

5-1-1963

An Approach to the Concept of Biblical Communication as the Core of Christian Education

Eugene Kester

Recommended Citation

Kester, Eugene, "An Approach to the Concept of Biblical Communication as the Core of Christian Education" (1963). *Western Evangelical Seminary Theses*. 69.
http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/wes_theses/69

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Western Evangelical Seminary at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Western Evangelical Seminary Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolf@georgefox.edu.

AN APPROACH TO THE CONCEPT OF BIBLICAL COMMUNICATION
AS THE CORE OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the
Western Evangelical Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Divinity

by
Eugene Floyd Kester

May 1963

APPROVED BY

Major Professor: Robert D. Bennett

Co-operative Reader: Robert V. Sack

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|---|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| Statement of the Problem | 4 |
| Justification of the Study. | 4 |
| Procedure of Development | 5 |
| Limitations of the Study | 6 |
| Definitions | 7 |
| II. THE CONCEPT OF COMMUNICATION | 9 |
| Semantic Definition | 9 |
| Word roots | 9 |
| Synonyms compared | 10 |
| Bestow | 11 |
| Convey | 11 |
| Impart | 12 |
| Résumé of semantic research | 13 |
| Definition by Quotation from Selected Authorities . . . | 13 |
| Wilbur Schramm | 13 |
| Authentication | 13 |
| Viewpoint | 14 |
| Colin Cherry | 14 |
| Authentication | 14 |
| Viewpoint | 15 |
| Résumé of Authorities | 17 |

CHAPTER

PAGE

Definition by Observing Fields Influenced by the

Communication Concept 18

Fields listed 18

Reason for influence 19

Definition by Description of Some of the Problems

Associated with the Idea of Communication 20

Vocabulary 20

Integrity 22

Faith 24

Information 25

Referent 26

Motive 27

Résumé of problems associated with the idea

of communication 29

Definition by Description of Process 30

Basic elements 30

Encoding 31

Noise 32

Transmission 32

Feedback 33

Redundancy 33

Entropy 34

Reception 35

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Résumé of the Description of the Communication | |
| Concept and Working Definition | 35 |
| III. THE BIBLE AND COMMUNICATION | 40 |
| Orientation | 40 |
| God's Purpose as Expressed in the New Testament | 40 |
| The promise of the Father | 41 |
| The hidden mystery. | 44 |
| Old Testament support for the New Testament | |
| declaration | 49 |
| Résumé of God's purpose as expressed in the | |
| New Testament | 50 |
| The Outworking of God's Plan as Described in the | |
| Old Testament | 51 |
| New Testament introduction to the Old Testament | |
| process | 52 |
| Old Testament process in the patriarchs | 54 |
| Résumé of Early patriarchs. | 55 |
| Later patriarchs. | 58 |
| Résumé of later patriarchs | 60 |
| Process Through Law | 61 |
| Résumé of process through law | 65 |
| Process in the Prophets | 65 |
| Résumé of the process in the prophets | 67 |

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Résumé of the process in the Old Testament | 68 |
| The Outworking of God's Plan in the New Testament . . . | 70 |
| Jesus, the fulfillment of the law | 70 |
| Jesus, the pioneer and perfecter of faith | 77 |
| Résumé of the Process in the Bible | 83 |
| IV. THE SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS | 85 |
| Summary | 85 |
| Conclusions | 86 |
| Suggestions for Further Study | 88 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 91 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the process of genuinely attempting to live and share the Good News of Jesus Christ with an "exploding" contemporary world, some people have become increasingly desperate to know how!

This necessity, they have discovered, is disturbing multitudes of sincere Christians in every walk of life. Many have found themselves turning from one "successful" method to another; while others have "faithfully" held to some favorite or "honored" procedure.

But who has succeeded and who has failed? What are the standards of the task? How is it known when one is actually succeeding? Many methods have been used throughout the history of the church. Some have come, some have gone; some have remained, some have returned. What is the measure of what is "good" and what is "bad" in this process?

At times some have begun to think that possibly neither they, nor the particular methods they were using had been designed to fit the unique circumstances of which they were a part. On the other hand, from time to time they were "successful;" at least in some amount or quality; but this was frequently only more perplexing because they neither really knew why it had occurred nor how to perpetuate it.

Nor did they find it possible to accept the easy concluding that it was just the "spirit of the age." It might be true, but they were haunted by the feeling that possibly they had not adequately carried out their portion of the responsibility; or that in spite of their

sincerity and zeal they might not have properly understood their part.

The writer has sought some answers to this enigma in studying such fields as: psychology, education, theology, philosophy, Bible, history, literature, etc. In addition the writer has taught, led youth and adult groups of various sizes and purposes; pastored churches and counselled the confused, bereaved, penitent, seeking, confident, careless, and indifferent.

At some time during this process, the writer became aware of the vast new science of communication. The more he read, the more he sensed a kinship between their problem and his. In fact, he began to wonder whether they might have discovered some clues to help solve his dilemma.

This idea the writer pursued through a study of the history of language, semantics, mass communication and the general communication theory. Though he is only novice in any of these fields and hardly that in some, he has become convinced that what and how they are speaking is at least pertinent to the problem faced by religious communicators. Of no small assistance in his coming to this insight were the works of such contemporary authors as Hendrick Kraemer,¹ Eugene Nida,²

¹ Hendrick Kraemer, The Communication of the Christian Faith (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956).

² Eugene Nida, Message and Mission (London: Hamish Hamilton Ltd., 1960).

F. W. Dillistone,³ J. B. Phillips,⁴ and Harry DeWire.⁵

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Since those making careful study in the concept of "communication" had appeared to be facing similar problems to those of the Christian educator, it was decided that it would be beneficial to seek answers for the following questions: "Does the contemporary concept of 'communication' have any relationship to God's recorded revelation of Himself?"; "If so, does this Biblical 'communication' give us any indication as to the principles involved in the construction and judging of contemporary means of Christian 'communication?'; and finally, "Is it possible that in answering these questions one approaches the core of Christian education?" This study attempts to begin to answer these questions.

II. JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY

It is not as if nothing had been said in reference to these thoughts. Surely all of theology, history of Christian thought, as well as Church history are closely related. Likewise, the above mentioned authors, others listed in the bibliography and many more seem

³F. W. Dillistone, Christianity and Communication (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956).

⁴J. B. Phillips, Making Men Whole (London: Collins Press, 1955).

⁵Harry DeWire, The Christian As Communicator (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959).

to be facing into this problem. Indeed, it appears that the changing world mission scene and the challenging field of Christian counseling, are both constantly making discoveries and inducing study in this area.

But in this limited investigation, the writer did not find anyone who had approached the problem in the particular way he had chosen, asking the specific questions. They may have implied them, inferred them or alluded to them; but it seemed logical that they should be asked directly; because of the nature of the "eternal truth" being shared, the complexity of the problems increasingly being faced and the apparently already helpful interrelationship of the two fields of "communication" and "Christian education."

