance or nature or kind of being. There are three *Hims*, but the three are one in a most fundamental, elemental way.

This means that while we are talking about three Persons, three Thous, we are not talking about three Gods (Tritheism)—but only one. In fact, it might be that, since the three are one, there is an intensification of the oneness, the unity, that would not obtain if there were not three who make the one. This is not the three of arithmetic, where you have three of, perhaps, the

same kind. It is the kind of oneness that obtains in an organism—when one organism is characterized by three systems (and more): respiration, circulation, and reproduction.

The deistic Thomas Jefferson deprecated the doctrine of the Trinity as an "incomprehensible jargon." Matthew Arnold referred to it as "the fairytale of the three Lord Shaftesburys." It has been called "an intellectual elixir." Nonetheless, this is our confidence as Christians: that God is three-in-one, one-in-three.

The doctrine is a revealed mystery and cannot be comprehended merely with our natural capacities. In part, the fact that we could not figure it out with our natural faculties is because we have no analogies of it in the natural world. No three human persons are structurally one so that there is a full interpenetration of the three. And, while an individual person is three in the matters of intellect, feeling, and will, such an individual is not three at the level of personhood. Further, while there are a few "rough" analogies in nature, such as water, which exists in three states (liquid, steam, and ice), the analogy does not apply very aptly. Likewise, the analogy of the family does not. A father, a son, and a mother (= the Holy Spirit) are not one in the structural way that the three Persons of the Trinity are.

Of course, Scripture does not in any one passage describe God as three Persons in one nature or substance. First John 5:7 pretty nearly does this, but that passage, found almost exclusively in the KJV, is not in any of the older Greek NT manuscripts. Scripture clearly teaches that there is only one God, and also, it teaches that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are all Deity.

On the oneness, we read, "The Lord our God, the Lord is one" (Deut. 6:4, NIV). Jesus, addressing the Father in prayer, calls Him "the only true God" (John 17:3). Paul, having referred to the "so-called gods," adds that "yet for us there is but one God, the Father, from whom all things came and for whom we live; and there is but one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom all things came and through whom we live" (1 Cor. 8:5-6, NIV). Paul also says that there is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all" (Eph. 4:5-6, NIV).

While the last three passages quoted are the special supports given against the Trinitarian view by Unitarianism's *Recovian Catechism*, we Christians believe them all, heartily, for we, too, stress that God is one and that the Father is the first-numbered Person of the Trinity. But we incorporate into such passages as those the ones that indicate the threeness of God. One such is in

Matt. 28:19, where we are to baptize "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (NIV). Another is where Paul closes 2 Corinthians with what we often use as a benediction: "May the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all" (13:14, NIV). Besides, the three are spoken of at Christ's baptism (e.g., Mark 1), and in John 14—16; Eph. 2:18; 1 Pet. 1:21-22; etc. And the Son is called God in John 1:1 where we read, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." And there is Thomas' post-Resurrection declaration addressed to Jesus, who had appeared to him, "My Lord and my God" (20:28). Christ also seems to be called God in 1 Tim. 3:16 and Heb. 1:8. That the Holy Spirit is God is implied in Heb. 9:14; 1 Pet. 3:18; and 2 Pet. 1:21.

While some have so stressed the deity of Christ as to teach what almost amounts to a "unitarianism of the Son," the Church has always taught that the Father holds a place of priority in the Trinity. All three are of equal eternity, all are fully divine, and all have infinite attributes. Yet, eternally, the Son has been generated from the Father's nature (as light comes from the sun), and not from His will. This is suggested by the *monogenēs* passages as in John 1:18 where Christ is said to be the "only begotten" or the "only born" one. The world was made, created, out of nothing; but the Son was eternally begotten, from the Father's nature.

Somewhat similarly, the Holy Spirit has eternally proceeded. In Eastern Orthodoxy it is understood that the Holy Spirit proceeded eternally only from the Father. They feel that this is supported in John 15:26 where we read, "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father."

In the Roman Catholic and Anglican and Protestant West, however, we have followed the Athanasian Creed, which declares, "The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten; but proceeding." This double procession of the Holy Spirit (from both the Father and the Son) is probably the teaching of certain NT passages. One is Rom. 8:9, where we read of both "the Spirit of God" and "the Spirit of Christ"—which probably means "who proceeds from God," and "who proceeds from Christ." The Western view is also suggested in 1 Pet. 1:10-11, where "the Spirit of Christ," that is, who proceeds from Christ, is quite evidently a reference to the Holy Spirit and not to Christ, because

through the prophets He "testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ."

Opposers of the doctrine of the Trinity have appeared, as the centuries have passed. Sabellius, of the early third century, taught that the three are successive ways in which the uni-personal God has revealed himself. The fourth-century Arius taught that Christ is neither divine nor human (instead of both of these); and that the Holy Spirit is still farther from deity than Christ is. Faustus Socinus (1539-1604) was of course anti-Trinitarian and fathered the Unitarians—who, now amalgamated with the Universalists, are among the impugnors of this doctrine. Protestant modernists in general have denied the Trinity as not suiting their rationalism, opposing the deity of Christ and the personality of the Holy Spirit. One of the rather recent oppositions to the Trinity came from Union (N.Y.) Seminary's Cyril Richardson, who preferred to say that the three are "symbols" and not persons (see his *Doctrine of the Trinity*, 14-15, 98, 111).

This doctrine, taught clearly by implication in Scripture, and spelled out in so many Christian creeds and confessions, which means that God is not an eternal solitary but an Eternal Society, might be the one most basic of all the Christian beliefs. Charles Lowry calls it "at once the ultimate and the supreme glory of the Christian faith" (*The Trinity and Christian Devotion*, xl).

See GOD, CHRIST, HOLY SPIRIT, ECONOMIC TRINITY, ESSENTIAL TRINITY, ETERNAL GENERATION, ETERNALLY BEGOTTEN, SABELLIANISM, UNITARIANISM.

For Further Reading: Grider, "The Trinity," *Basic Christian Doctrines*, ed. Henry; Lowry, *The Trinity and Christian Devotion*; Wiley, CT, 1:394-440.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

TRITHEISM. See TRINITY, THE HOLY.

TRUST. See FAITH.

TRUTH. The primary meaning of the Greek word *alētheia* (truth) is openness. It thus refers to what is not concealed. In Hebrew the primary idea is that which sustains. Truth implies steadfastness. It is that which does not fail or disappoint one's expectations.

Truth or "the true" is therefore (1) what is real as opposed to what is fictitious or imaginary; (2) what completely comes up to its idea or what it purports to be; (3) what in reality corresponds to the manifestation; (4) what can be depended upon, which does not fail or change or disappoint (Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 1:436).

The quest for truth is universal. Philosophy,

science, and religion are all committed to the search. Philosophy seeks the truth about being, science the truth about phenomena, religion the truth about God and ultimate meanings. Each science brings to the quest its own methods and tools.

The truth of discrete parts is partial; to be complete it must be seen in relation to every other part. Science, therefore, without philosophy and religion, can never arrive at truth, for science alone can never get beyond facts.

Furthermore, truth of necessity must be harmonious. The truths in one branch of knowledge cannot be in ultimate contradiction to the truths in other branches of knowledge.

This is the case because absolute truth is God, and truth apprehended is the knowledge of God. He is both the Key and the Core of truth, and all lesser truths relate to Him and flow from Him. In scriptural terms Christ is the Revelation of the truth in God (John 14:6-9). Jesus Christ, being God incarnate, is not only the true Way to God but also the true Representative, Image, character, and quality of God. Likewise the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth, who communicates truth, who maintains the truth in believers, who guides believers in the truth, and who hates and punishes lies and falsehoods. This plainly implies that in God there is no fallacy, deception, or perverseness (John 16:12-13).

Since man is the creation of God, all valid knowledge of truth and right must come from Him. Whether knowledge comes from God immediately or ultimately is of secondary importance (Burrows, *An Outline of Biblical Theology*, 40-42).

Truth as one of the moral attributes of God may be resolved into veracity and fidelity. Thus the truth of God refers also to His perfect and undeviating truthfulness in all His communications to mankind, whether in words or in deeds or mode. His communications are in exact accord with the real nature of things (John 17:17). There is utmost sincerity in all His declarations. Fidelity in God especially respects His promises and is the guarantee of their fulfillment.

Since God is the Source of all truth, it follows that He is true in His revelation and true in His promises. He keeps His promises and is ever faithful to His covenant people. God has made available to finite minds such truth about Himself as is needed for redemption, although finite minds approach the truth and the perfections of God only by degrees. Man's incomplete systems of thought, thus, can never pass beyond probabilities.

God is perfect truth because His nature is pure love and forms the character of God. Men become true as their character becomes good, for truth in the heart is a quality of personal character which coincides with the law of love (Carnell, *A Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, 450-53).

See GOD, METAPHYSICS, PROPOSITIONAL THEOLOGY, HEART PURITY, REALITY THERAPY, THEISTIC PROOFS, FIDELITY, INTEGRITY.

For Further Reading: Carnell, *The Case for Orthodox Theology*, 27, 87-88; Henry, *Basic Christian Doctrines*, 31; Purkiser, ed., *Exploring Our Christian Faith*, 34-36; Wiley and Culbertson, *Introduction to Christian Theology*, 108.

WAYNE E. CALDWELL

TYPE, TYPOLOGY. A type is a person, event, or institution in the OT which foreshadows a corresponding person, event, or institution in the NT. Typology is the hermeneutical principle which recognizes the presence of types and antitypes in the Bible and establishes guidelines for identifying them and for understanding the relationship of the type in its original historical context to its more complete fulfillment in the development of God's eternal purposes.

The use of typology in the study of the Bible assumes the unity of the Old and New Testaments which makes typology possible: viz., that "the New is in the Old concealed; the Old is in the New revealed." It likewise assumes the presence of predictive prophecy in Scripture and the progression of revelation. This necessitates a linear view of history and a supernaturalism which allows for divine interruptions into the historical order of human experience.

Typology differs from allegory in that allegory attempts to exegese a spiritual meaning from a historical account, often without due regard for historical meaning or even historicity. Typology finds in the historical account that which prefigures a later historical development. The relationship between type and antitype is that of pattern and reality, promise and fulfillment, anticipation and completion.

There are certain restrictions to the use of typology. Some scholars would go as far as to disallow any typology other than that which is indicated in the NT. While this establishes safeguards against abuse, it wrongly insists that the NT has exhausted all correspondences between the Testaments. Types should be restricted to those instances where there is historical correspondence or, as Bernard Ramm insists, there is "a genuine resemblance in form or idea" (*Protestant Biblical Interpretation*, 228). Furthermore, the

use of typology should be limited to historical analogies and not extended to matters of minute detail. As in the case of the parable, the central truth must be grasped without expecting each detail to bear spiritual fruit.

There are several dangers in the use of typological interpretation. First, the history of the church verifies the problem of unrestrained imagination. Doctrinal heresies and aberrant theories have resulted from "supposed" OT types. Second, the OT may cease to be valued as the objective revelation which God gave to Israel and be spiritualized into a religious book of signs and symbols. Even though the OT is incomplete in itself, it remains as the historical record of God's progressive preparation of His people for the fullness of times when the Word would become flesh. Third, the historicity of scriptural accounts is undercut when there is little concern for the historical context as though that were secondary or unimportant. Bultmann's demy-

thologization of the NT exemplifies such an unconcern for history.

The value of a typological interpretation of the OT is that it recognizes the historical continuity of revelation and God's redemptive program. It immeasurably enriches and vivifies our understanding of basic biblical motifs. It takes seriously Jesus' declaration that the OT bears witness to Him (John 5:39) and finds an embryonic Christology in the Hebrew Scriptures that anticipates the birth of the Babe of Bethlehem.

See ALLEGORY, ALLEGORICAL INTERPRETATION, HERMENEUTICS, PARABLES, PROGRESSIVE REVELATION, BIBLE: OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

For Further Reading: Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture*; Westermann, ed., *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics*; Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 443-61; Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation*, 215-40; Laurin, "Typological Interpretations of the Old Testament," *Hermeneutics*, Ramm et al., 118-29; Wood, *Pentecostal Grace*.
WILLIAM B. COKER

U

ULTIMATE CONCERN. Ultimate concern is one of the central concepts in the theological system of the Protestant theologian Paul Tillich. It forms an important link in a series of words the meaning of which constitute the highly integrated fabric of his theology. Because of the tight integration of his system one can choose any of his major terms as an introduction to his thought.

As is true of most of his key concepts, Tillich gives *ultimate concern* differing but consistent shades of meaning, depending on whether he is speaking specifically to the Christian community for whom the word "God" already has a markedly Christological content, or whether he is speaking as a Christian apologist to those of other religions, or to a secular philosophy or political ideology for which the term "God" may not play a significant role.

Man is finite, contingent, and he is deeply aware of this. He is concerned about his finitude and expresses this concern by his efforts to guarantee his finitude against the threats to it that appear in many forms, death being the ultimate threat. Man's natural efforts to keep from losing himself to these threats result in the creation of and participation in political, national, cultural, domestic, moral, and personal forms. But all of

these are preliminary concerns, for they are also finite. They too are subject to erosion.

It is precisely the preliminary nature of these concerns which shows that they cannot finally be of ultimate significance to man. Man's principal error, which Tillich calls sin, is that he tends to treat preliminary concerns as though they were ultimate, unconditional, nonfinite. He tends to elevate them to a place of ultimacy. But time and the events of history have a way of "shaking these foundations" and exposing them for what they are. Shaken, man is driven beyond preliminary concerns to what concerns him ultimately, to the truly Unconditioned. As preliminary concerns reveal their finitude, he is driven toward the God who is not one thing among others, but the Creator God, the Giver of all life. God is Being itself. He does not exist as things exist; rather, *He is*.

Tillich believed that Jesus' summary of the law in Matt. 22:37-39 is the principal biblical statement of the central meaning of ultimate concern. He believed that Heb. 12:25-29 accurately describes the way we are led to the unshakable foundation (Christ) as preliminary concerns reveal their finitude.

Tillich believes that all people are concerned

about that which concerns them ultimately, even though they may not recognize God as the Object and Fulfillment of that quest. He believed this to be the sure testimony in all people. The reality of God cannot finally be denied by anyone. Tillich used this concept as an apologetic device for reaching moderns for whom the term "God" has lost its meaning.

All people give some form of expression to the belief that reality is ultimately meaningful, that finite being is anchored in some ultimate, non-contingent reality. This state of being ultimately concerned, Tillich says, is faith, the fulfillment of which is faith in God's Christ, the bringer of the New Reality.

See RELIGION, RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE, FAITH, IDOL (IDOLATRY), COSMOLOGY, CHRISTIANITY.

For Further Reading: Magee, *Religion and Modern Man*, 22 ff, 25-26; Hughes, ed., *Creative Minds in Contemporary Theology*, 451-79; McKelway, *The Systematic Theology of Paul Tillich*.

ALBERT L. TRUESDALE, JR.

UNBELIEF. This is the moral resistance to, and lack of confidence in, the commands and promises of God, which arises from an evil heart (Heb. 3:12). It is a refusal to trust that God's commands are valid and that what He has promised He is able to perform. So unbelief is beyond mere doubt and questioning as to the *how* and *why* of divine ordinances. The refusal to believe or trust renders one culpable in the eyes of biblical writers.

Unbelief is thus both an intellectual and moral attitude toward God, truth, and reality. It is a refusal of the volitional action which faith calls for.

In the NT the two common terms for *unbelief* are *apeitheia*, "disobedience, and unpersuadability" (Rom. 11:30, 32; Heb. 4:6, 11), and *apistia*, "distrust, or absence of faith." The noun, *apeitheia*, really indicates "obstinate opposition to the divine will." The verb, *apeitheō*, specifies "the refusal or withholding of belief" (John 3:36; Heb. 3:18; 1 Pet. 2:7-8; 4:17). The adjective, *apeitheis*, describes one who is "unpersuadable, uncompliant, and contumacious" (Rom. 1:30; 2 Tim. 3:2; Titus 3:3). The verb, *apistēō*, means "to betray a trust, to entertain no belief" (Rom. 3:3; Luke 24:11, 41; Mark 16:11, 16; 2 Tim. 2:13). Its noun, *apistia*, means the "lack of faith and trust" (Mark 6:6; Rom. 4:20; 11:20, 23; Heb. 3:19). And its adjective, *apistos*, describes one who is "without faith or trust in God, and is thus unbelieving and incredulous" (Matt. 17:17; [cf. Mark 9:19; Luke 9:41]; Luke 12:46; John 20:27; 1 Cor. 6:6; 7:12-14; 2 Cor. 4:4; Rev. 21:8).

Since *unbelief* is an absence of the will to be-

lieve, it exerts a determinative influence on conduct. He who refuses the implications of faith likewise denies the contents of faith. To trust or put confidence in a person or a proposition involves and calls for a commitment thereto. This the unbeliever is unwilling to do. Hence unbelief is the attitude of the irreligious person.

It was William James who contended for man's right to adopt a believing attitude in religious matters in spite of the fact that his merely logical intellect may not have been compelled. He defended to his students the lawfulness of voluntarily adopted faith. He insisted that "the question of having moral beliefs at all or not having them is decided by our will." He said, "If your heart does not *want* a world of moral reality, your head will assuredly never make you believe in one." Furthermore, he declares, "We have the right to believe at our own risk any hypothesis that is live enough to tempt our will." In the final analysis he is sure that "belief is measured by action," hence the one who believes is unlike the person he would be in unbelief.

It has been rightly said: A man has the right to believe as he *must* in order to live as he *ought*. Hence faith is a proper and scriptural attitude toward God, and *unbelief* is its opposite.

See FAITH, BELIEF, OBEDIENCE, SKEPTICISM.

For Further Reading: Burton, "Word Study XVI," *Pistis and Pisteuō, Commentary on Galatians* (ICC); James, "The Will to Believe," *Essays in Pragmatism*, 88-109.

ROSS E. PRICE

UNBLAMABLE. See BLAME, BLAMELESS.

UNCONDITIONAL ELECTION. See ELECT, ELECTION.

UNCTION. See ANOINTING.

UNDERSTANDING. See WISDOM.

UNIFICATION CHURCH. The Unification Church or United Family is a cult composed of some 2 million members worldwide, including 1 million in South Korea, 50,000 in Japan, and 10,000 in the United States, whose goal is the reconstitution of the human race by way of the third Adam, who by implication is Sun Myung Moon, the founder. Moon was born on January 6, 1920, in what is now North Korea, to Presbyterian parents. He claims that at 16 he had a vision in which Jesus commanded him to finish the work of redemption. He studied electrical engineering in Japan. Between 1944 and 1948 he evangelized in North and South Korea and was excommu-

nicated by the Presbyterians. He was imprisoned by the Communists, but escaped in 1950. In 1954, he founded the Holy Spirit Association for World Christianity and was divorced by his wife of 10 years. In 1958, he established the Divine Principle and in 1960 married Hak Ja Hon.

Moon's ideas combine the Korean-Chinese philosophy of Ying and Yang, Korean shamanism (spiritualism), with Christian eschatology and spiritual gifts. God, instead of being Trinity, is both male and female. Jesus is not God, but the Second Adam who failed His mission because He did not marry and have children. Christians are Jesus' spiritual offspring by way of the Holy Spirit, His heavenly Bride. Redemption must be completed physically through marriage because the first sins were sexual; Lucifer's spiritual seduction of Eve and Eve's physical seduction of Adam.

According to Moon, on the day he married Hak Ja Hon "the Heavenly Son came to the earth, restored the base, and welcomed the first Bride of heaven." As a result Moon is greater than Jesus, having restored "the spiritual as well as the physical" ("The Significance of July 1st, 1973," *Master Speaks*, 381, 7-1-73, 3).

See CHRIST, CHRISTIANITY, CULTS, FALSE CHRISTS.

For Further Reading: Boa, *Cults, World Religions, and You*, 164-77; Ellwood, *Religious and Spiritual Groups in Modern America*, 291-96; Sparks, *The Mind Benders: A Look at Current Cults*, 121-53; Kim, *Unification Theology and Christian Thought*.

DAVID L. CUBIE

UNION WITH GOD. See MYSTICISM.

UNITARIANISM. This is self-described as "a free faith for the modern mind"; "a faith that will help you develop the religion that is within you . . . [not] . . . the ready-made 'religion of a church.'" While committed to "staunch noncreedalism," its core concept is of a God with single rather than Trinitarian personality or being. Clustering about this concept are certain key emphases: a non-dogmatic approach to religion so that the personal beliefs of its clergy and laity run the gamut of liberalism; a commitment to humanism with a theistic tinge—"salvation by character"; tolerance toward other religions; exaltation of reason; advocacy of religious and civil liberty; eager, uncritical acceptance of science.

They differ sharply whether they should be characterized as Christian. Example: "All of us in the liberal church are basically Christian"; but "Christianity is a religion whose adherents subscribe to an essential core of doctrine which no Unitarian Universalist . . . would accept." Their

denials include belief in the Trinity, Jesus as divine, original sin, eternal damnation, virgin birth of Christ, infallibility of the Bible, miracles, and vicarious atonement. They possess no binding statement of belief. Private judgment in matters of faith and morals is supreme.

Unitarians are found in various Protestant pulpits and pews. Those openly committed are to be found mostly in the 1961 merger of Unitarians and Universalists in the Unitarian Universalist Association.

See SOCINIANISM, CHRISTIANITY, TRINITY (THE HOLY), ORTHODOXY, HERESY, UNIVERSALISM.

For Further Reading: Mead, *Handbook of Denominations* (4th ed.), 208-12.

LLOYD H. KNOX

UNITY. Unity is to be distinguished from oneness, since oneness may be a fact of experience, while unity is a spiritual and intangible quality of harmony which should inhere in the oneness. While unity is hard to define, its absence in any social unit is easily recognized. The parts of an engine may all be present and share in a common oneness in the sense that they all belong to the same engine; yet if unity is lacking, we say the engine is not performing properly. So in marital relationship, cohabitation creates oneness but does not guarantee unity (Matt. 19:5; 1 Cor. 6:16). Similarly, Christians are one in Christ—they are actually members of the one body—yet they may be emotionally divided.

Therefore unity is a virtue to which Christians are exhorted (Eph. 4:3, 13; Phil. 1:27; 2:2). The prayer of Christ for the unity of believers (John 17:20-22) has been misconstrued by ecumenists to provide authority for calling for a single church and for branding all denominational separateness as sin. But the unity for which Jesus prayed was spiritual, a true oneness with each other based on a true oneness with the Triune God. The context shows that such a oneness finds its reality not in external uniformity or conformity but in personal sanctification. It is holiness which unites; carnality divides (1 Cor. 3:1-3). Changing denominational labels does not change hearts.

The achievement and preservation of unity requires humility, unselfishness, and fervent love. But these are the constituent elements of biblical holiness.

See IMITATION OF CHRIST, SEVEN CARDINAL VIRTUES, MIND OF CHRIST.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

UNIVERSALISM. Universalism claims that no person is excluded finally from God's redemption. Through freedom God will bring all human or

heavenly persons into conformity to His will. A third-century scholar, Origen, wrote: "God will 'show the riches of his grace in kindness' (Eph. 2:7): When the greatest sinner . . . will, I know not how, be under treatment from beginning to end in the ensuing age" ("On Prayer," *Library of Christian Classics*, 2:304). The Church considered Origen had speculated beyond scriptural warrant.

In the 16th century Socinus laid the foundation for the doctrine's revival. Against Calvinist doctrines of election and atonement, Socinus argued for God's universal forgiveness because of Jesus' death and resurrection.

Universalism became an organized movement in America about 1800. A leader, Hosea Ballou, asserted that Christ's death conveyed moral, not legal, force over sin. A general conference was established by 1866. Adherents numbered under 100,000 at most. Under various rationalistic influences (and because of inner inconsistencies, its critics charged) the movement lost its Socinian foundation. The movement merged with the Unitarians in 1961 and no longer claims to be a Christian denomination.

"Universalism" should not be confused with "universal salvation," which signifies that Christ died for *all*—that is, every person of every kind in every nation—although any may reject Him. The Quaker, Robert Barclay, used the phrase "the universal and saving light," whereas the Arminian, John Wesley, used the term "prevenient grace" to describe the universal character of salvation. The divine witness antecedent to, or even independent of, outward hearing of the gospel, they asserted, is more than a condemnation for sin. For the faithful it is Christ's saving light.

Scholars such as C. S. Lewis and Charles Williams, while acknowledging God's respect for human freedom (including eternal punishment), urge Christians to yearn for the salvation of all, and warn against limiting the freedom of God who is unwilling that any should perish. Yet God in the Scriptures declares the moral bases of salvation and gives no indication that these will ever be set aside to accommodate the impenitent. The fundamental tenet of universalism, viz., that every heavenly or human person must in the end be saved, is expressly repudiated in the Scriptures.

See UNITARIANISM, SOCINIANISM, PROBATION, ETERNAL PUNISHMENT, IMPENITENCE, FREEDOM.

For Further Reading: *Corpus Dictionary of Western Churches*, 1970; Lewis, *The Great Divorce*.

ARTHUR O. ROBERTS

UNIVERSALS. This has to do with the degree to which concepts are real. Realists, in medieval times, were people who believed that concepts, such as man, or cow, are real—and that individual humans and cows are not actually real. Eriugena and Anselm and others taught in this way. At the opposite extreme were the nominalists, such as Roscellinus, who believed that only particulars are real, and that concepts are no more than names that describe look-alike particulars. Two views, on universals, mediated between the extremes of realism and nominalism. One of them is conceptualism, espoused by Peter Abelard. Here, a concept exists, but not prior to particulars, only afterwards. Another of them is moderate realism, held by Thomas Aquinas, who eclectically taught that both concepts and particulars are actually real.

Probably no question was as significant to the Scholastics of the 9th to the 14th centuries as the degree to which universals are real. Interest in the matter waned after Aristotle was received into Christian orthodoxy in the 12th and 13th centuries, during which times such theologians as Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas engaged themselves most especially with amalgamating Aristotle with orthodoxy. But while interest in universals waned at that time, universals still is, and always will be, an important matter for theologians and philosophers to consider.

See REALISM, REALISM AND NOMINALISM, REALISM IN THEOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Suarez, *On Formal and Universal Unity*; Landesman, *The Problem of Universals*.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

UNLIMITED ATONEMENT. See ATONEMENT.

UNPARDONABLE SIN. Much misunderstanding has surrounded the so-called unpardonable sin. The misunderstanding has grown up in part through incorrect interpretations of a few isolated passages of Scripture; in part, too, no doubt, due to an excessive zeal to secure an immediate response to the gospel in evangelistic services.

This sin no doubt consists of a repeated and willful attributing to demons the work of the Holy Spirit. This is what Mark 3:28-30 suggests, where we read, "All the sins and blasphemies of men will be forgiven them. But whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will never be forgiven; he is guilty of an eternal sin." He said this because they were saying, "He has an evil spirit" (NIV). This sin, of saying an "evil spirit" accom-

plishes what one knows full well was accomplished by the Holy Spirit, is blasphemy (cf. Matt. 12:31). And it is unpardonable because the person himself sets himself into this kind of stance and will not let God transform his mind and forgive him. It is therefore unpardonable more from man's standpoint than from God's—for we read elsewhere in Scripture that God will graciously forgive anyone at all who asks for pardon (see Hos. 14:4; Eph. 4:32; Luke 7:21; Rom. 8:32; Col. 2:13; Heb. 10:17; Luke 15:11-32).

Some people use Isa. 63:10 to teach that God will refuse to forgive some people, where we read: "Yet they rebelled and grieved his Holy Spirit. So he turned and became their enemy and he himself fought against them" (NIV). Adam Clarke is no doubt correct when he suggests that this turning to become their enemy, on God's part, is a reference to the Last Judgment—when probation is past.