III. PROCEDURE OF DEVELOPMENT

To accomplish the aim, the writer chose first to discover a succinct definition of the concept "communication." In this the experience and knowledge of certain experts, as well as other general reading in the field, has been utilized; in addition to a semantic study of the word "communicate."

Other authors certainly cannot be held responsible for the writer's conclusions, but it is hoped that at least some logic has been followed in the use of their information and in the final construction of a "working" definition.

Next, the writer, using the formulated definition, attempted to

approach Scripture* as a communications man; and let the Bible itself judge whether there was any relationship between the recorded "revelation of God" and the "idea of communication" as it was defined. This led naturally into an attempt to "spell out" some of the apparent relationships in the terms of both fields. Preparatory reading and evaluation for this task was done casually and in concentration over a period of three years, in addition to the above mentioned experience.

The accumulated information then became the resource out of which the writer endeavored to discover whether there might be some tentative solutions to the original need for principles in the construction and evaluation of the contemporary process of Christian education.

IV. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Obviously, the task was immense so that certain guidelines ultimately had to be established; although they were not finally set until the period of writing which forced its consequent discipline of communication.

As has been inferred, Special or Biblical Revelation was chosen for this investigation rather than General Revelation; because it was more objective and authoritative. This was not to infer that the General Revelation was not related, but just that it was not chosen for

*The writer has chosen the Revised Standard Version of the Bible for this work because it is the contemporary standard version. Other authorized, standard and contemporary translations were used in study; and all seemed to support and give insight toward the resultant conclusions.

this study.

Another limitation emerged out of the very procedure of the investigation itself. Having spent all his life in the church and over twenty years teaching and preaching the Bible, it would have been easy for the writer to merely proof-text some new "notions." And likely this has not been completely avoided.

Therefore to alleviate this as much as possible, a genuine attempt has been made to let the Scripture "speak" for itself. Some resumes are made from time to time, as well as contrasts and comparisons between the facts and incidents of revelation and the ideas and theories of communication; but it was felt that there was neither time nor space in this investigation to "spell out" the multitude of implications.

The discovery of general relationships between the fields of "communication" and "Biblical revelation" and the possible unfolding of some core principles to govern the mode and appraisal of the Christian education process were the only goals.

V. DEFINITIONS

For this paper the following definitions were assumed:

God. Creator of all things known and unknown; interested in man.

Jesus Christ. The authentic personal revelation of God in the world.

The Bible. The authentic recorded revelation of God to man; the major confirmation and source of definition of all contemporary knowledge of Him.

Man. A creature of God, made in God's image and capable of fellowship with God.

CHAPTER II

THE CONCEPT OF COMMUNICATION

CHAPTER II

THE CONCEPT OF COMMUNICATION

It is obvious that words and ideas have history; that they are "rooted" in past circumstances and events and cannot be adequately understood apart from these "roots." Because of this, an investigation was made of some of the semantic history of the term "communication" before turning to the way it has been used by contemporary authors.

I. SEMANTIC DEFINITION

The word "communication" was found to be represented by Webster¹ as having come from the Latin communicatus, past participle of communicare, to communicate; which in turn is derived from communis or common.

Word Roots

Of immediate interest then, was the word communis or common which Webster broke into its constituent parts: co, signifying with, together, in conjunction, jointly; combined with munus which means obligation or with munia which means gift. Thus common could be shown to express the idea of an obligation or gift held jointly or shared. The related Sanskrit word mayate was used to support and illuminate this concept through its basic meaning of exchange.

¹Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged, (Springfield, Mass.: Merriam Company, 1934). Because of the difference in classification of dictionaries page references were considered useless by the writer.

Investigation revealed that this idea was carried over into the Anglo-Saxon gemæne which was defined by the words "common" or "general." Semantic kinship was likewise detected in the Danish gemeen, German gemein, Gothic gamains. This was also noted to be true in the English words: mean, immune, migrate, municiple, munificent, mutable, mutual, permeate.

This reasoning was confirmed by Webster's actual definition of the term "common" as:

1. Belonging or pertaining to the community at large.
2. Shared equally or similarly by two or more individuals. ...
4. Of frequent or ordinary occurrence or appearance; familiar by reason of frequency; as, a common sight... .

Continued research in Webster revealed that the word "commune" too was integrally related through its meaning of:

1. To share (with); also to have intercourse (with).
2. To converse or confer together; to take counsel; now specifically, to converse intimately; to hold spiritual or confidential intercourse.

Provided with this basic semantic background, one was more prepared to comprehend the fundamental term, "communicate," which Webster described as meaning:

1. To impart, bestow, or convey; as to communicate a disease or sensation;... .
2. To make known; to give by way of information;... .
3. To share in common; to participate in... .

Synonyms Compared

The writer then determined that a further means of describing communication might be to compare the three synonyms used in the definition: impart, bestow and convey.

Bestow. For the sake of this investigation the word "bestow" was considered first; and for authority the classic, "Crabb's English Synonyms"² was consulted. He stated that:

Bestow is compounded of be and stow, which, like the vulgar word stoke, come from the German stauen and stauchen, and is an onomatopoeia, or representation of the action intended to be expressed, namely, that of disposing in a place.

Crabb further elucidated "bestow" by comparing it to its synonym confer.

Conferring is an act of authority; bestowing that of charity or generosity. Princes and men in power confer; people in private station bestow. Honors, dignities, privileges, and rank are things conferred; favors, kindnesses, and pecuniary relief are the things bestowed. Merit, favor, interest, caprice, or intrigue gives rise to conferring; necessity, solicitation, and private affection lead to bestowing.

"Bestow," therefore, though seen to be similar to communicate, nevertheless was perceived to have the idea of giving or presenting to without necessarily any implication of response, exchange or sharing as had apparently been revealed in the concept of communication.

Convey. The synonym "convey" was next considered. In Crabb's work it had been associated with such words as: "bear," "carry" and "transport."

CONVEY, in Latin conveho, is probably compounded of con and veho, to carry with one. ...To bear is simply to take the weight of any substance upon one's self, or to have the object about one: to carry is to remove a body from the spot where it was: we always bear in carrying, but we do not always carry when we bear. Both may be applied to things as well as per-

²George Crabb, English Synonymes (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1891). All words are listed as in a dictionary so that page references seemed unnecessary.

sons: whatever received the weight of anything bears it; whatever is caused to move with anything carries it. That which cannot be easily borne must be burdensome to carry: in extremely hot weather it is sometimes irksome to bear the weight of one's clothing...Convey and transport are species of carrying. Carry in its particular sense is employed either for personal exertions or actions performed by the help of other means; convey and transport are employed for such actions as are performed not by immediate personal intervention or exertion: a porter carries goods on his knot: goods are conveyed in a wagon or a cart; they are transported in a vessel. Convey expresses simply the mode of removing; transport annexes to this the idea of the place and distance.

Turning to Webster again, it was discovered that the idea of transmission was also related to convey. But there were nuances.

...CONVEY usually stresses the suggestion of a medium which conducts or imparts; TRANSMIT suggests rather the process of sending, or allowing to pass, through...