Some people feel that 1 John 5:16 refers to the "unpardonable sin," where we read, "There is a

sin that leads to death. I am not saying that he should pray about that" (NIV). This more likely refers to a sin which carries the death penalty in civil law. We are not necessarily to pray that the civil law's penalty will be alleviated, although God might, of course, forgive a person of such.

Since a repeated and knowing attributing to demons what the Holy Spirit does is unpardonable only from man's standpoint instead of God's, the most important thing to remember about the unpardonable sin is that anyone who fears that he has committed it, and is concerned about the matter, hasn't.

See SIN, REPENTANCE, FORGIVENESS, APOSTASY.

For Further Reading: Carter, *The Person and Ministry of the Holy Spirit*, 108-12; Fitch, *The Ministry of the Holy Spirit*, 230-33.
J. KENNETH GRIDER

UNRIGHTEOUSNESS. See INIQUITY.

UPRIGHT, UPRIGHTNESS. See RIGHT, RIGHTEOUSNESS.

V

VALUES. These are the established ideals of life, the standards people live by. The study of values—their nature, type, criteria, and status—is referred to as axiology.

One's system of values determines the choices he makes, the things he appreciates and strives for. It guides a person's course of action, and so it determines one's general pattern of behavior.

While it is an empirical fact that all people live by values, there is considerable difference of opinion as to what the basic values for living are. For the Christian, values are not individualistic and subjective. For him the rule or standard for making value judgments is God himself, the highest of all values. The key, therefore, for developing a Christian system of values is found in Jesus' words: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness" (Matt. 6:33).

This reference to the Gospel suggests that the Bible provides the basis for a doctrine of Christian values. In the OT the Book of Proverbs, for example, gives guidance for discriminating among values. It points out that the way of wisdom in every area of life is found in the fear of the Lord. A NT principle is that persons are al-

ways of much greater value than things (Luke 12:6-7; Matt. 6:25-26; 16:26; Mark 8:36-37).

The frequent use of the Greek term *axios* in the NT further suggests a basis for establishing a standard of values. It is usually translated "worthy," "counted worthy," or "worthily." In such passages as Phil. 1:27 and 2 Thess. 1:11, for instance, Paul indicates concern that his readers may in God's sight be living worthy of the gospel to which they have been called. Another passage of this type is Matt. 10:37-38.

Some of the fundamental human values about which the Bible speaks are: bodily health and care, recreation, home and family, education, work, and the trilogy: the beautiful, the good, and the true.

In the light of what the Bible teaches, the Christian assigns value to anything, abstract and concrete, in relation and in proportion to its worth in bringing glory to God and in advancing His kingdom among men. Anything which does not have potential for glorifying God is not to be considered valuable and should, in fact, be devalued.

Even with this criterion, every Christian may

not have the same arrangement of priorities, for individuals and their circumstances differ. Even an individual's circumstances may vary from time to time, and there may need to be a comparable rearrangement of values. But Christian discipline and stewardship demand that every Christian arrange his priorities in the fear of God. To arrange values in proper relation to each other and to the ultimate Good is difficult. To do it well is a mark of Christian maturity. All through the Christian pilgrimage one should, then, be learning better how to order life's values.

See AXIOLOGY, TRUTH, MATURITY, DISCIPLINE, DISCIPLESHIP, VALUES CLARIFICATION.

For Further Reading: Brightman, *Religious Values*; Purkiser, ed., *Exploring Our Christian Faith*, 461-76.

ARMOR D. PEISKER

VALUES CLARIFICATION. Values clarification is a term used to identify a particular systematic educational approach aimed at developing skills in choosing values and making decisions based upon one's values. The approach was formulated by Louis Rath (1966) and is concerned with the process of valuing rather than the content of values.

The values clarification approach utilizes strategies designed to help the student learn to: (1) choose his values freely; (2) choose his values from alternatives; (3) choose his values after consideration of the consequences of the alternatives; (4) prize and cherish his values; (5) publicly affirm his values; (6) act upon his values; and (7) act upon his values consistently. Many strategies have been developed, utilizing interviews designed to draw out values, values games, hypothetical values dilemmas, creative writing on personal values, personal goals inventories, ordering various lists according to priorities, etc.

While many of the suggested strategies can be useful in helping individuals to become aware of their values as well as alternatives, the weakness of the system is found in its root of humanism. While purporting to be not concerned with the content of values, the system itself is a statement of humanistic values and can be a subtle tool in promoting those values. The system begins with man and relativity and rises no further. Values clarification encourages children (who have the least amount of experience upon which to base their judgments) to choose their values without any reference to values and attitudes that have stood the test of time, let alone to God and revealed truth. The values clarification approach presupposes that man himself (even the juvenile) is capable not only of choosing his values, but

that it is proper to create one's values strictly with reference to oneself.

See VALUES, AXIOLOGY, HUMANISM, STEWARDSHIP.

For Further Reading: Simon, Howe, and Kirschenbaum, *Values Clarification*; Simpson, *Becoming Aware of Values*; Simon and Clark, *Beginning Values Clarification*; Rath, Harmin, and Simon, *Values and Teaching*.

GLENN R. BORING

VEIL. This term is frequently used in the Bible as a reference to an article of clothing used to wrap, cover, or disguise an individual (Gen. 24:65; 38:14; Exod. 34:33). More significantly, a veil, or curtain, was used in the Tabernacle and later in the Temple to "separate . . . the holy place from the most holy" (26:33, RSV). This sacred veil, made according to divine instructions of blue, purple, and scarlet linen, screened from view the ark of the testimony and the mercy seat contained in the most holy place (vv. 31-36). The glory of God was so awesome and holy that the veil was necessary because men could not stand before His unveiled presence and live (33:20).

The holy of holies, behind the veil, was entered only once each year by the high priest who presented an offering of blood for his own sin and for the sins of the people. The veil was also used to wrap the ark of testimony when the Tabernacle was in transit (Num. 4:5).

Matthew and Mark report that at the time of Jesus' death this veil in the Temple was "torn in two, from top to bottom" (Matt. 27:51, RSV; cf. Mark 15:38-39). The writer of Hebrews sees the veil as a symbol of Christ's "flesh," the rending of which opened the way for all believers into the holiest—the immediate presence and grace of God (Heb. 6:19-20; 10:19-20).

In 2 Cor. 3:12-18 the apostle Paul uses "veil" as a symbol for that which prevents a thing from being clearly understood. Referring to the veil Moses wore following his encounter with God on Mount Sinai (Exod. 34:29-35), he declares that when the Israelites read the old covenant "that same veil remains unlifted, because only through Christ is it taken away" (v. 14, RSV). It is in turning to Christ that the veil is lifted; then, with "unveiled face" we are enabled to behold the glory of the Lord and to be "changed into his likeness" (v. 18, RSV).

It is quite possible to speak of God's presence during the OT time period as somewhat "veiled." The inner sanctuary of the Temple was covered by the veil. However, in the NT the veil is rent, and we see the glory or self-revelation of God in the person of Christ.

See HOLY OF HOLIES, DAY OF ATONEMENT.
DON W. DUNNINGTON

VENGEANCE. See REVENGE.

VERBAL INSPIRATION. See INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE.

VICARIOUS. This is a theological term. While the term is not in the Bible, the concept is biblical. It is especially appropriate as descriptive of Christ's death. *Vicarious* defines an act as performed, received, or suffered on behalf of another person, so that the benefits of the act accrue to that person. In biblical theology, it is most often used in reference to Christ's death, as being for us, on our behalf, or in our stead.

More than two dozen specific biblical texts support this understanding of Calvary. In John 10:11 Jesus himself declared to His disciples, "I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep" (NIV). That is to say, He gives His life for the sake of theirs. Later, at the Last Supper, Jesus described His blood as "shed for many" (Mark 14:24) and His body as "given for you" (Luke 22:19). Also, 1 Pet. 3:18 depicts Christ's death for sins as "the righteous for the unrighteous" (NIV); and 1 Tim. 2:6 declares His self-sacrifice "a ransom for all men" (NIV).

In spite of the fact that substitution is inherent in the concept of vicarious, many contemporary interpreters resist the designation of Christ's death as substitutionary. But a careful study of the Greek preposition *hyper* (translated by "for" in the texts cited above) supports the traditional view. A. T. Robertson affirms: *hyper* commonly means "in behalf of," "for one's benefit"; but often it further conveys the notion "instead" as a resultant idea, "and only violence to the context can get rid of it" (*Grammar*, 631).

Christ died not only in our behalf, but in our stead. He became accursed in our stead (Gal. 3:13); He died in our place (Rom. 5:6-8). That is to say, His death is vicarious. It holds crucial significance and meaning for us.

See ATONEMENT, SIN OFFERING, CROSS, CRUCIFIXION, GOVERNMENTAL THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT.

For Further Reading: Ladd, *Theology of NT*, 426-28; Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek NT*, 630-32.

WAYNE G. MCCOWN

VICE. Vice is the term applied to those immoral or evil habits which degrade both individuals and society. Vice is the *opposite* of virtue, as wrong is of right and darkness is of light.

While the KJV does not employ the word "vice," some recent versions do (e.g., Rom. 13:13 and Eph. 4:19, NEB; 1 Cor. 5:8, NBV, Williams' NTLP). In NT times the Graeco-Roman world was vice-ridden, especially with sex sins. Premarital and extramarital sex, homosexuality, and incest were practiced without shame. Prostitution was connected with and sanctioned by the rituals of heathen temples.

Medieval theologians set forth seven vices—called "capital" or "deadly" sins—as the root cause of all of humanity's moral and spiritual ills: pride, covetousness, lust, envy, gluttony, anger, and sloth.

In today's society paganism's ancient immoralities are again flourishing—often glamorized. There is widespread fear that illicit sex, abortion, divorce, drug addiction, alcoholism, nicotine addiction, pornography, gambling, cheating, thievery, demoralizing recreations, and the like are propelling our civilization toward destruction.

Biblical Christianity (Eph. 2:8-10) is the perfect antidote to humanity's vices (Rom. 1:29-32; 1 Cor. 5:1; 6:13-20; 1 Thess. 4:3-8).

See VIRTUE, SEVEN DEADLY SINS, SIN.

For Further Reading: GMS, 120-28, 268-84, 527-47.
DELBERT R. ROSE

VICTORY, VICTORIOUS LIVING. In the Scriptures, words such as "triumph," "conquer," and "overcome" express the various facets of victory. The victory is always the Lord's and is credited to others only as He is willing to make it His gift, or with whom He graciously and gratuitously shares it (Deut. 20:4; Ps. 18:50; 44:1-8; Judg. 5:11; 2 Sam. 22:51; et al.).

In the OT "victory" is synonymous with the manifested supremacy and complete preeminence of Jehovah, perhaps even with His attributes of glory. Creation (Ps. 92:4) and redemption (Exod. 15:1, 21) alike demonstrate His victory and triumph.

The victory of God indicates also the ultimate and universal vindication of God's will and purpose, the full accomplishment of His intentions and activities (1 Chron. 29:10-13; Isa. 25:8-9; et al.). The thought of the moral and spiritual triumph of His people is also included (Dan. 11:32, RSV).

Nor must we forget that the concept of victory also includes and expresses the praise and joy of those who share the victory of God, for the ideas of public acclaim and personal jubilation are embraced (Exod. 15:1-2; Judg. 5:1-32; Josh. 10:24;

cf. Rom. 16:19-20). The "God of peace" is that God of efficient action and all-triumph.

In the NT all of these elements are in the Christian concept of "victory." The divine victory is achieved in the Lord Jesus Christ. Although His life was one of unrelieved conflict, it was one long trail of triumph of faith, obedience, and discipline, coming to final unequivocal triumph in His death and resurrection, in which He was the Victim-Victor (1 Cor. 15:54; Rom. 4:25). The Cross is the raw material of the Crown; the victim's scaffold is the victor's chariot (Col. 2:13-15).

The victory is and ever will be the Lord's (Rev. 11:15-18). But He shares it now and in the future with all who trust Him and keep His commandments. "The victory is our's, thank God!" (1 Cor. 15:54, Moffatt). In Paul's world the "triumph," strictly speaking, was a festival celebrating the victory. This too is part of victory in the NT (2 Cor. 2:14) and means a whole "fount of blessing" to the believing heart: triumph in trouble (Rom. 5:3-5, RSV, cf. Moffatt), inward assurance (8:37), the possibility of triumphant faith (1 John 5:5).

These logically lead to and postulate a victorious life-style. Life is built from the inside; victorious Christian living depends on yieldedness and submission to the triumphant Spirit of Christ. "Greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world" (1 John 4:4). And, it is the great positive that determines the matter of victory in Christian life: "Let God re-make you so that your whole attitude of mind is changed. Thus you will prove in practice that the will of God's good, acceptable to him, and perfect" (Rom. 12:1-2, Phillips). Paul exults, "I can do all things in him who strengthens me" (Phil. 4:13, RSV). Triumphant Christian life-style in a hostile and aggressive age demands not only that we put on "the whole armor of God" (Eph. 6:11-18, RSV), but first of all that the man in the armor be "strong in the Lord and in the strength of his might" (v. 10, RSV).

See IN CHRIST, GROW (GROWTH), HOLINESS, HIGHER LIFE, LIFE-STYLE.

For Further Reading: Cattell, *The Spirit of Holiness*; Redpath, *Victorious Christian Living*.

T. CRICHTON MITCHELL

VIRGIN BIRTH. Virgin birth is a specific term. There has never been but one, that of Jesus Christ. The conception and birth took place without sexual union between the mother and any man. The preexistent Son of God took to himself human nature and "came" as a man among men. The Word was made flesh (John 1:1-14). Technically, it was only the conception that was unique. Once the babe was "conceived

of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. 1:20), the natural processes seem to have carried through to birth. The Son of God became also the Son of Man and the Seed of the woman.