So it was decided that one could assume that though associated with the communication concept, they nevertheless seem to be more a part of the communication process. In other words it might be stated that one tried to find a way in which to convey or transmit the idea he wished to communicate.

Impart. Finally the synonym "impart" was scrutinized.

Webster was sought as the authority for this comparison.

COMMUNICATE, IMPART agree in the idea of a conveyance or transfer of information or of qualities (no longer of tangible or concrete thing); they differ chiefly in emphasis, communicate stressing the result, impart, rather the process of the transfer. To COMMUNICATE (the more general term) is to make common to both parties or objects involved the knowledge or quality conveyed; to IMPART, to share with another what is regarded as primarily one's own; as, the sky communicated its color to the sea; his courage communicated itself to his men; the smoke imparted its odor to his clothes; to impart one's skill to others.

Résumé of Semantic Research

At this point, the writer became convinced that possibly the most significant point to be seen emerging in the semantic study was the living quality of the concept "communication" as expressed in its best synonyms: common, commune, share, impart, exchange, participate.

These were found to be in contrast to other similar words which though associated seemed actually more closely related to the communicating process, such as: convey, transmit, bestow, carry, transport.

Continued research manifested that this "dynamic" concept was supported by the definition and usage of many authorities. For this inquiry, the following were chosen as representative.

II. DEFINITION BY QUOTATION FROM SELECTED AUTHORITIES

Wilbur Schramm

Authentication. Wilbur Schramm is now the director of the Institute for Communication Research at Stanford University. He formerly had been associated with similar work in the University of Illinois and has done considerable writing and editing in the field of communication, especially "mass" communication.

In 1954 Schramm edited a book entitled, "The Process and Effects of Mass Communication."³ The material had originated in the United States Information Agency to supply background material in training

³Wilbur Schramm, ed., The Process and Effects of Mass Communication (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1954).

new employees. The opening article, "The Process of Communication," was written by Schramm and presented an introduction to the concept. It is perhaps significant that the material was originally published in Japan and later in the fifty-third Yearbook of the Society for the Study of Education.

Viewpoint. After presenting the familiar Latin derivation of the basic word, Schramm states,

When we communicate we are trying to establish a "commonness" with someone. That is, we are trying to share information, an idea, or an attitude. At this moment I am trying to communicate to you the idea that the essence of communication is getting the receiver and the sender "tuned" together for a particular message. At this same moment, someone somewhere is excitedly phoning the fire department that the house is on fire. Somewhere else a young man in a parked automobile is trying to convey the understanding that he is moon-eyed because he loves the young lady. Somewhere else a newspaper is trying to persuade its readers to believe as it does about the Republican Party. All these are forms of communication, and the process in each case is essentially the same.⁵

Thus it was seen that Schramm's use of such words as "common," "share," "tune," "phone," "convey" and "persuade," seemed to confirm and illuminate the semantically implied emphasis on essence rather than process.

Colin Cherry

Authentication. Colin Cherry is the Henry Mark Pease Reader

⁴Ibid., First page of Foreword.

⁵Ibid., p. 3.

in Telecommunication at Imperial College, University of London. In 1957 he wrote the book "On Human Communication," which was published jointly by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and John Wiley and Sons, Inc.⁶ At that time it was the first in a series of "Studies in Communication" and was to serve as, "Introduction."

In 1961, Science Editions, Inc., a paper back science series, republished the book exactly as the original. On the back cover the publisher states,

On Human Communication discusses the opinions of internationally known authorities...The author's critical approach cuts across a wide field of the literature, and his work emerges as a comprehensive source book of references, citations, and definitions.

Since it is natural for a publisher to promote his work in such a way, they also quote in the same place from the Journal of Communication that "'This is 'must' reading for anyone interested in the scientific study of human communication.'"

It is interesting and possibly significant to notice that in his work on Mass Communications of 1960, Schramm mentions Cherry⁷ in the bibliography section entitled "The Communication Process." Schramm's accompanying annotation suggests that Cherry's book is "An attempt to combine some of the different scholarly approaches to communication." He also adds, that the "author," Cherry, is a tele-

⁶Colin Cherry, On Human Communication (New York: Science Editions, Inc., 1957).

⁷Wilbur Schramm, ed., Mass Communications (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960), p. 673.

communications engineer."

Viewpoint. In the light of this background on Cherry, his definition of communication seemed significant. In a glossary Appendix it was detected that he sought to describe the information he was about to present, as:

Definitions and Explications of some of the terms used in this book. Where different schools of thought or shades of opinion are of serious consequence, this is indicated.⁸

Following this comment, he described communication as:

Broadly: The establishment of a social unit from individuals, by the use of language or signs. The sharing of common sets of rules, for various goal-seeking activities. (There are many shades of opinion.)⁹

At another place in his work, under the heading, "What is Communication," he affirmed that;

Communication is essentially a social affair. Man has evolved a host of different systems of communication which render his social life possible - social life not in the sense of living for hunting or for making war, but in a sense unknown to animals. Most prominent among all these systems of communication is, of course, human speech and language.¹⁰

To this he added:

When "members" or "elements" are in communication with one another, they are associating, co-operating with one another, forming an "organization", or sometimes an "organism." Communication is a social function. That old cliché, "a whole is more than the sum of the parts," expresses a truth; the whole, the organization or organism, possesses a structure which is describable as a set of rules, and this structure, the rules, may remain unchanged as the individual members or

⁸Cherry, op. cit., p. 303. ⁹Ibid. ¹⁰Ibid., pp. 3-4.

elements are changed. By the possession of this structure the whole organization may be better adapted or better fitted for some goal-seeking activity. Communication means a sharing of elements of behavior, or modes of life, by the existence of sets or rules.¹¹

Cherry elucidated further by commenting on a definition of one whom he regards as "a leading psychologist," who stated that "'Communication is the discriminatory response of an organism to a stimulus."¹²

But Cherry observed that,

...The same writer emphasizes that a definition broad enough to embrace all that the word "communication" means to different people may risk finding itself dissipated in generalities. We would agree; such definitions or descriptions serve as little more than foci for discussion. But there are two points we wish to make concerning this psychologist's definition. ...as we shall view it in our present context, communication is not the response itself but is essentially the relationship set up by the transmission of stimuli and the evocation of responses.¹³

Résumé of Authorities

Thus it was recognized that to Schramm's ideas of "commonness," "sharing," "tuning," "conveying" and "persuading" had been added the significant concept of communication being within a "social unit" or "relationship" "established" by "language" or other "signs" or "rules," within which a "whole" "organism" may adapt itself to some

¹¹Ibid., pp. 5-6.

¹²S. S. Stevens, "Introduction: A Definition of Communication," quoted in Colin Cherry, Ibid., pp. 6-7.

¹³Ibid., p. 7.

"goal" or "purpose" through "association," "cooperation," "participation."

Thus we had ascertained that not only did these men confirm the "dynamic" quality of the concept of communication, but also provided greater resource material for a definition.