The Virgin Birth can only be explained as an act of God. God had created Adam with no parent, Eve with no mother, and others with both parents. Now He brought His Son into the world (Heb. 1:6) by a fourth method. God supplied what was lacking in the ovum of Mary and implanted the Son of God in human flesh in the womb of the virgin. This new thing that God did brought excitement in heaven and good tidings to earth (Luke 2:9-14). However else God could have done it, He did bring salvation through the virgin-born Messiah. To make a myth of it would dilute and call in question the whole plan of salvation.

Nor does the Virgin Birth furnish scriptural or logical grounds for the myth of the "perpetual virginity" of Mary. She remained a virgin until after the birth of her "firstborn son" (Matt. 1:25). Then she apparently surrendered her virginity in the God-ordained way. The fruit of love and marriage is evident in sons and daughters, half brothers and half sisters of Jesus (Matt. 13:54-56). Her virginity had accomplished its purpose. It was not standardized as the ideal adult state.

The Virgin Birth is reasonable, though neither proved nor disproved. It is not a problem but a solution. It is a unique fact that explains how the Incarnation took place.

On what authority, then, does the Virgin Birth stand? The Word of God. Whether or not the Greek and Hebrew words (*parthenos* and *almah*) always retain the usual meaning of unmarried and pure virgin (Matt. 1:23 and Isa. 7:14), there is no question in the NT context. The case does not rest on linguistics. The angel made factual affirmation of the Virgin Birth to both Mary and Joseph (Luke 1:26-38 and Matt. 1:18-25). Although these details of God's act are not fully repeated elsewhere in the Scriptures, the announced facts are the key to the mysteries of both prophecy and fulfillment in the plan of redemption. This is how Jesus "came," "was sent," "was made flesh," etc. Nothing contradicts these facts. Everything leans on them. As Machen says, "The virgin birth is an integral part of the New Testament witness about Christ" (*The Virgin Birth of Christ*, 396).

The announcements of the Virgin Birth are addressed to faith—as are the existence of God and the truth of God's Word. It may not have been best to share the facts immediately with the skeptical public. One wonders at what point

Mary's knowledge spread to the family and to the community of believers. Certainly it was known by the time of the earliest written Gospels. And it is in the earliest creeds, baptismal formulae, and even in exorcism. Accepting God's explanation of the coming of the Savior seemed to be a test of faith. In the Early Church one had to profess belief in the Virgin Birth to be baptized. Historically, the doctrine has always been considered to be one of the fundamentals of the Christian faith.

See CHRIST, INCARNATION, CHRISTOLOGY.

For Further Reading: Machen, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*; Edwards, *The Virgin Birth in History and Faith*; Orr, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*; Boslooper, *The Virgin Birth*; GMS, 353-56.

WILBER T. DAYTON

VIRTUE. This is a word rarely used in the Scriptures. All four OT references describe women: "A virtuous woman is a crown to her husband" (Prov. 12:4; cf. Ruth 3:11; Prov. 31:10, 29). In this context, virtue is synonymous with moral uprightness, chastity, and goodness.

Virtue is ascribed to God once in the NT (1 Pet. 2:9, where it is translated "praises" in KJV), and to men four times. In each instance, virtue is better translated as "Moral excellence." It represents a positive quality of personal character derived from the character of God himself: "His divine power has granted to us everything pertaining to life and godliness, through the true knowledge of Him who called us by His own glory and excellence" (2 Pet. 1:3, NASB, italics added). It is an attribute, however, that must be actively cultivated: "Applying all diligence, in your faith supply moral excellence [virtue], and in your moral excellence, knowledge" (v. 5, NASB).

The Greek philosophers distilled four virtues—self-control, courage, justice, and wisdom—which represent the epitome of human moral achievement. And for that very reason, virtue, in the classical sense, proved to be only marginally useful to NT writers. Moral excellence is not the result of man's efforts but of God's grace, appropriated by faith: "For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works" (Eph. 2:10, NASB).

See SEVEN CARDINAL VIRTUES, CHARACTER, GROW (GROWTH).

For Further Reading: Wynkoop, *A Theology of Love*, 165-83; Ferm, *Encyclopedia of Morals*, 11-38.

C. S. COWLES

VISION. A popular use of the word "vision" is based on a misunderstanding of Prov. 29:18 inculcated by the poor rendering of it in the KJV.

"Vision" is not merely a hunch of something that should and must be done, and the challenge to rise up and do it. Vision is one means by which God reveals His will and gives guidance. The idea of "oracle" or oracular is also involved and has reference to the Word of God by which all things are to be tested (Acts 7:38; Rom. 3:2; etc.).

"Vision" is an ecstatic experience in which new knowledge is revealed through something seen. Usually the recipient of the vision (not always a "visionary" in the usual sense of the word) is assigned to do something, say something, or go somewhere; he is commissioned to communicate the new knowledge to others. Hence vision, prophecy, and oracle are closely connected. OT prophets, NT prophets, and apostles are alike in this respect: They have God's Word in trust for transmission.

Prov. 29:18 (RSV) insists that unless some persons had received special communications, and passed them on to others together with their meaning, anarchy and chaos would have and still would overtake mankind. Disregard for the vision and the Word still breeds anarchy and terrorism. The revelation of God's will was made by means of visions (Ps. 89:19, NASB). Nathan the prophet exemplifies the receiving of a vision, the communication of the word of the vision, and the challenge to obey that word (1 Chron. 17:3-15).

The NT apostles and prophets likewise were granted visions prompting the communicating of divine truth (Acts 2:17; 10:1-8; 16:9; Rev. 1:9-20). Paul relates visions and revelations in 2 Cor. 12:1-5, but it seems clear that to him visions are subject to higher laws, especially the law of perfect love (1 Cor. 13:1-3; 14:32-33).

Paul received both "visions" and "revelations"; the former suggests seeing, the latter suggests hearing; the former will be subject to the latter, and both will be held within the control of perfect love. We must note also that the Pauline formula "in Christ" overarches all, and that the visions and revelations are "of the Lord," received in the context of spiritual discipline through physical suffering (2 Cor. 12:7-10). Even the moderating element "a thorn in the flesh" was a "gift" from God—in spite of its designation as "a messenger of Satan."

The element of challenge should not be overlooked, however. The vision is the call, and it is inspired guidance to follow the call. Without it we lose our way, get out of touch with God, and yield to the vagaries of human reasoning; and so, in the words of the wise man, we "run wild" but are not free.

See TRUTH, REVELATION (SPECIAL), HOLY SPIRIT, GUIDE (GUIDANCE), VOCATION, PROPHET (PROPHECY), PREACHING.

For Further Reading: *NBD*, 1312; *ISBE*, 5:3057.

T. CRICHTON MITCHELL

VOCATION. In Christian theology, "calling" (Lat. *vocatio*) means both God's summons (election) to saving faith and fellowship in the covenant community, and divine assignment to serve the neighbor through one's daily work. Biblical thought gives a central place to the former and a sound basis for the latter, more fully developed in Protestantism.

God calls the Hebrews out of slavery into covenant community, names them as His own, and claims them for His service. He also calls individuals such as Moses and the prophets for particular tasks. In the NT God calls a new people into being in Christ. Gentiles are invited to share the fellowship, inherit the promises, and bear the ministry of reconciliation. All are "called to be saints" (holy ones, Rom. 1:7) and servants, to belong to God and become like Christ in all of life (cf. Eph. 4:2). Within this universal or general calling, some are specially assigned to perform particular functions within the Body of Christ for the effectiveness of its ministry.

Building upon this base, Luther and Calvin gave Christian vocation a distinctive meaning by uniting the biblical themes of divine vocation and daily work. In opposition to the double standard of medieval Christianity which limited vocation to the religious life of priests and monks, the Reformers stressed that every Christian is called into God's service in and through the daily occupation. One's common work is assigned by the Lord, to be done in faith and disciplined obedience, for ministry to the neighbor. Herein are the priesthood of all believers and the equality of all before God—profoundly biblical ideas with revolutionary social consequences. The transition to modern secular, technological society, however, has brought with it serious obstacles to this understanding of vocation as stewardship and service in the common life.

See CALL (CALLED, CALLING), STEWARDSHIP, WORK (WORKS), LABOR, LEISURE.

For Further Reading: Brown, *The Spirit of Protestantism*, chaps. 7–9; Gardner, *Biblical Faith and Social Ethics*, 297–303; Nelson, ed., *Work and Vocation: A Christian Discussion*; Scheef, "Vocation," *IDB*.

WILFRED L. WINGET

VOLUNTARISM. See INTELLECTUALISM.

VOWS. A vow is a solemn promise. It may be legally binding, supported by documents and signatures; or it may be verbal only. A vow differs from an oath in that a vow relates to future action or performance, while an oath is a commitment to the truth, usually accompanied by invoking Deity or some sacred object. However, vows in the OT were usually confirmed by an oath.

The biblical view of vows is that they must be voluntary in order to be binding (Deut. 23:22), and that they are subject to the approval of those who may have authority over one (Num. 30:10–15). But once made and validated, they are to be sacredly kept. A mark of one who will abide in the Lord's tabernacle is the kind of fidelity that "sweareth" to one's "own hurt, and changeth not" (Ps. 15:4). The Preacher bitingly prods: "When thou vowest a vow unto God, defer not to pay it; for he hath no pleasure in fools" (Eccles. 5:4). Clearly the biblical viewpoint is that there is no more accurate index to character than the carefulness with which one fulfills one's vows.

Most of the vows in biblical times were religious. The first instance was Jacob's promise at Bethel to serve God and pay tithes. Two NT cases are Acts 18:18; 21:23, both involving Paul. The vows (whatever they were) required certain formalities and religious rites.

Human relationships today are bound together by vows also, in spite of the fact that the contemporary mood is to deny them. The most basic to society are civil vows, commercial vows, and marital vows (most under attack). In church circles there are also membership vows and ordination vows.

Even a utilitarian philosophy of social contract should prompt fidelity to vows; for when vows are despised and disregarded, the fabric of society disintegrates. How much more conscientiously should Christians keep their vows, who are prompted by Christian love, undergirded with a sense of integrity. Church members who flagrantly violate their church vows, and clergy who forget their ordination vows, bring dishonor to Christ and His Church.

The most concerted attack in modern society is on marriage vows, not only by the increasingly easy divorce, but by the trend to live together without benefit of legal contract. But marital vows serve a dual purpose. First, they acknowledge the stake which society has in the marriage. The community which must "pick up the pieces" if the marriage fails, is inescapably implicated because property rights, personal protection of

wife and children, and such matters all depend on the network of law. Young people who conform to state requirements and exchange vows publicly, signing official documents, are acknowledging these inherent rights of the community and accepting responsibility in conformity to them.

But even more importantly, vows if taken in the name of God, or especially within a religious context, are the public acknowledgment of the claims of God upon the union: that marriage is instituted of God, to be governed by His laws, and ultimately to be judged by God. These rights of God prevail whether they are acknowledged or not. The exchange of vows is a public acknowledgment of an awareness of these divine rights.

It must not be forgotten, however, that while marriage vows are indirectly to God and to the

community, they are primarily made by the principals in the marriage to each other. A man and a woman are solemnly promising fidelity to the most sacred union possible to men on earth, as long as both shall live. In Malachi the Lord declares His hatred of divorce (2:14-16) and in Hebrews promises judgment upon "whoremongers and adulterers" (13:4).

The question whether it is ever right to break vows is an acute one. A rule of thumb might be that an evil promise had better be broken than kept. Such a case would surely have been Jephthah, whose foolish vow, followed by his stubbornness in keeping it, cost the life of his daughter (Judges 11).

See FIDELITY, INTEGRITY, DISCIPLINE, CHARACTER, CHURCH, MARRIAGE.

For Further Reading: *ISBE*, 5:3058.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

W

WALK. See LIFE-STYLE.

WAR. War is the resort of nations to settle issues by force of arms. Wars are always the product of human sinfulness, in either immediate instigation or indirect occasion.

While civilized nations should pursue a policy of peace, it is unlikely that what ought to be done will always be. Jesus understood the hard fact of human sinfulness when He predicted wars and rumors of wars throughout the age (Matt. 24:4-8). Universal peace will be established only by the personal presence and reign of the Prince of Peace.

However, Jesus' prediction is no excuse for failing to work for peace. The advent of the nuclear age has compelled nations to reassess the perils of war and weigh the risk of a nuclear holocaust against the possible gains of military action. Christians also have been prompted to examine anew what is their duty.

Christ undoubtedly established among men a new kind of kingdom, to be extended by spiritual means, not carnal. The only sword in its arsenal is the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. This Kingdom transcends earthly kingdoms and is compromised when any attempt is made to amalgamate with them. Its objective is the sal-

vation of men for time and eternity; its enemies are sin and Satan; and its methods are prayer, preaching, witnessing, teaching, and if need be, dying.

The problem confronting the believer whose allegiance is committed to the heavenly Kingdom is how to relate now to the old kingdoms, those of earthly political sovereignties.

Radical separatists see only bifurcation between the two kinds of kingdoms with no possibility of the Christian functioning in both, excepting in the minimal sense of living within the law and being a good neighbor. The state is seen as demonic and politics as so thoroughly corrupt that Christians can remain uncontaminated only by remaining strictly aloof. According to this view the world should be left to run its own affairs. This approach rules out not only participation in war but in legal and police activities. These activities by their very nature require the use of force, which is forbidden, the radical separatists believe.

A more moderate group of pacifists recognize the divine ordering of the state as a necessary means of protecting and controlling sinful men, and they perceive the legitimacy of law enforcement functions. There is some ambivalence concerning how far Christians can engage in this

necessary activity; this ambivalence extends to the degree in which Christians should involve themselves in the political process, especially in seeking office and playing a part in the formulation of the laws and the system. But even those who see the possibility of combining active citizenship in both kingdoms feel that the higher principles governing the kingdom of Christ prohibit them from any function which might involve them in the taking of life; this of course would include war.

A third group of Christians believes that there is no such sharp conflict between their two levels of citizenship. Their reasons include the biblical position that government is ordained of God, and in bearing the sword, law enforcement is God's minister (Rom. 13:1-7). It is a kind of work made necessary by the mass of sinful people yet in the old kingdom; and because mandated by God, it is righteous, and if righteous, as equally appropriate for the child of God as for the child of the devil. Indeed it would be done better if all judges, enforcement officers, and lawmakers were Christians. They believe further that no activity within this secular frame of reference depends on hate or is incompatible with love; on the contrary those ruled by love will do it better. Love itself demands action against evil.

This group further believes that the Bible recognizes the necessity of at times taking human life, and provides no basis whatsoever for labeling all killing as murder; the entire OT and to a lesser degree the NT assume the contrary. While the NT identifies hate as murder, it does not imply that the minister of God who bears the sword is a murderer.

Again, this group further believes that the legitimate duties of the state include not only protecting citizens from each other but protecting them from international predators. Whether this function is carried out by means of so-called police action through the United Nations, by other alliances, or unilaterally, in any case if the action is to be effective, the possibility of killing, and of even mild action erupting into war, is always present. There are in every generation Hitlers who must be restrained and disarmed. The alternative is capitulation. If capitulation is not acceptable, then nations—including the Christians in them—must bear the burden of deciding what is worth dying for, and acting accordingly. To deny that the cause of freedom, justice, and righteousness have at times been defended or advanced by war is to be blind to the facts of history. Furthermore, it is to forget that God utilizes military action as a means of punishing

wicked nations and disciplining His own people, as well as bringing about the political changes He sovereignly wills (Deut. 9:4; 28:49-52; 1 Kings 11:14, 23; et al.).

See PACIFISM, MURDER, WRATH, RETRIBUTION (RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE), PROGRESSIVE REVELATION.

For Further Reading: DeWolf, *Responsible Freedom*, 330-58; Hostetler, *Perfect Love and War*.

RICHARD S. TAYLOR

WARFARE, SPIRITUAL. See SPIRITUAL WARFARE.

WATER. References to water are abundant in the Bible, not only because it was so essential to the welfare of God's people—indeed of humanity everywhere—but because it spoke of life, refreshing, cleansing, verdure, health, and abundance. The symbolism of water is especially pronounced in the Gospel of John. Without too much strain it is possible to see the miracle at Cana (John 2) as a promise of transformed life, the promise to the woman at the well of living water (John 4) as eternal life, and the "rivers of living water" (John 7) as the promise of the fullness of life through the infilling of the Spirit.

The chief theological problem concerns the meaning of water in John 3:5—"Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." The water here has been variously interpreted as the water of natural birth, the water of John's baptism of repentance, the water of the baptismal sacrament, the water as a symbol of the Word of God, and the phrase as a figure of speech called a hendiadys, wherein water is intended to serve as a parallel or equivalent of Spirit. Only the last two carry through the thread of typology in the Gospel, and they alone harmonize with the spiritual nature of the gospel.

The first would imply that the Kingdom is restricted to human beings. The second could be acceptable if the emphasis was on repentance instead of water. The third is an extreme sacramentarianism as rigid as Judaistic circumcision, totally incompatible with the free, untrammelled activity of the Spirit in regeneration. Water as the Word has real support, since water as a cleansing agent is sometimes linked with the Word (John 13:10 with 15:3; Eph. 5:26; the spurious 1 John 5:7 placed between vv. 6 and 8 proves that someone in the past associated water with Christ as the Word). The requirement therefore is understandable if Jesus is saying that except a person be quickened into spiritual life both by the word of the gospel and the inner action of the Spirit, he or she cannot enter the Kingdom. Does the

Spirit ever regenerate apart from the truth about Christ?

Water also is a type of cleansing. It is important to see that the heart may be purified at two levels, the water level and the fire level. The water level is the level of expiation or forgiveness—hence John's baptism, and hence the figurative language of Acts 22:16; 1 Cor. 6:11; and Titus 3:5. But water cannot reach the inner nature as can fire; hence the cleansing accompanying the baptism with the Holy Spirit is linked not with water but with fire (Mal. 3:1-3; Matt. 3:11 and parallels; Acts 2:3). This is why the word *katharizō*, "to cleanse, make free from admixture," is the most appropriate word for Acts 15:9.

See NEW BIRTH, EMBLEMS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, CLEANSING, ETERNAL LIFE.

For Further Reading: Marsh, *Emblems of the Spirit*, 220 ff; HDNT, 2:814; CC, 5:530 ff; Thomas, *The Holy Spirit of God*, 62 ff. RICHARD S. TAYLOR

WEALTH. See MONEY.

WEDDING GARMENT. The parable concerning the guest who came to a wedding feast with inappropriate attire is found in Matt. 22:1-14. A question is raised as to which party was responsible for providing the wedding garment. Was the guest to obtain the garment for himself, or was the appropriate garment to be supplied by the host? The biblical account appears to avoid the question in order to address a more crucial issue.

The significant theological question is, What did Jesus have in mind when He suggested that a guest had come to a wedding feast without a wedding garment and was therefore to be expelled? The theological discussion centers on whether the wedding garment symbolizes the righteousness of Christ which is imputed to the individual, or if it indicates that man must obtain something for himself in order to stand in the presence of a holy God.

It appears that the wedding garment denotes an element in moral character. Paul has a parallel admonition when he suggests that the Christian is to "put on Christ" (Rom. 13:14; cf. Gal. 3:27). To "put on Christ" is to choose to be in a definite relationship with Christ, which produces personal holiness of character. Likewise, the wedding garment would be neither good works nor the imputation of a cleanness that does not belong to an individual. Rather the availability of the wedding garment suggests the possibility of a holiness of character available to all. If this quality of character is chosen by the moral agent, he will be enabled to stand in the presence of a holy God.

Thus the symbolism of the parable would appear to indicate that while grace is available to all, personal holiness must be personally chosen and "worn."

In his sermon entitled "The Wedding Garment" John Wesley noted that "holiness becometh his house forever! This is the wedding garment of all that are called to 'the marriage of the Lamb.' Clothed in this they will not be found naked: They have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."

See HOLINESS, HEAVEN, SALVATION, IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS, IMPARTED RIGHTEOUSNESS.

For Further Reading: Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 65 ff and 187 ff; Trench, *Notes on the Parables of Our Lord*, 75-83; Wesley, *Works*, 7:311-17. LARRY FINE

WESLEYAN SYNTHESIS. At the very heart of holiness doctrine are four sets of categories which, when kept together as congenial complements, prevent lopsidedness, but when allowed to polarize into antithetical and competing concepts, result in fragmentation and serious distortion. These are *process* and *crisis*, *grace* and *freedom*, *state* and *becoming*, and as subheads under that, *being* and *relation*. Other terms which become involved are *substance*, *dynamic*, and *nature*.

Take the first set of terms, *process* and *crisis*. At its best, holiness theology has preserved a fine balance, seeing experiential salvation as being an overall process involving many minor but two major crises, the major crises being the new birth and entire sanctification, and the process including all the influences of prevenient grace and all the growing between the major crises and thereafter. Wise Wesleyans pay equal respect to works of grace and the walk of grace.

A similar biblical synthesis is maintained—or should be—between *grace* and *freedom*. Grace is seen as the redemptive action of God, freedom is seen as the capacity of man to cooperate with grace or frustrate it. One of the watershed issues of theology is the relation of divine action to human action. An authentic Wesleyanism sees grace as prior and primal, but always as restoring and enabling freedom, never as overpowering it.

Likewise does a biblical holiness doctrine refuse to allow *state* to become the contradictory of *becoming*, or the idea of becoming to constitute an antithesis to the concept of state. Rather there is possible a state of holiness, knowable and definite; but this state, if genuine, is never static. It is a state which in its very nature is essentially dynamic.

In like manner we must refuse to pit *being* and *relation* against each other. Being is not only exist-

tence but *what* a person or thing is in itself—its internal nature; relation is the connection which beings sustain to each other. The state of being will determine the quality of relationships, and equally, poor relationships will alter the quality of being. But the two are not totally identical. We cannot simply define *being* as the sum total of relationships. There is an entity which is independent of relationships. Yet in the concrete order of things all entities are in relation to all other entities, in such a way that being/relation becomes both causal and reciprocal. Those who think largely in *relational* terms prefer dynamic and relational kinds of language, while those who emphasize *being* use substantive kinds of language.

See RELATIONAL THEOLOGY, ARMINIANISM, WESLEYANISM, SYNERGISM, COMPLEMENTARIANISM, CALVINISM.
RICHARD S. TAYLOR

WESLEYANISM. The term Wesleyanism has a broad application, being in some cases used as a synonym for Methodism. In this usage, the connotation of institutional range and of denominational organization is prominent. In a more specific sense, however, Wesleyanism as a term is employed to indicate a theological pattern, based upon the ministries of John and Charles Wesley (1703-91 and 1707-88 respectively). Out of the literary heritage left by the Wesleys and their contemporaries, their successors have produced a theological system which has been normative for those acknowledging themselves to be the heirs of historic Wesleyanism.

John Wesley's own thinking was shaped by the orthodox standard of Anglicanism. This is suggested by his adaptation of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican church to a body of Twenty-five Articles of Methodism, long normative for major Methodist bodies. Basic to Wesley's theological stance was his acceptance of the following tenets: the sovereignty of God, the full authority of Holy Scripture, the full deity and Saviorhood of Jesus Christ, the fall and consequent depravity of man, and mankind's need for supernatural deliverance from sin. He reinterpreted significantly the Reformed understandings of the depravity of man, of grace, of atonement, and of sanctification.

Wesleyanism has traditionally rejected the Genevan interpretations of election and reprobation, of irresistible grace, of unconditional perseverance, and of merely forensic sanctification. On the positive side, there has been an insistence upon personal salvation, and as a particular emphasis, entire sanctification as an

instantaneous crisis experience by which the "remains of sin" which survive regeneration are eliminated from the heart.

In the decades following the lives of the Wesleys, this last emphasis was developed, by making explicit that which was implicit in John Wesley's sermons and Charles Wesley's hymns. That is to say, there came to be a frank identification of entire sanctification with the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Continued in this elaboration were Wesley's terms for the state of grace to which the sanctifying crisis led, namely, Perfect Love and Full Salvation. Continued also was Wesley's disavowal of flawless perfection in favor of "perfection in love" and of evangelical perfection.

Wesley's solution to man's total depravity, and hence moral inability, was his doctrine of prevenient grace, as a universal and unconditional benefit of the Atonement. While all therefore were born sinful, they were also born in grace. This not only assured salvation for the infant but constituted an influence toward God, and a restoration of sufficient moral ability to turn to God in repentance and faith. This ability was not a residue of the Fall, but a first provision of redemption. Yet it was an influence and an enablement, not a coercive or determinative power.

From the viewpoint of church government, the Wesleys basically followed the pattern of Anglicanism, but were ultimately forced into a free-church mode of organization—but retaining the episcopacy and a connectional system. This model was followed by major Methodist bodies. In response to special conditions and needs, religious bodies which were Wesleyan in doctrine appeared during the 19th century. Such were the Free Methodist church, the Salvation Army, the Wesleyan Methodist church (now united with the Pilgrim Holiness church to form the Wesleyan church) and the numerically larger Church of the Nazarene.

While the doctrine of Christian perfection became part of standard Wesleyanism, there came a gradual resistance to it upon the part of mainline Methodism, which gathered momentum in the last quarter of the 19th century. From being suspect in many circles, perfectionism came to be regarded officially as unacceptable, the crisis coming in 1893-94. The emphasis upon this aspect of Christian doctrine was maintained by elements within mainline Methodism, who continued to sponsor camp meetings, and when possible, to foster protracted evangelistic meetings within their local churches. There had already (in 1867) been organized the National

Association for the Promotion of Holiness, whose leaders were largely ministers in the Methodist church, and who found means by which the historic emphasis upon Wesleyanism in general, and of Christian perfection teaching in particular, could be implemented within the constituency of general Wesleyanism.

Through the interdenominational outreach of Wesleyanism, a number of other denominations not definitely known as Wesleyan, have been greatly influenced by this form of theology. Among these are the Christian and Missionary Alliance, and Evangelical Friends (Ohio, Kansas, Oregon, and Rocky Mountain yearly meetings).

Wesleyanism today is maintained as an emphasis by both denominational and interdenominational agencies. It is the basic theological stance of at least four graduate theological seminaries, and of several score of liberal arts and Bible colleges. It is also the predominant theological emphasis in the missionary arms of the denominations mentioned above, and in a number of "faith" missionary societies, notably the World Gospel Mission and the Oriental Missionary Society, International.

See CHRISTIAN PERFECTION, HOLINESS, HOLINESS MOVEMENT (THE), PERFECT LOVE, PERFECT (PERFECTION), PERFECTIONISM, WESLEYAN SYNTHESIS.

For Further Reading: Wesley, *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection*; Wesley, *Standard Sermons* (selections); Wiley, CT, 2:217-517; Cox, *John Wesley's Concept of Perfection*; Turner, *The Vision Which Transforms*; Geiger, ed., *The Word and the Doctrine*; Wood, *John Wesley: The Burning Heart*.

HAROLD B. KUHN

WHITSUNDAY. See CHRISTIAN YEAR.

WHOLE, WHOLENESS. This has to do with our becoming redeemed, through grace, and thereby becoming whole in the sense of healed of sin and made adequate for life—physically to some extent, psychologically, and spiritually. It sees a tie-up between our receiving holiness and our being given a "wholeness." The person made holy through grace, then, is the truly well person.

An exaggerated stress on wholeness fails to preserve the sharp distinction between body and soul, hence has no basis for distinguishing between physical health and spiritual health. That there can be sick saints and robust sinners is patently obvious, both in Bible and contemporary times.

See HOLINESS.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

WHOLLY OTHER. This refers to God's being entirely different from us humans. It is the view that God is infinitely different from us, qual-

itatively. The emphasis was that of Søren Kierkegaard (1813-55), who was reacting to the pantheistic view of Friedrich Hegel in which God and man are thought of as akin to each other. Karl Barth (1886-1968) says that he was helped in a basic way by Kierkegaard, to view God as wholly other than us—in our sinfulness. The view is salutary in that it speaks against pantheistic understandings. But it is so extreme that it hesitates to admit that we are like God in any way—as in our being persons, and as in our being holy (through grace).