III. DEFINITION BY OBSERVING FIELDS INFLUENCED BY THE COMMUNICATION CONCEPT

The next step in the continuing deliniation was the observation of the variety of fields of knowledge touched by the concept of communication.

Fields Listed

From the vantage point of his experience, it was noted that Cherry perceived the concept of communication as arising

...in a number of disciplines; in sociology, linguistics, psychology, economics; in physiology of the nervous system, in the theory of signs, in communication engineering.¹⁴

Cherry also observed that when one hears the term communicate it

...calls to mind most readily the sending or receipt of a letter, of a conversation between two friends; some may think of newspapers issued daily from a central office to thousands of subscribers, or of radio broadcasting; others may think of telephones, linking one speaker and one listener.

But, he added, that this was not necessarily true of the

¹⁴Cherry, op. cit., p. 2.

specialist:

...for instance, ornithologists and entomologists may think of flocking and swarming, or of the incredible precision with which flight maneuvers are made by certain birds, or the homing of pigeons...Again, physiologists may consider the communicative function of the nervous system, co-ordinating the actions of all the parts of an integrated animal. At the other end of the scale, the anthropologist and sociologist are greatly interested in the communication between large groups of people, societies and races, by virtue of their cultures, their economic and religious systems, their laws, languages, and ethical codes.¹⁵

To these lists it was found that one could add semantics, syntactics, television, phonetics, cybernetics, public speaking, philosophy, motion pictures, advertising, transportation, writing, photography, art education, history, etc.; all discovered to be either special fields in themselves or specialized areas of related disciplines. In fact, it appeared that there was practically no division of human thought which had been left untouched by the communication "revolution."

Reason For Influence

As a reason for the wide interest in this subject, Cherry suggested the concentration of modern specialization:

...most of us are content to carry out an intense cultivation of our own little scientific garden..., deriving occasional pleasure from a chat with our neighbors over the fence, while with them we discuss, criticize, and exhibit our produce.

Too many of us [though] are scientifically lonely; we

¹⁵Ibid., p. 5-6.

tire of continually talking to ourselves, and seek companionship...¹⁶

It was presumed, then, that our study had disclosed that the trend of analysis and its resultant isolation, had stirred the search for synthesis, integration and even interpretation in interrelation.

Continued investigation added the qualifying fact that in order to accomplish this communication, someone in each field, or discipline must initiate a move toward others. It seemed to be obvious, though, that this would be more easily said than done. Such insight suggested the next point of definition: the problems associated with the idea of communication.

IV. DEFINITION BY DESCRIPTION OF SOME OF THE PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE IDEA OF COMMUNICATION

Since it had been detected that the intention of communication was to "share," to find a point of "commonness," to "cooperate," to "associate," to "relate" even "participate;" it therefore seemed logical for the integrating individuals or fields to discover or create some mutual vocabulary.¹⁷

Vocabulary

So this apparent necessity of "vocabulary" became the first

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 1-2. Bracketed word is inserted.

¹⁷Harry A. DeWire, The Christian as Communicator (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), p. 156.

problem investigated. Between some disciplines the building of vocabulary was considered to be fairly easy; for instance: physics and mathematics, sociology and psychology, economics and diplomacy, etc. Their relative ease of bridging was shown to occur most from the overlapping problem situations and terminology. Although it was ascertained that the similarity can also become a problem if the words used are the same but have different connotations.

But examination revealed that the more one drifts away from the so-called "exact" sciences or the more naturally interrelated fields, the more probability there is of "misunderstanding." This fact was presumed as the major reason for the enthusiasm in some groups for the mathematically centered "Theory of Communication," also called the "Information Theory of Communication."

But it was learned that telecommunications engineer Cherry, had struck a hard blow at any undue optimism toward the unifying power of the "Mathematical Theory." "True," he acknowledge, "it has considerable relevance to...different disciplines, but it is not a cure-all."¹⁸ In fact, he continued...

At the time of writing, the various aspects of communication, as they are studied under the different disciplines, by no means form a unified study; there is a certain common ground which shows promise of fertility, nothing more.¹⁹

By this it was presumed he meant that even those special

¹⁸ Cherry, op. cit., p. 2.

¹⁹ Ibid.

fields which make up the science of communication itself (linguistics, mathematics, cybernetics, psychology, semantics, phonetics, etc.) were not yet united; let alone other specialized fields.

Thus it was assumed that one of the major problems in communication was vocabulary--words, bridges, rules; the actual tools of the interrelating process.

Integrity

The next vital concern detected in the communication process was that of integrity.²⁰ As two individuals or fields actually attempt to move toward commonness or association in vocabulary, it was discovered that there is the possibility of the "stronger" (larger, more highly developed, more mature or secure) absorbing (dominating, assimilating) the "weaker." If this occurs; instead of communication (bridging, sharing, participating, cooperating) it was perceived that there would be coercion. And coercion probably would result in either capitulation (with assimilation, imitation and pretense) or rebellion (with rejection, defense and violence.)

Nor was it found that this danger of coercing was merely one related to those who are "stronger." The "weaker," it could be seen, might take advantage of the generous "stronger" and create a similar reaction.

²⁰Harry A. DeWire, op. cit., pp. 158 and 16.

This ideal of "freedom" was supported by modern investigators in the field of communication science. Joseph T. Klapper, one of the authors in Schramm's book on mass communication, concluded that "The condition believed to render persuasion most effective is the monopoly propaganda position."²¹ In other words, if only one side is presented exclusively and constantly, the mind has little or no choice--it is coerced by words.

This brings to mind the titles of Stuart Chase's books on the proper and improper use of language and thought; "The Tyranny of Words," "The Power of Words" and "Guides to Straight Thinking."²²

Another very interesting and confirming series of "summaries" related to this problem was made by three authors in a chapter entitled "Changing Opinions on a Controversial Subject."²³ They discovered that:

1. Presenting the arguments on both sides of an issue was found to be more effective than giving only the arguments supporting the point being made, in the case of individuals who were initially opposed to the point of view being presented.

²¹ Joseph T. Klapper, "Mass Media and Persuasion," The Process and Effects of Mass Communication, ed. by Wilbur Schramm (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1954), pp. 317, 318.

²² Stuart Chase, The Tyranny of Words (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1938); The Power of Words (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1953, 1954); Guides to Straight Thinking (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1956).

²³ Carl I. Hovland, Arthur A. Lumsdaine and Fred D. Seffield, "The Effects of Presenting 'One Side' versus 'Both Sides' in Changing Opinions on a Controversial Subject," Wilbur Schramm, ed., The Process and Effects of Mass Communication, op. cit., p. 274.

2. For men who were already convinced of the point of view being presented, however, the inclusion of arguments on both sides was less effective for the group as a whole than presenting only arguments favoring the general position being advocated.

3. Better-educated men were more favorably affected by the presentation of both sides; poorly educated men were more affected by the communication which used only supporting arguments.

4. The group for which the presentation giving both sides was least effective was the group of poorly educated men who were already convinced of the point of view being advocated.