See TRANSCENDENCE, GOD, ATTRIBUTES (DIVINE), IMMANENCE.

For Further Reading: Otto, *The Idea of the Holy*; Hitchcock, *The Rediscovery of the Sacred*; Kraft, *The Search for the Holy*.

J. KENNETH GRIDER

WICKED, WICKEDNESS. See SIN.

WILL. See FREEDOM.

WILL OF GOD. See GUIDE, GUIDANCE.

WINE. See TEMPERANCE.

WISDOM. Wisdom literature in the OT distills the insight and experience of the Hebrew people as they reflected upon God's ordered creation and man's position within it. Wisdom is more than knowledge or intelligence. It is the capacity of the mind to understand and the heart to rejoice in the inner meaning, coherence, beauty, and enduring principles upon which existence is established. Wisdom is the God-given ability to deal with life's varied experiences intelligently and with the result of bringing true blessedness to the lives of all who are involved.

Proverbs embodies wisdom's optimism arising from Israel's golden age. Its theme is expressed in the memorable refrain, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom" (9:10; Ps. 111:10). The wise man knows and obeys God's laws and thus enjoys a long and blessed life. The fool disregards God's order and brings swift destruction upon his head.

Ecclesiastes, however, underscores the futility of a life that has been lived in outward conformity to wisdom's dictates, but has remained self-centered and self-serving. A wisdom devoid of a dynamic relationship to God leads inevitably to despair.

Wisdom literature in the OT achieves its greatest profundity in Job. Here is the saga of a righteous man who lives according to the dictates of Proverbial wisdom and still is overwhelmed by

catastrophe. The presence of the demonic, the principle of irrationality, and the problem of evil in human existence are faced. Yet, in the midst of inexplicable suffering, Job's faith rises to affirm, "I know that my Redeemer lives, and at the last He will take His stand on the earth" (Job 19:25-26, NASB).

Surprisingly, OT wisdom literature is never directly quoted or referred to in the NT. This is not because the collective wisdom of the Hebrew people is false, but likely because it is a result of the saving knowledge of God rather than a medium of that knowledge.

In contrast to the sacred wisdom of the OT, man's human, secularistic wisdom is of no value in acquiring a true knowledge of God (1 Cor. 1:21). Human wisdom can no more obtain a knowledge of God than works of righteousness can merit His favor.

There is, however, a "wisdom . . . taught by the Spirit, combining spiritual thoughts with spiritual words" (1 Cor. 2:13, NASB). The wisdom greatly to be desired is not that derived by human reflection but by divine revelation. This wisdom is incarnate in Jesus Christ, "in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Col. 2:3, NASB). In His followers, the marks of wisdom are humility, holiness, and Christlikeness (Jas. 3:13-18).

See DISCERNMENT, FOOL (FOOLISHNESS, FOLLY), PRUDENCE.

For Further Reading: GMS, 107-9, 152-53, 332-33; Eerdman's Handbook to the Bible, 317-18, 463.

C. S. COWLES

WITCHCRAFT. See SORCERY.

WITNESS. See TESTIMONY, WITNESS.

WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT. The witness of the Spirit, as understood by Wesleyans, is the direct, inward communication to the believer of the fact of his acceptance with God. It is not just an emotional release or a special enablement to act or speak in a certain way. It is not the same thing as the Spirit's witness to the truthfulness of Scripture (as in Ramm, *The Witness of the Spirit*, 65, etc.) or the confidence (claimed by many Calvinist and neoorthodox believers) that one is of the elect. It is a direct witness to a conscious relationship with God.

In Rom. 8:15-16, there are two distinct witnesses. One's own spirit is aware of the new life from God and of the fruit of the Spirit. (First John enumerates evidences by which one can take inventory and arrive at the certain knowledge re-

flected in 5:13.) To the human witness is added the divine. The Holy Spirit testifies that one is a child of God. As in home owning, to the conscious blessings of possession is added the clear title of a warranty deed. Certainty is of inestimable value in the matter of destiny.

In practical matters the witness of the Spirit cannot be separated from the fruit of the Spirit. Wesley says, "Let none ever presume to rest in any supposed testimony of the Spirit which is separate from the fruit of it," and "let none rest in any supposed fruit of the Spirit without the witness" (*Works*, 5:133). Otherwise, one might exalt human experience above the Word of God. The twofold witness assures that the human experience is shaped by the Word and the work of God.

Sanctification is attested by a similar witness "both as clear and as steady" as of justification, and this witness is "necessary in the highest degree" (*Works*, 11:420). In both instances, variations are admitted as to the clarity of the witness. Wesley says, "I know that I am accepted: And yet that knowledge is sometimes shaken, though not destroyed, by doubt or fear. If that knowledge were destroyed, or wholly withdrawn, I could not then say I had a Christian faith" (*Works*, 12:468). This agrees with the understanding that both salvation (in any degree) and its witness can be threatened or lost by sin or by preoccupation with the world. Likewise, these may be recovered upon repentance and faith.

See EXPERIENCE, JUSTIFICATION, ADOPTION, DOUBT, FRUIT OF THE SPIRIT.

For Further Reading: Wesley, Sermons 10-12 on the "Witness of the Spirit" and "Witness of Our Own Spirit"; also *Works*, 5:111-44; GMS, 459-61; Ralston, *Elements of Divinity*, 435-43; Wiley, CT, 2:431-39.

WILBER T. DAYTON

WOMAN. Scripture portrays woman as man's equal companion in all areas. Both creation accounts stress the unity of the human race. Gen. 1:27 reads, "God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them" (NASB). Together they were given the tasks of being fruitful, multiplying, and having dominion over the earth and its creatures (vv. 26, 28). Genesis shows God's creation of woman to be a companion corresponding to man in all ways, "bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh" (2:23), that the two might be "one flesh" (v. 24).

Their harmony, however, with one another and with nature was broken by sin. Together in the garden (3:6), both ate of the forbidden tree. While the man tried to blame the woman and

God for his disobedience (v. 12) and the woman blamed the serpent (v. 13), God punished all by driving them from the garden. The consequences of their sin are toil and pain in childbearing and food production. While the woman yearns for the lost oneness, the man in sin becomes dominant (3:16).

In Christ unity is renewed (Gal. 3:28). The Bible presupposes basic biological functional differences but stresses mutuality of responsibility. Both parents are responsible for their children, and both are to be honored (Exod. 20:12). Both women and men are to display the fruits of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22-23) and to be strong in the faith, ready to defend it. All Christians are to submit to each other as Christ modeled for us in His life and death (John 13:14-16; Rom. 12:10; Phil. 2:3-4; 1 Thess. 5:15; 1 Pet. 5:5). In marriage Paul teaches mutual submission and mutual nurture toward wholeness (1 Cor. 7:3-4; Eph. 5:21-33).

Jesus, contrary to the customs of His culture, taught, touched, and healed women. Many followed as His disciples (Luke 8:1-3) and were last at His cross and first at the tomb. To women was entrusted the message of the Resurrection.

Peter, quoting the prophet Joel, saw the Holy Spirit's empowering of women for ministry as a sign of the Kingdom's arrival (Acts 2:17-18). Women like Priscilla taught in the Early Church (18:26); Phoebe was a deacon (Rom. 16:1-2); many others are listed as Paul's co-workers. While Paul recognized women's right to pray and prophesy (1 Cor. 11:5), he warned against disorder, idle chatter, and interruptive questioning in services (1 Corinthians 14). The ban in 1 Timothy against women teaching at that time could have been prompted by the danger of false teaching by uneducated women. The added concern that a woman not "usurp authority" does not prohibit a woman's exercising legitimate authority given her by the Church through normal processes of leadership designation, for in this same Epistle we read of women deacons (3:11) and possibly women elders (5:1-22).

When seen in contrast to the cultures from which it sprang and in which it has taken root through the centuries, Christianity has been a source of woman's elevation. While the equality displayed in creation and redemption has rarely been actualized in society, woman's role has been steadily expanded under the gospel's encouragement.

See ORDINATION OF WOMEN, WOMEN'S LIBERATION, MARRIAGE, FAMILY, FATHERS, PARENTS AND CHILDREN, CHAIN OF COMMAND.

For Further Reading: Jewett, *Man as Male and Female*; Mollenkott, *Women, Men, and the Bible*; Scanzoni and Hardesty, *All We're Meant to Be: A Biblical Approach to Women's Liberation*.

NANCY A. HARDESTY

WOMEN, ORDINATION OF. See ORDINATION OF WOMEN.

WOMEN'S LIBERATION. The movement of the 1960s and 1970s is but a reflowering of the 19th-century call for "woman's rights."

As women became active in temperance and abolition, their rights to organize, speak out, and engage in public political activity were challenged on the basis of traditional scriptural interpretations. From evangelical circles surrounding revivalist Charles G. Finney and from Wesleyan/holiness groups came a series of defenses, first of woman's right to work for reform and eventually for her right to preach the gospel in its fullness. Finneyites Sarah Grimké (*Letters on the Equality of the Sexes*, 1838) and Antoinette Brown Blackwell ("Exegesis of 1 Corinthians, xiv., 34, 35 and 1 Timothy, ii, 12," *Oberlin Quarterly Review*, 1849) declared that whatever was morally right for man to do was morally right for woman. Methodists Luther Lee (*Woman's Right to Preach the Gospel*, 1853), Phoebe Palmer (*Promise of the Father*, 1859), Catherine Booth (*Female Ministry*, 1859), Frances Willard (*Woman in the Pulpit*, 1888), and B. T. Roberts (*Ordaining Women*, 1891) all argued that John Wesley allowed women to preach and the Bible not only permits but encourages women's service to the church and the world. Thus many holiness and Pentecostal denominations do ordain women.

After the 19th Amendment gave women the right to vote in 1920, women's rights as an organized movement went into decline, only to be reborn as an adjunct to a renewed concern for civil rights. Goals of the women's movement have been equal pay for equal work, equal recognition under the law, and individual fulfillment unfettered by restrictive cultural sex roles.

Within the church, women began to be fully ordained in a number of mainline denominations in the mid-1950s. During the 1970s biblical feminists sought to recover the liberating exegesis of Scripture used by their grandparents; to foster the use of inclusive language in Bible translations and worship materials; to achieve mutual submission and responsibility in home, church, and society; and to realize the full giftedness of every person in Christ, in whom there is neither male nor female (Gal. 3:28).

See WOMAN, ORDINATION OF WOMEN.

For Further Reading: Dayton, *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage*; Gundry, *Woman Be Free*; Scanzoni and Hardesty, *All We're Meant to Be: A Biblical Approach to Women's Liberation*.
NANCY A. HARDESTY

WORD OF GOD. This term may refer to: (1) an isolated message from God; (2) the Holy Bible, commonly called the "Word of God written"; or to (3) Christ as the living Word, the divine Logos.

There are many references in the OT to isolated messages, which God usually gave to prophets (e.g., 1 Sam. 3:11-14; 1 Kings 12:22-24; Jer. 1:4-5; 51:33; Ezek. 7:1 ff).

The written Word of God as the aggregate of His recorded messages is the theme of Psalm 119 (though only a part of the Scriptures had been written at that time). In the NT the sacred writings are called "scriptures" (Matt. 21:42; Mark 14:49; Luke 24:27; John 5:39; et al.). The Bible as a whole can properly be called the Word of God even though it contains words which are not God's, as for instance the words of Satan or of evil men. Such are inspired in the sense that God directed the human writers to include them for a divine purpose.

But it is through the Living Word, Christ, who was from the beginning (John 1:1 ff), that God has revealed himself most clearly to man (14:9).

The above categories of the Word of God are so closely associated that they blend into each other. If, for example, Jesus is the Truth (John 14:6), and God's words, whether spoken or written, are true (2 Sam. 7:28; Ps. 19:9), then the Word of God in all categories possesses the quality of truth. A dramatic example of the coalescing of their meaning is seen in Heb. 4:12. There, what seems at first to be a statement about the qualities of the spoken and written Word quickly becomes expressed in personal terms and is "a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart." All things are "manifest in his sight" (v. 13).

To take another example, the Word of God, spoken, written, and personal is "a lamp unto [our] feet" (Ps. 119:105; John 8:12) and the Inspirer of faith (Rom. 10:17; 2 Pet. 1:4; Heb. 12:2). But the Living Word alone is the source of salvation (Acts 16:31; 4:12).

See CHRIST, LOGOS, BIBLE, INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE.

For Further Reading: Walls, "Word," *Baker's DT*; Wiley and Culbertson, *Introduction to Christian Theology*, 185-238.
W. RALPH THOMPSON

WORK, WORKS. This is the English translation of several Hebrew (e.g., *maaseh*, *melakah*, *poal*, *ya-*

gia) and Greek words (*ergon*, *poiēma*, *pragma*, *koriaō*, *energeia*, etc.) whose generalized meaning is purposeful activity. Work or works may be variously classified according to the agent (God or man), sphere (sacred or secular), variety (physical or intellectual), evaluation (positive or negative, good or bad), purpose (contextually defined), and/or the distinctive uses of specific biblical authors.

Scripture presents God himself as the Model of positively evaluated work, primarily in creation and redemption (cf. Gen. 1:1—2:3; Isaiah 43—45; Ps. 8:3; 19:1). Of His healings Jesus said, "My Father is always at his work to this very day, and I, too, am working" (John 5:17, NIV; cf. v. 36; 9:3-4; 17:4; Matt. 11:2-6).