5. An important incidental finding was that omission of a relevant argument was more noticeable and detracted more from effectiveness in the presentation using arguments on both sides than in the presentation in which only one side was discussed.

So the investigation seems to corroborate the necessity of mutually agreed upon "definitions," "rules," "signs," "vocabularies" of communication not only for reciprocal understanding, but also for proper integration.

This inferred necessity for freedom from coercion also introduced the importance of some additional considerations. Not only did there seem to be the necessity of mutually comprehensible vocabulary or rules to govern the process and protect the integrity of all parties; but if there was to be maturity in relationship there apparently also needed to be education in the proper receipt and evaluation of information.

Faith

These deductions manifested the fact that "suspicion" might be one of the greatest hindrances to the sharing and receiving process. Observation affirmed that an unbelieving "receiver" will very likely either "twist" or "miss take" all overtures (or gestures, as DeWire

puts it)²⁴ toward himself, whatever might be the actual motive of the "sender."

It was also noted that this could be true of the "sender." If he was not convinced that the "receiver" had confidence in him he would likely seek to protect himself from misuse and misrepresentation; and probably thereby be more vague and therefore incomprehensible in his attempted communication.

And, in addition, it was ascertained that the more "distance" by way of time, place or culture that was naturally between them; the more intense this problem would become.²⁵

Faith or confidence, then, had been demonstrated to be the key to vocabulary building and integration as well as definition or comprehension of meaning.

But then the question became, "What if there was an initial 'gulf' or lack of understanding, how can this be overcome?" In other words, "Where does one begin in establishing the pivotal authority-faith relationship?"

Information

On the basis of general knowledge, it seemed obvious that the only place to begin establishing a real point of contact with an individual would be on the edge of his conscious or cultural expe-

²⁴ Harry A. DeWire, op. cit., p. 109.

²⁵ Colin Cherry, op. cit., pp. 8-16.

rience.²⁶

Research indicated that comprehensible information, in truth, must be presented in order to relate the individual and his needs to the source of communicative relationship.²⁷ A large volume and considerable variety of information to insure reception and yet avoid "entropy" or boredom and apathy were also suggested. This seemed to establish the need of education for proper receipt of information.

Referent

It occurred to the writer that even these means might well prove futile unless there were some way in which the information could be objectively confirmed in the immediate personal experience of the individual.

That this referent could be either negative or positive appeared evident as long as it was an attestation to the verity of the message as given.

It also seemed logical that repeated confirmation might be necessary before the desired attitude of confidence was attained. But it was also evident that that which was said must have reality to "back" it and that this reality must be disclosed in some way and measure before there could be satisfactory basis for belief.

²⁶Eugene A. Nida, Message and Mission (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), pp. 57, 58.

²⁷See discussions of learning and meaning in Cherry and Nida. Also Nida, op. cit., pp. 72-75 and 138.

Apparently though, once this basic confidence was established and maintained, there would be no end to the ever enlarging possibilities of communication.

Approval of this line of reasoning seemed to come from the law of the referent.²⁸ This principle affirms that in order for a word or concept to have meaning, it must have a referent, it must be "real," "actual," "fulfilled."

Many of the high-sounding and/or rabble rousing words and phrases of contemporary life can be shown to be mostly emotion for many people: "American way of life," "communism," "church and state," "creeping socialism," etc. All these have weak or extremely complicated referents, so that they are understood as being difficult to define. In fact, when they are delineated it is usually through the illustration of some person or incident in which they are embodied.

These assumptions and investigations seemed, therefore, to give reasonably strong support for the need of proper confirmation or "authorization" if it was expected that information was to be accepted.

Motive

The next question was, "Why bother?" "If it is so difficult,

²⁸C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards, The Meaning of Meaning (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., 1946), pp. 9-11.

tenuous and risky; what is the advantage of communicating?"

Hendrick Kraemer gives one answer to this question by a quotation from Roger Mehl, "Communication is 'the fundamental human fact.'"²⁹ There is, he declared, no alternative; men are "doomed" to communicate. They are communicators.

Wendell W. Freshley in an article describing an interview of Harry A. DeWire indorses this idea quite succinctly.

Communication is the fundamental human fact. It occurs as people talk, shake hands, gesture, embrace, work, eat, or play together. It happens as people evade one another, admonish, show fear or come to blows. Frequently the non-verbal expressions communicate more effectively in person-to-person relationships than do actual words.³⁰

Communication, then, in its broadest sense was demonstrated to be living: thinking, doing, not doing.

If one was going to attempt to answer the question, "Why communicate?"; then one must face the question "Why live?" What is the motive or motivation?

That this question could not be explored in this paper was evident, but some light was sought.

The already presented research seemed to affirm the fact that most people will just naturally persist in life and communication either for their own benefit (in other words their own existence and

²⁹Hendrick Kraemer, The Communication of the Christian Faith (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), p. 11.

³⁰Wendell W. Freshley, "Let's Communicate," Builders (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: The Evangelical United Brethren Church Press), December 2, 1962, Vol. 48, No. 48, p. 3. An interview of Harry A. DeWire, author of the book, The Christian as Communicator, in The Westminster Press Series on Christian communication.

pleasure) or for the benefit of others: or perhaps some of both.³¹

Résumé of Problems Associated With the Idea of Communication

The aim of this section has been to uncover some of the problems raised by the idea of communication.

It has been established that one of the deepest questions is that of motive which was seen to determine the desire or will to share and probably the "spirit" or attitude of that relationship.

That men would persist in communication was concluded, though how and why must evidently be left to their discretion, but probably not without consequence.

It has been determined that any individual, therefore, wishing to communicate may; but he would be obligated to attempt to establish a mutually comprehensible vocabulary to act as a bridge (a framework for relationship) as well as to protect the mutual integrity of all participators.

It was further deduced that this vocabulary would not likely be accepted or even comprehended unless there was some effort at confirming or verifying its reality within the realm of the personal experience of the individual.

From this line of reasoning it was assumed that if and when the vocabulary was accepted, it would form the basic material by which information could be shared, the "common ground" upon which relation-

³¹Harry A. DeWire, op. cit., pp. 20-112.

ship could be built.

This led to the final area of definition which seeks to demonstrate some of the technicalities of this process as described by contemporary communication science.

V. DEFINITION BY DESCRIPTION OF PROCESS

David K. Berlo, in his book The Process of Communication;³² Stuart Chase, in Power of Words;³³ in fact, a number of authors in the communication field are reasonably well agreed on the "basic" model or pattern of the process of communication. But for this investigation Schramm and his opening chapter, "How Communication Works,"³⁴ was the authority.

Basic Elements

The essential elements, he asserted, included "the source, the message, and the destination."

A source may be an individual (speaking, writing, drawing, gesturing) or a communication organization (like a newspaper, publishing house, television station or motion picture studio). The message may be in the form of ink on paper, sound waves in the air, or any other signal capable of being interpreted meaningfully. The destination may be an individual listening, watching, or reading; or a member of a group, such as a dis-

³²David K. Berlo, The Process of Communication (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1960), pp. 30 ff.

³³Stuart Chase, The Power of Words (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1953, 1954), pp. 11 ff.

³⁴Schramm, op. cit., pp. 3-26.

cussion group, a lecture audience, a football crowd, or a mob; or an individual member of the particular group we call the mass audience, such as the reader of a newspaper or a viewer of television.³⁵

The "source" was depicted as having to take into consideration the proposed "message" and considerable information about the intended "receiver." Then he was shown as "encoding" the "message," that is, putting it in a form to be "transmitted." This would be the initial step in vocabulary building as described in the previous section.

Encoding

Many questions were suggested as necessary considerations of the "source" before the message was "encoded." "How long would this message need to last?" A written, recorded or filmed message was demonstrated as lasting longer than one which was only spoken into the air. Radio, television, motion picture, or other amplifying equipment was portrayed as having the capacity of transmitting a greater distance. The problem would be, "How far is it to go?"

Additional questions might include: "What common experiences does the receiver have with the "sender?" "Do they speak the same language?" Nor would this "language" have to be merely the recognized national tongues. One might have the language of the "specialist" versus that of the "layman;" the language of the "poor" versus the "rich;" or it could be the language of the "church" versus that of

³⁵Ibid., pp. 3-4.

the "world;" the language of "love," of "music," etc., and/or some combination. Whatever the case, the "source" was designated as obligated to "tune in" on the "destination," if understanding of and response to his message was desired.

Noise

Further questions to be asked by the "source" included:

"How much 'noise' would there be?" This "noise" was represented as having to do with the environment of the message during transmission; that is, after it left the "encoder" of the "sender" and before it was received into the "decoder" of the "destination" or "receiver."

Examples of "noise" described were: static or electrical interference in the air or on transmission lines of radio, television, telephone; people talking or moving in a room; in addition to any other distracting thought, movement, sound or even motive.

The "noise" factor was characterized as influencing the force or intensity of the "message," as well as the simplicity or complexity of the "code." Also affecting these would be the urgency of the message.

Transmission

The capacity or receptivity of the "decoder" was manifested as a necessary consideration. "What is the transmitting medium best suited to the "receiver?" "Can it see, feel, hear?" "Which does it do best?" Another significant element was the means to which the message was best adapted.

All these, and many more questions were elaborated as essential observations in the initiation of each simple communication event, though not necessarily conscious.³⁶

Feedback

While the message was on its way, the "source" was described as seeing, feeling or hearing it. This "echo" was denoted as part of the "feedback." It was demonstrated that "feedback" might also be "reflected" from the "destination" in the form of a "Letter to the Editor," a glance at the watch, a hand cupped to the ear, a smile or nod, a frown, wink, laugh, reply, lack of reply, etc.

Redundancy

"Feedback" was represented as usually causing the corrections and adjustments in "vocabulary" and "transmission" thought necessary to insure the best possible communication. This consequent process of reflection and clarification, of repetition and intensification was labeled "redundancy."

"Redundancy" was likewise disclosed as being built into the very structure of language. Berlo³⁷ offered the sentence, "John saw Jim," as an example. He noted that when people say this they are

³⁶The scientific description of communication is so technical that the writer has chosen to select certain basic elements according to the need. It was noted that most non-technical writers do this. Berlo, DeWire, Nida and others can be consulted as references.

³⁷Berlo, op. cit., p. 203.

stating that:

1. There is a person named John.
2. There is a person named Jim.
3. There is a process named seeing.

We are also saying something else. We are saying that John was engaged in the process of seeing, and that Jim was the consequence of John's engagement in the process.

It could be added that if the statement was being made by anyone other than John or Jim, then one also knows that "X" saw John seeing Jim or hear someone say that John saw Jim, etc.

Another "nonsense" sentence of Berlo's was called upon to serve as an illustration;³⁸ "Most smoogles have concom."

...the formal meaning for the "s" in the word "smoogles(s)" is "more than one." The formal meaning for the word "have" is "more than one." If we were to use words to say what these formal meanings say, the sentence might read something like this: Most (there are more than one) smoogles (of course, there are more than one) have (remember there are more than one) concom.

The "built in" "redundancy" is shown as helping to insure the proper communication. And it is presumed that if the "noise" level is high and the emergency great enough, one would likely increase the "redundancy" and simplify the "symbol" to be certain of comprehension.

Entropy

Another element manifested as being overcome with "redundancy" is "entropy," or the tendency for a message to lose something in passage.³⁹ Included in this term were the adequacy of the communicating

³⁸Ibid., p. 202. ³⁹Chase, op. cit., p. 19.

instrument to accurately transmit the symbols; the question of the precision of the symbols transmitted to convey the desired meaning; and the capacity of communicating symbols and transmitting instrument to persist until the message has been conveyed.⁴⁰

Reception

Finally, the "destination" or "receiver" was characterized as "hearing" the material transmitted and "deciding" whether to "listen;" if so, then it would "decode" the message; according, of course, to its own "programming" or pattern of definition. In the light of the previous study, it is evident that if there is confidence and adequate mutual vocabulary, the "receiver" would probably be able to comprehend, in some measure, the idea the "sender" intended to share.

The reply of the "receiver" would naturally constitute him a "sender" and thus the process is exhibited as becoming an inter-relationship with the possibility of growing understanding, sharing and participation.

It should be evident that with this many variants, and there are more, the process could and does become exceedingly complex.

VI. RÉSUMÉ OF THE DESCRIPTION OF THE COMMUNICATION CONCEPT AND WORKING DEFINITION

Obviously, this study has only barely scratched the surface of

⁴⁰See Nida's discussion of "entropy" and its relation to Christian communication, op. cit., pp. 150-151.

the exceedingly technical and rapidly developing field of the science of communication. But it shall be presumed that there is sufficient evidence for the following assumptions.

The aim for this entire chapter has been to discover, if possible, a definition of the concept of communication adequate enough for use in an investigation of its relation to the Bible.

The discussion began in a semantic uncovering of the roots of the word "communicate." It was ascertained that this term did not refer to merely a mechanical arrangement; but more properly to the dynamic essence of a relationship of sharing and participation.

This assumption was found to be supported by at least two authorities in the communication science field. They also added the significant idea of the communicating event occurring within a social unit established by the use of signs and functioning as a purposeful organism through mutual association and cooperation.

Practically every knowledge discipline was exhibited as being influenced by the communication idea; and, in fact, shown to need its help. The challenge seemed to be more in finding those who would be willing to face the vast problems associated with this process and continue to attempt to communicate.

The problems, it was decided, stemmed mostly out of the necessity for an adequate mutual vocabulary. These bridges or rules were disclosed to be not only valuable for reciprocal comprehension; but also for maintaining the integrity of all the individuals involved in

the communicating process. It was concluded that a clearly defined relationship (with elements purposefully drawn from the common experience of each part) was necessary to establish the bounds as well as create the environment in which the association and reception events could freely occur with the ultimate potentiality of reciprocal understanding and participation.