Work, both physical (Gen. 1:28; 2:15; Ps. 104:14, 23) and intellectual (Gen. 2:19-20; 1:26, 28), intended to create, conserve, control, and classify, was part of God's original purpose for man, not a consequence of the Fall. Sin distorted the character of man, and since work is a fundamental act of human existence, it was directly affected by that sin. Work became wearisome toil, aggravated by an uncertain relationship between exertion and achievement (cf. Gen. 3:17-19; 5:29; 8:21; Eccles. 2:4-11, 18-23; 4:4-8; 6:7), and an occasion for sins of avarice (cf. Luke 12:13-21; Prov. 23:4) and exploitation (cf. Exod. 1:11-14; Jer. 22:13-17; Jas. 5:1-6). Idleness and sloth are considered vices (cf. Prov. 6:6-15; 10:2-5; 13:4; 14:23; Eph. 4:28; 1 Thess. 4:11-12; 2 Thess. 3:6-13). The apostolic ultimatum is: "If any one will not work, let him not eat" (2 Thess. 3:10, RSV). But through God's work of redemption even everyday secular tasks become sacred when performed in obedience to the divine will, "as to the Lord" (cf. Eph. 6:5-9; Deut. 2:7; 14:28-29; Job 1:10).

When we move from "work" to "works," we find ourselves at once grappling with an age-old theological problem. There developed in late Judaism the notion that the fulfillment of God's law was a holy work which established a man's righteousness or a treasury of merit before God. This accounts for Paul's negative appraisal of "works," i.e., doing what the law requires as a means of achieving or securing salvation (Rom. 3:20, 28; 9:30—10:4; cf. Matt. 20:1-15; Luke 17:7-10). He argues that salvation is by grace alone, God's work. Even the human response of faith and the subsequent performance of good works are not meritorious, but a ceasing from vain efforts to secure self-salvation (Eph. 2:1-10; Rom. 3:21—4:25; 7:7-25; Gal. 2:15-21; 3:21-22; cf. Heb. 4:9-11).

The obedience of faith (Rom. 1:5; 15:18) working through love (Gal. 5:6) will keep God's commandments (1 Cor. 7:19) and thereby fulfil the law's intent (Rom. 8:1-4; 13:8-10; 1 Cor. 15:58; Gal. 5:13-14; Eph. 4:10; Phil. 1:27; Col. 1:10). James's reminder that "faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead" (Jas. 2:17, RSV; cf. vv. 14-26) only apparently contradicts Paul. Paul was writing against legalistic piety, while James's concern was dead orthodoxy which did not issue in a transformed life.

See MERIT, FIDEISM, VOCATION, JUSTIFICATION, LAW AND GRACE, MOSAIC LAW.

For Further Reading: Bertram, "*ergon*, etc.," Kittel, 2:635-55; Braun, "*poieō*, etc.," Kittel, 6:458-84; Hahn and Thiele, "Work, Do, Accomplish," *NIDNTT*, 3:1147-59; Maurer, "*prassō*, etc.," Kittel, 6:632-44; GMS, 38-39, 107-19, 527-59; Richardson, *The Biblical Doctrine of Work*.
GEORGE LYONS

WORK ETHIC. See LABOR.

WORLD, WORLDLINESS. The principal word in the Hebrew is *tebel*, which means "the earth, the globe, its inhabitants." The term is often parallel to and synonymous with "earth." In the Greek the most common word is *kosmos*, meaning "orderly arrangement or ordered world."

The Hebrew had no concept of the world as it is known today. To his mind the physical world was not the whole. Beyond were the heavens where God's throne was located with all His heavenly host. He did not think of the universe but rather thought in terms of the abode of God (heaven). God was the Author of both, and the orderly movements of the heavenly bodies and the seasons were testimony of His creating and keeping power. When man sinned, a curse fell upon all creation (Ps. 104:29).

A striking fact is the way in which the NT uses "world" as something evil. Man is divided between the followers of Christ and the followers of the world: "If ye were of the world, the world would love his own" (John 15:19); "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world" (17:16).

Worldliness is not a scriptural term, but it is a biblical concept. The life that is ordered by a love for earthly things which separate from God is worldly. The Christian is opposed by all the elements of the present world and opposed by the spiritual powers of this world: "The whole world lieth in wickedness" (1 John 5:19). The person who loves this system is not of Christ (Jas. 4:4). Worldliness is to be in harmony with the spirit of this age as opposed to Christ. Satan directs the course of the world that now is: "We wrestle not

against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world" (Eph. 6:12).

Love is the motive that sets priorities, determines and gives direction. Love helps one to select and limit. Love directs itself toward pleasure, not suffering, hurt, and privation. Because of this guiding factor in life, the Bible teaches: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him" (1 John 2:15). To love the world is to accept the aims of the visible world, its plans, customs, and values. The worldly person is caught up in the spirit of the age. Worldliness is not an act, not *things*, but a *spirit*, by which one is engrossed with the now, the physical, as opposed to the eternal and the spiritual.

See SEPARATION, SPIRITUALITY, PIETISM, LIFE-STYLE, TEMPTATION.

For Further Reading: Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, 6:179-82; Trench, *Synonyms of the New Testament*, 200-205.
LEON CHAMBERS

WORLD VIEW. See COSMOLOGY.

WORSHIP. Worship is the acknowledgment of the "worth-ship" (Anglo-Saxon, *weorthscipe*) of God. It is the human response to the divine nature. "When thou saidst, Seek ye my face; my heart said unto thee, Thy face, Lord, will I seek" (Ps. 27:8). Man's response is itself divinely inspired. "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him" (John 6:44). If the Holy Spirit is the divine Agent who motivates our worship, it is Christ who by His finished work on Calvary makes that motivation possible.

Worship can only rightly be offered to God himself. He alone is worthy! The heart of Christian worship is adoration, the most self-abnegating devotion of which man is capable. It is part of the mission of the Church to recognize the need of cultivating in its members the spirit of reverence and awe that leads to adoration. Here is the vital spark of heavenly flame that is to inspire, promote, and sustain the life of the soul. The worship service is a tryst with God. "And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee" (Exod. 25:22).

Worship involves the whole man. It cannot be divorced from moral and ethical content. The qualification for fellowship with God is fitness for it. "Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? or who shall stand in his holy place? He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart" (Ps. 24:3-4). Worship also embraces obedience and service (Luke 6:46). In Scripture there is no difference between

the two. The Hebrew verb "to serve" (*abhaah*), when used in reference to God, includes every form of service, whether offered in Temple worship or in daily life. In the NT the noun *leitourgia* (from which our word *liturgy* is derived) is used without distinction between worship and service. The revelation of God to man is never one of presence only; it involves also God's purpose. "There can be no apprehension of the divine Presence that is not at the same time a summons to a divinely-appointed task" (Baillie, *The Sense of the Presence of God*, 206).

From the human side Christian worship implies both offering and receiving. The subjective element (man's receiving) is essential to all true worship: "Strength and beauty are in his sanctuary" (Ps. 96:6). Attendance at worship is intended in part for the therapeutic values that the Christian faith offers. Keeping a balance between the objective and the subjective aspects of Christian worship is not always easy. Our theology of God conditions our worship perspective. For some, God may be almost exclusively transcendent; for others, He is altogether immanent. Man's nature calls for a sense of both the ultimate and the intimate. But when one is magnified at the expense of the other, religious experience is in danger of becoming either cold and legalistic or overfamiliar and sentimental. The worship of God is a blend of both awe and love.

See REVERENCE, CHURCH, CHURCH MUSIC, BLESS (BLESSED, BLESSING), PRESENCE (DIVINE), LITURGY, PRAYER, PUBLIC PRAYER.

For Further Reading: NIDCC, 1062-63; ER, 830-31; DCT, 361 ff. JAMES D. ROBERTSON

WRATH. The Bible speaks both of the wrath of man and the wrath of God. As to man, he is exhorted against any uncontrolled rage or passionate anger (Gen. 49:5-7; Matt. 5:9, 21-22; Rom. 12:19; Gal. 5:19-20; Eph. 4:26-31; Col. 3:8; Jas. 1:19-20). The NT view of grace carries with it the possibilities of enjoying a sanctified spirit from which any violent anger has been removed. In the OT, in particular, men were often called upon to carry out certain responsibilities related to the wrath of God (cf. Josh. 9:20). In cases of this type of behavior, the person functioned under the Spirit of God, and the initiation of God was made known to men.

As to God, the Bible speaks clearly about the wrath of God. The apostle Paul, for example, uses such phrases as "the wrath to come" (1 Thess. 1:10); "children of wrath" (Eph. 2:3); "the

day of wrath" (Rom. 2:5); "vessels of wrath" (9:22); and other similar phrases. Obviously, the concept of wrath as it relates to God plays a significant part in Paul's theological understanding. In the Book of Romans, after introducing the theme of the Epistle in 1:16-17, he proceeds to deal with the issue of sin in the history of mankind. "The wrath of God is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and wickedness of men who suppress the truth by their wickedness" (v. 18, NIV). Needless to say, these declarations make it abundantly clear that "a principle of retribution" is at work in this moral universe.

Is the wrath of God personal or impersonal? Many scholars find offensive the suggestion that God's wrath is personal. They see His wrath as "an impersonal system of cause and effect in the moral realm." For example, Brunner speaks of the wrath of God as "the headwind against which every sinner walks." This position rests upon a fear that God's wrath may be understood in psychological terms, that is to say, it is some type of emotional rage, much like what we witness among humans. Therefore, God's wrath cannot be personal.

On the other hand, God's wrath may be considered personal in the sense that it is His steady, holy displeasure at sin. As Purkiser writes, the wrath of God is His "unfailing and unceasing antagonism to sin, which must be so long as God is God." Moreover, His wrath is His judicial attack on evil. The end result of the divine wrath is twofold: (1) to maintain the created order; (2) to punish justly those who rebel against His providences and redemption and who persist in acting wickedly.

Three facts must be kept in mind with respect to this issue of the personal or impersonal character of God's wrath. First, the moral law, under which all of us live, originates in the nature of God, not His will. This means that the wrath of God is not "an unbridled and normless exercise of vengeance" but an indignant response to sin based upon His own holy nature. Second, since the moral law arises out of His being which is unchangeable, it too is changeless. This removes any capriciousness from God's wrath. Third, wrath and love are not opposites. Hate is the opposite of love. "Wrath is the unfailing opposition of God's holy love to all that is evil," writes Purkiser.

See GOD, ATTRIBUTES (DIVINE), RETRIBUTION (RETRIBUTIVE JUSTICE), ETERNAL PUNISHMENT, ANGER, LOVE.

For Further Reading: Purkiser, "Second Thoughts on

"The Wrath," *The Seminary Tower*, Fall, 1958; Stahlin, "orge," Kittel, 5:419-47; W. White, Jr., "Wrath," *ZPEB*, 5: WILLARD H. TAYLOR

WRITE, WRITING, WRITTEN. Writing is the recording and communicating of visual and verbal symbols objectively (White, "Writing," *ZPEB*, 5:995). While oral tradition merely restates horizontal communication, writing transmits data across time spans beyond the life of the individual or his social group. Documents have been found in western Asia dating back to 3000 B.C. From them still earlier beginnings may be inferred. Long before Moses it was not necessary to depend on oral transmission to preserve a tradition. In Abraham's day, five distinct and complete writing systems were in common use around him (*ibid.*, 1014).

Though memory was highly cultivated in the ancient East, important matters have long been

put in writing. Laws, court records, decrees, and contracts are kept for accurate reference. Throughout the Bible, writing is an important mark of revelation. One is forbidden to tamper with it (Rev. 22:18-19).

The word for a writing or writings (*graphē*) is used 51 times in the NT, referring exclusively to the Holy Scriptures. To say, "It is written," is tantamount to quoting God himself (e.g., John 7:38; Rom. 9:17; 10:11). Since Scripture is God-breathed, it is of unique value to the people of God (2 Tim. 3:16-17). Once God has gone on record, His decree *stands written*. And His Word is Truth (John 17:17).

See BIBLE, BIBLICAL AUTHORITY, TRADITION, INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE.

For Further Reading: *ZPEB*, 5:302-13, 995-1015; Brown and Mayer, "Scripture, Writing," *Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, 3:482-97; Schrenk, "Graphō, etc.," Kittel, 1:742-73. WILBER T. DAYTON

Y, Z

YAHWEH. See JEHOVAH, YAHWEH.

YOKE. The yoke as noted in the Bible was a bar which connects two animals, usually two of a kind. The construction of the yoke varied as to material. Often the construction was that of a piece of wood made to curve near each end, and connected to this bar were two other pieces of bowed wood which were to be placed around the necks of oxen.

In biblical times the yoke was also used on human beings when they were taken captive from their homeland (Jer. 28:10). Slaves, too, were sometimes held captive by the use of a yoke.

Figuratively, any burden imposed on another or any means of subjection would be viewed as a yoke. It is for these reasons the yoke became the object of one of the metaphors of Jesus' teaching. The metaphor would be well understood when used as a symbol of slavery to the law or slavery to sin.

Theologically, the most significant aspect of the yoke as a teaching metaphor is the concept of slavery. The slavery noted by use of this metaphor is spiritual rather than physical.

Jesus and Paul both used the yoke to allude to those who had become slaves to the law. The law applied in an extremely legalistic way became a yoke of burden (Acts 15:10). Gal. 5:1 is a direct

reference to such servitude with regard to the law. By comparison, servitude to Christ was easy (Matt. 11:29). When comparing Christ's yoke with the yoke of the law, "the contrast is not between 'yoke' and 'no yoke' but between my teaching (light yoke) and the current scribal teaching (heavy yoke)" (*ISBE*, 5:3127).

The yoke of Jesus is to do the will of the Father (John 8:29). When an individual comes to Christ, he is coming to one whose use of the law does not produce a legalistic bondage.

See SERVANT, SERVICE, OBEDIENCE, DISCIPLESHIP.

For Further Reading: Waetjer, *Baker's DCE*, 563; Brown, ed., *NIDNTT*, 3:1160-65; Wolf, *IDB*, 4:924-25.