A discussion of how to accomplish this ideal was the final portion of the definition. It included a description of some of the essential elements or tools of the process such as: the determining of the message to be transmitted; the proper choice of codes; the consideration of noise, feedback, redundancy and entropy in transmission; and careful consideration of all the environmental problems of the receiver.

Thus the concept of communication might be deduced succinctly as: relationship for commonness.

But, as has been depicted, this relationship must be purposefully established, clearly defined and mutually comprehended; otherwise there would likely be no commonness but only confusion.

It was also manifested that commonness was understood as the free sharing of one's self with someone else and the free reception of the other; resulting in a common organism within which there could be reciprocal understanding and participation.

Therefore, for the sake of this study, the concept of communication will be defined as:

The purposeful establishment of a clearly defined, mutually comprehended relationship in order to freely share one's self with someone else; which, if properly received, would result in a common organism of reciprocal understanding and participation.

In the light of this definition the research will turn to the Bible to determine whether there is any relationship between it and the concept of communication as designated.

CHAPTER III

THE BIBLE AND COMMUNICATION

CHAPTER III

THE BIBLE AND COMMUNICATION

I. ORIENTATION

The next step in this research was to embark on a very fascinating and seemingly presumptuous voyage. The established goal was to discover whether the Bible message had any relation to the defined concept of communication which had been elicited from the initial investigation. Therefore, this chapter will consist of a brief Bible survey in the light of the proposed definition.

Some questions asked are: "Does this concept, 'communication,' have any relationship to God; to the ways or activities of God as unfolded in the Bible?" And if so, "What is that relationship?"

Other sources may be used, but only to illuminate or confirm the "original" source.

II. GOD'S PURPOSE AS EXPRESSED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

In the defining of communication it was determined that in order to convey anything, there was need first for the "purposeful establishment of a clearly defined...relationship." Therefore, in this survey, the introductory question is, "Does the Scripture indicate that God has any such purpose in relation to man?"¹

It seems valid to go to the New Testament for the initial ans-

¹Note the definition of "communication" on pages 37-38 above.

wer to this question, because in it God claims to have presented His full and final word. In past days God had spoken in "the prophets," but now in "His Son."²

The Promise of the Father

After considerable study, the writer determined that chapter eleven of the letter to the Hebrews would be a good place to begin because it was discovered that here there was the suggestion of some great plan.

These all died in faith, not having received what was promised, but having seen it and greeted it from afar, and having acknowledged that they were strangers and exiles on the earth (Heb. 11:13).

This theme is repeated in verse thirty-nine and elaborated.

And all these, though well attested by their faith, did not receive what was promised, since God had foreseen something better for us, that apart from us they should not be made perfect (Heb. 11:39, 40).

Chapter twelve of Hebrews adds further clarification.

Therefore, since we are surrounded by so great a cloud of witnesses, let us also lay aside every weight, and sin which clings so closely, and let us run with perseverance the race that is set before us, looking to Jesus the pioneer and perfecter of our faith, who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is seated at the right hand of the throne of God. ...It is for discipline that you have to endure. God is treating you as sons;...he disciplines us for our good, that we may share his holiness... (Heb. 12:1, 2, 7a, 10b).³

One quickly observes that the words "share his holiness" rings with familiarity in the light of the definition. These terms are not only "purposeful" but also "dynamic;" seeming to imply what might well

²Hebrews 1.

³Underlining inserted.

be described as a desire to "establish" an "organism" of "reciprocal understanding and participation."

Earlier in the Hebrew letter, the author encourages the people to "not be sluggish, but imitators of those who through faith and patience inherit the promises" (Heb. 6:12). And Abraham is declared the example of those who "having patiently endured, obtained the promise" (Heb. 6:15).

Apparently, though, the immediately "obtained" "promise" of Abraham is not exactly the same as that mentioned in reference to the contemporary readers of the Hebrew letter. For Abraham is listed among those in chapter eleven who "died in faith, not having received what was promised" (Heb. 11:8-13).

So, possibly that which he "received" also pointed toward that which was to come.

Further evidence of a Divine "purpose" can be derived from the apostle Paul. In writing to the Romans, he speaks of the "promise to Abraham, emphasizing especially the fact that those who "believe," as Abraham did, are the true "descendents" and "inheritors of the promises."⁴

In the letter to the Galatians, Paul continues to show that it is the "men of faith who are sons of Abraham" (Gal. 3:7); and the "inheritors" of the "blessing of Abraham;" which is, supremely, "the promise of the Spirit through faith" (Gal. 3:14).

⁴Romans 4:13-17 and 9:1-13.

Here then is further confirmation of the divine intention toward "reciprocal understanding" and "participation" by man; as is indicated in the idea of "reception."

This certainly seems to coincide with the emphasis of Jesus and the early church. At the close of the Gospel report and the beginning of his history of the church, Luke recalls the command of Christ to the apostles "not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father,⁵ which...you heard from me,...but before many days you shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit" (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:1-4).

The fact and direction of God's great plan are further elucidated through the incident of the initial fulfillment of the "promise." On that day of the feast they were "filled with the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:4); and interpreted their experience by quoting from the prophet Joel.

And in the last days it shall be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions and your old men shall dream dreams; yes, and on my menservants and my maidservants in those days I will pour out my spirit; and they shall prophesy. And I will show wonders in the heaven above...And it shall be that whoever calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved.⁶

So we have demonstrated that there is good evidence for the deduction that "the promise of the Father" indicates an underlying

⁵Underlining inserted.

⁶Joel 2:28-32 as quoted by Luke in Acts 2:17-21. Underlining inserted.

Divine purpose for intimate relationship with man.

The Hidden Mystery

Continued observation disclosed that tied to the idea of a "promise" is a theme of "mystery" which seems to present further evidence and clarify the fact of God's aim in communication.

In the closing benediction of his letter to the Romans, Paul alludes to the "revelation of the mystery which was kept secret for long ages but is now disclosed and through the prophetic writings made known..." (Rom. 16:26).

The "mystery" is succinctly "unfolded" in Paul's letter to the Colossians where he describes his calling as one "to make the word of God known..., the mystery hidden for ages..." (Col. 1:25-26). This mystery being now fully manifested, according to him, by the truth of "Christ in you, the hope of glory" (Col. 1:27).⁷

In these thoughts, one perceives some deliniation of the idea presented. God's "sharing" of "His holiness" apparently means not only His desire to communicate through "sharing" and "giving" Himself, but also through a "relationship" of "indwelling."

The idea of God's indwelling is corroborated by Paul's personal testimony to the Galatians.

I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me; and the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me (Gal. 2:20).