LARRY FINE

ZEAL. This word translates the Hebrew *ganna* and the Greek *zēlos*. The Hebrew noun occurs 43 times in the OT, while *zēlos* occurs 16 times in the NT. In both of the Testaments, whether zeal has a positive or negative meaning is dependent on the context. It may be used in a good sense as "zeal, ardor, jealousy for" (cf. Ps. 69:9; 2 Cor. 7:7). In its negative sense it is considered as "envy or jealousy of" (Num. 5:14; Acts 5:17). Zeal may be misdirected even when sincere (cf. Rom. 10:2; Phil. 3:6). Once Paul qualifies the term with the adjective "godly" (2 Cor. 11:2).

"Zeal" in its original Greek usage had various

meanings such as (1) the capacity or state of passionate committal to a person or cause; (2) orientation to a worthy goal; (3) envy or jealousy. Sometimes it means jealousy in the married life (Prov. 6:34; Song of Sol. 8:6). When used of God or of man in relation to God, it usually has religious significance. Often in the LXX it is used to denote a specific intensity in the divine action and is sometimes listed with *orgē* (Deut. 29:20) and *thumos* (Num. 25:11; Ezek. 34:14; Deut. 4:24; 6:15), where God is described as a "jealous God." God is jealous for Israel as a husband is jealous for his wife; Israel is peculiarly His own according to the covenant made with her. His jealousy is as much a part of His character as righteousness, holiness, and love. In the NT it is not God, but rather His Son (John 2:17) and His spiritual sons (2 Cor. 7:11; 11:2) who express this "divine zeal" in behalf of God's holiness and kingdom. A basic mark of God's purified people is that they are "zealous of good works" (Titus 2:14).

See DEVOTE (DEVOTION), JEALOUSY.

For Further Reading: Kittel, 2:877-88; "Zeal," IDB; Arndt and Gingrich. JERRY W. MCCANT

ZEALOTS. This militant party of Jewish patriots came into existence during the early years of the first century A.D. in Palestine. In A.D. 6, Quirinius, the Roman legate of Syria, ordered a census to be taken of the newly created Roman province of Judea. The census was to provide the basis for the taxation of the Jews. In retaliation, Judas of Galilee, along with some of his Jewish compatriots, organized a revolt (cf. Acts 5:37).

Josephus is not too kind in his assessment of these people. He depicts them as fanatics who engaged in rash deeds which finally hindered rather than advanced their cause. Furthermore, he attributes the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 to their nationalistic spirit. Some of the Zealots fled to Herod's fortress-palace, Masada, and held out there against the Romans until A.D. 73.

This party functioned with strong theocratic sensitivities, being firmly committed to the principle that acceptance of a Gentile as sovereign was unlawful for the Jews. They shared the theological beliefs of the Pharisees except with respect to the Jewish political situation under the Roman rule. While the Pharisees pled for patience in the matter of release from the bondage, the Zealots felt they were religiously required to take the initiative in breaking the Roman yoke, in much the same way as the Maccabees had done in their time.

One of the disciples of Jesus was named Simon the Zealot (Luke 6:15; Acts 1:13). We are not to

assume from this reference that Jesus' activities and preaching were associated with the political messianism of the Zealots.

See PHARISEES.

For Further Reading: Bruce, *New Testament History*, 93 ff; Josephus, *Wars of the Jews*, 4. 3. 9, 12-14; Lohse, *The New Testament Environment*, 83-84.

WILLARD H. TAYLOR

ZIONISM. The term *Zionism*, from "Zion," an early OT synonym for Jerusalem, was first coined by a European Jew, Nathan Birnbaum, in April, 1890. It designated a Jewish nationalist movement which aimed to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine. Increasingly in the 19th century there were movements among the numerous European Jews towards a return to Palestine, then part of the Ottoman Empire. Influential Jews such as Mordecai Noah (in 1818) and Moses Hess (in 1862) had proclaimed *Eretz Israel* ("the land of Israel") as the Jews' rightful possession; and the growing movement of *Choveve Zion* ("Lovers of Zion") protested against any permanent assimilation of Jews into Gentile lands and culture.

The true founder of Zionism was Theodor Herzl (1860-1904), a Jewish Viennese journalist whose concern about growing anti-Semitism in Europe was climaxed by the proceedings of the famous Dreyfus case in France in 1895. In 1896 Herzl wrote a short but very influential pamphlet entitled *Judenstaat* ("The Jewish State"). He argued that such was the menace of anti-Semitism that the Jewish people could only survive if gathered together and concentrated in one geographical area. Herzl convened the first Zionist Congress in Basel in 1897 which agreed on a Zionist Charter: "Zionism aims at establishing for the Jewish people a publicly and legally assured home in Palestine." Thousands of Jews all over the world supported the Zionist cause, including many wealthy American Jews and European Jews such as Chaim Weizmann (1874-1952), an internationally recognized scientist and later to be elected the first president of the state of Israel in 1949.

See JUDAISM, ISRAEL, RESTORATION OF ISRAEL.

For Further Reading: Cohen, *The Zionist Movement*; Halpern, *The Idea of a Jewish State*.

HERBERT MCGONIGLE

ZOROASTRIANISM. The dualistic religion founded by the Persian prophet Zarathustra (c. 630-583 B.C.) and important because it stands as one of man's earliest attempts to explain the origin of sin (Wiley, *CT*, 2:71). In reaction to Persian poly-

theism, Zoroaster (Greek form of Persian name) taught the existence of one supreme God, Ahura Mazda or Ohrmuzd, author of all good, who sought only the good of man. Angra Mainyu or Ahriman, the source of all evil, was coeval in origin with Ahura, yet not truly eternal because ultimately he would be annihilated. Man's soul is the battlefield where the conflict between good

and evil is fought. Zoroaster stressed man's freedom to ally himself with Ahura Mazda and thus share his ultimate triumph through eternity.

See NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS.

For Further Reading: Parrinder, *A Dictionary of Non-Christian Religions*, 83-84, 316-17; Archer, "Zoroastrianism" in *Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 15:1203-4.

MAUREEN H. BOX

Bibliography

Dictionaries, Lexicons, and Word Studies

- Abbott, Lyman. *A Dictionary of Religious Knowledge*. New York: Harper and Bros., 1885.
- Barclay, William. *New Testament Words*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964, 1974.
- Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and edited by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Blunt, John Henry. *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*. London: Rivertons, 1972.
- Brown, Colin, ed. *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1975, 1978.
- Buck, Charles, ed. *A Theological Dictionary*. London: James Duncan, 1833.
- Buttrick, George Arthur, ed. *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962, 1976.
- Cremer, Hermann, ed. *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New-Testament Greek*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1980.
- Cross, F. L., ed. *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. London: Oxford University Press, 1957, 1958, 1974.
- Cully, Kendig Brubaker. *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Education*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.
- Douglas, J. D., ed. *The New Bible Dictionary*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962, 1971.
- , ed. *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974.
- Ernst, Cornelius, ed.; trans. Richard Strachan. *Theological Dictionary*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1968.
- Ferm, Vergilius, ed. *A Protestant Dictionary*. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1951.
- Harrison, Everett F., ed. *Baker's Dictionary of Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960, 1973.
- Hastings, James. *A Dictionary of the Bible*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900.
- . *A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908.
- . *Dictionary of the New Testament*. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973.
- Henry, Carl F. H., ed. *Baker's Dictionary of Christian Ethics*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973.
- Hill, David. *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Kittel, Gerhard, ed.; trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964, 1965, 1967.
- Liddell, H. G., and Scott, Robert, comps. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1943. Revised by H. S. Jones, 1958.
- Macquarrie, John, ed. *Westminster Dictionary of Christian Ethics*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.
- McKenzie, John L., ed. *Dictionary of the Bible*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1965.
- Miller, Madeline, and Lane, J., eds. *Harper's Bible Dictionary*. New York: Harper and Row, 1952, 1973.
- Richardson, Alan, ed. *A Dictionary of Christian Theology*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.
- , ed. *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1951, 1962, 1964, 1967.
- Roberti, Francesco, comp.; trans. Henry J. Yannone. *Dictionary of Moral Theology*. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1957, 1962.
- Robertson, A. T. *Word Pictures in the New Testament*. New York: R. R. Smith, 1930.
- Runes, Dagobert D., ed. *Dictionary of Philosophy*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959.
- Souter, Alexander. *A Pocket Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*. Reprint. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.
- Tenney, Merrill C., ed. *The Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1963.
- Unger, Merrill F. *Unger's Bible Dictionary*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1964.
- Vincent, Marvin R., ed. *Word Studies in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957.
- Vine, W. E., ed. *An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*. Old Tappan, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1966.
- Wiener, Claude, ed. *Dictionary of Biblical Theology*. New York: Seabury Press, 1973.
- Wolman, Benjamin B., ed. *Dictionary of Behavioral Science*. New York: Van Nostrand, Reinhold Co., 1973.
- Wuest, Kenneth S., ed. *Wuest's Word Studies*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1966.

Encyclopedias

- Adler, Cyrus, et al., eds. *The Jewish Encyclopedia*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1901-6.
- Alexander, David and Pat, eds. *Eerdmans' Handbook to the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1973.
- Baver, Johannes, ed. *Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology*. 3 vols. London: Sheed and Ward, n.d.
- Benton, A. A. *Church Cyclopaedia*. New York: M. H. Mal-lory and Co., 1883.
- Denham, J. F., ed. *The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclo-pedia*. Chicago: Howard Severance Co., 1911.
- Edwards, Paul, ed. *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1967.
- Fallows, Samuel, et al., eds. *Bible Encyclopedia and Scrip-tural Dictionary*. Chicago: Howard Severance Co., 1910.
- Ferm, Vergilius, ed. *Encyclopedia of Morals*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956.
- , ed. *An Encyclopedia of Religion*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1945.
- Hastings, James. *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.
- Jackson, Samuel M., et al., eds. *Schaff-Herzog Encyclope-dia of Religious Knowledge*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1909. Revised as *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. 13 vols. 1909. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1949-50.
- Loetscher, Lefferts A., ed. *Twentieth Century Encyclope-dia of Religious Knowledge* (an extension of the origi-nal Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia). Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1955.
- McClintock, John, and Strong, James, eds. *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*. New York: Harper and Bros., 1891. Reprint. Grand Rap-ids: Baker Book House, 1970.
- Meagher, Paul Kevin, et al., eds. *Encyclopedia Dictionary of Religion*. Washington, D.C.: Corpus Publishers, 1979.
- The Mennonite Encyclopedia*. Scottdale, Pa.: Mennonite Publishing House, 1956.
- New Catholic Encyclopedia*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967-69.
- Orr, James, ed. *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1943, 1959.
- Pfeiffer, Charles F.; Vos, Howard F.; and Rea, John; eds. *Wycliffe Bible Encyclopedia*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1975.
- Rahner, Karl A., et al., eds. *Encyclopedia of Theology*. New York: Seabury Press, 1975.
- Rahner, Karl A.; Ernst, Cornelius; and Smyth, Kevin; eds. *Sacramentum Mundi: An Encyclopedia of Theol-ogy*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1968-70.
- Seligman, Edwin R. A., and Johnson, Alvin, eds. *Ency-clopedia of the Social Sciences*. New York: Macmillan Co. and Free Press, 1963. (International edition, ed. David L. Silla, published in 1968.)
- Tenney, Merrill C., ed. *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclo-pedia of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Pub-lishing House, 1975, 1977.
- Urmson, J. O., ed. *The Concise Encyclopedia of Western Philosophy and Philosophers*. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1960.
- Wolman, Benjamin, ed. *International Encyclopedia of Psychiatry, Psychology, Psychoanalysis, and Neu-rology*. New York: Aesculapius Publishers, Inc., 1977.

Major Works and Theologies

- Arminius, James. *Works*. Translated by Nichols and Bag-nall. Buffalo, N.Y.: Derby, Miller, Orton, and Mul-ligan, 1853.
- Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics*. Edited by G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936—.
- Chafer, Lewis Sperry. *Systematic Theology*. 8 vols. Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1947-48.
- Fletcher, John. *The Works of the Rev. John Fletcher*. New York: B. Waugh and T. Mason, 1833. Reprint. Salem, Ohio: Schmull Publishers, 1974.
- Hills, A. M. *Fundamental Christian Theology*. 2 vols. Pas-adena, Calif.: Pasadena College, 1931. Abridged ed., C. J. Kinne, 1932.
- Marty, Martin E., and Peerman, Dean G., eds. *New The-ology*. 2 vols. New York: MacMillan Co., 1964-65.
- Miley, John. *Systematic Theology*. 2 vols. New York: Hunt and Eaton, 1892-94.
- Souter, A., ed. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. New York: Mac-millan Co., 1920.
- Wesley, John. *Standard Sermons*. Edited by Edward H. Sugden. London: Epworth Press, 1968.
- . *The Works of the Rev. John Wesley*. London: Wes-leyan Methodist Book Room, 1872 reprint. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press of Kansas City, n.d.; also Baker Book House.
- Wiley, H. Orton. *Christian Theology*. 3 vols. Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1940.

Commentaries

- Barclay, William. *The Daily Study Bible*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956-58.
- Broadman Bible Commentary*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1970.
- Bruce, F. F., ed. *The New International Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954, 1959.
- Calvin, John. *Calvin's New Testament Commentaries*.

- Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1961.
- Carter, Charles W., ed. *The Wesleyan Bible Commentary*. 7 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964-66.
- Clarke, Adam. *The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ*. 6 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, n.d.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *The International Critical Commentary*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1962, 1975-79.
- Greathouse, Wm. M., and Taylor, Willard H., eds. *Beacon Bible Expositions*. 12 vols. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press of Kansas City, 1974—.
- Grosheide, F. W. *New London Commentary*. London: Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, 1953.
- Harper, A. F., ed. *Beacon Bible Commentary*. 10 vols. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press of Kansas City, 1964-69.
- Keil, C. F., and Delitzsch, F. *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*. 25 vols. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., n.d.
- Morris, Leon, ed. *Tyndale New Testament Commentaries*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957.
- Whedon, D. D. *Commentary on the New Testament*. Reprint. Salem, Ohio: Schmul Publishing Co., n.d.
- Will, Harold E., ed. *Commentary on the New Testament*. Traverse City, Mich.: OCI Missionary Publications, 1975.