Earlier in this same letter he had affirmed that God "called"

⁷Underlining inserted.

him to reveal His Son "in" him (Gal. 1:15-16). And later he indicates that he, Paul, is "again in travail until Christ be formed "in" them (Gal. 4:19).⁸

Possibly one of Paul's most profound statements of the "ancient" plan and purpose of God is found in his letter to the Ephesians. He asserts that they, as "the saints who are also faithful in Christ Jesus," have been chosen in Christ "before the foundation of the world" (Eph. 1:1-4). They are "destined," he explains, to be God's "sons" "through Jesus Christ according to the purpose of his will..." (Eph. 1:5).⁹

The necessary "redemption" and "forgiveness" are "lavishly" provided by "God the Father" in Christ. It is, in fact, in Him, that is Christ, that they are given "insight" into the "mystery" of God's will. This "plan" of God is, broadly, to "unite all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth" (Eph. 1:7-10).¹⁰

As designated participants in this plan, those who have believed in Christ are "sealed with the promised Holy Spirit, "which," Paul attests, "is the guarantee of [their] inheritance until [they] acquire [their final] possession of it..." (Eph. 1:11-14).¹¹

Continued investigation reveals that there is reason to believe

⁸Underlining inserted.

⁹Underlining inserted.

¹⁰The referent is Christ

¹¹Underlining and brackets are inserted.

in a profound communicative purpose in God; as expressed in "the promise" and "mystery;" and that its outworking can be designated as a "dynamic," conscious, participating group association in the "Church;" as well as "living," "free," individual association; all in and with God and others through the "persons" of Christ and the Holy Spirit.

This impression is confirmed by Paul's prayer that the Ephesians might know "the hope to which" they have been called; and "what are the riches of his glorious inheritance in the saints" (Eph. 1:16-18).

The "glorious inheritance" is disclosed to be the fact that they are

...made...alive together with Christ...and raised...up with him, and made to sit with him in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, that in the coming ages he might show the immeasurable riches of his grace in kindness toward [them] in Christ Jesus (Eph. 2:4-7).¹²

Paul continues by reminding these people who are "Gentiles in the flesh" (Eph. 2:11) that though they were once "strangers to the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world," they are now "brought near in the blood of Christ" (Eph. 2:12-13).¹³

The result of their new "nearness" is attested by the fact that they are "no longer strangers...but...fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God..." (Eph. 2:19).¹⁴

¹²Underlining and brackets are inserted.

¹³Underlining inserted.

¹⁴Underlining inserted.

This means, Paul illustrates, that they can be likened to a building erected on the "foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus being the chief cornerstone;" and they, so "joined together" in Him that the "whole structure...grows into a holy temple... a dwelling place of God in the Spirit" (Eph. 2:20-22).¹⁵

From these quotations there emerges strong evidence for the divine design of "establishing" a "clearly defined, mutually comprehended" relationship" for the "purpose" of His "sharing," giving, indwelling; and man's "free," and "reciprocal understanding and participation."

Paul is apparently so captivated by this marvelous scheme of God that he repeats it immediately in a different metaphore.

This "mystery of Christ," he elucidates, is expressed in the fact that "the Gentiles are fellow heirs, members of the same body, and partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel" (Eph. 3:4-6).

These "unsearchable riches in Christ" are like a "glorious inheritance;"¹⁶ which is now "revealed" to "make all men see what is the plan of the mystery hidden for ages in God...that through the church the manifold wisdom of God might now be made known to the principalities and powers in heavenly places" (Eph. 3:9-10).¹⁷

¹⁵Underlining inserted.

¹⁶See Ephesians 1:16-2:7.

¹⁷Underlining inserted.

This declaration drives Paul to prayer again;¹⁸

...that according to the riches of his glory he may grant you to be strengthened with might through his Spirit in the inner man, and that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith; that you, being rooted and grounded in love, may have power to comprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length and height and depth, and to know the love of Christ which surpasses knowledge, that you may be filled with all the fullness of God.¹⁹

Perhaps one of the most beautiful and inspiring statements of this great "purpose" of God and "hope" of men is found in the Revelation of John.

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. And I saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband; and I heard a voice from the throne saying, "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; he will wipe away every tear from their eyes, and death shall be no more, neither shall there be mourning nor crying nor pain any more, for the former things have passed away" (Rev. 21:1-4).

There can hardly be any doubt, then, that it is distinctly indicated that there has been in the "mind" of God "ages ago"²⁰ a real "purpose" or "aim," the divine "goal" to "communicate" Himself to man, "share" Himself with man through a "dynamic," intimate association.

Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's Spirit dwells in you?²¹ ...he who is united to the Lord be-

¹⁸See Ephesians 1:16. ¹⁹Ephesians 3:16-19. Underlining insert.

²⁰II Timothy 1:9. ²¹I Corinthians 3:16.

comes one spirit with him.²² Do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God: You are not your own; you were bought with a price.²³

Old Testament Support for the New Testament Declaration

Though the Old Testament anticipation of these events was probably not as vivid; nevertheless, the New Testament writers plainly find complete support in it for their basic thesis of God's sharing through indwelling.

Paul quotes from Exodus 25:8 and 29:45; Leviticus 26:12; Ezekiel 37:27; Jeremiah 31:1; Isaiah 52:11; Hosea 1:10 and Isaiah 43:6; when he compares the "person" to the "temple of the living God" in I Corinthians 6:16 through 18.

For we are the temple of the living God; as God said, "I will live in them and move among them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Therefore come out from them, and be separate from them, says the Lord, and touch nothing unclean; then I will welcome you, and I will be father to you, and you shall be my sons and daughters, says the Lord Almighty."

Possibly even stronger support is derived from the Old Testament by Peter as he quotes directly from the Prophet Joel in his attempt to interpret the astonishing events of the Church's first day as recorded in Acts 2:17 and 18.

Other Old Testament references are brought to mind by these words:

For I will pour water on the thirsty land, and streams on the dry ground; I will pour my Spirit upon your descendents,

²²I Corinthians 6:17.

²³I Corinthians 6:19-20a.

and my blessing on your offspring (Isaiah 44:3):

And I will give them one heart and put a new spirit in them, and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and give them a heart of flesh (Ezekiel 11:19):²⁴

And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and be careful to observe my ordinances.²⁵

Jesus Himself made reference to Isaiah²⁶ on the last day of the feast as He proclaimed...

"If any one thirst, let him come to me and drink. He who believes in me, as the scripture has said, 'Out of his heart shall flow rivers of living water.'" Now this he said about the Spirit, which those who believed in him were to receive; for as yet the Spirit had not been given, because Jesus was not yet glorified (John 7:37b-39).

Résumé of God's Purpose as Expressed in the New Testament

Possibly the best resume of the intimate communicating purposes of God toward men is found in that magnificent "pastoral" message of Jesus to his disciples in the "upper room" just before His arrest and crucifixion.²⁷ The whole portion will be referred to later; at this point, more than sufficient evidence is derived from the final plea of Jesus' "high-priestly" prayer.

"O righteous Father, the world has not known thee, but I have known thee; and these know that thou hast sent me. I made known to them thy name, and I will make it known, that the love with which thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them" (John 17:25-26).²⁸

²⁴Note also II Corinthians 3:3.

²⁵Ezekiel 36:27.

²⁶Isaiah 44:3, 55:1 and 58:11.

²⁷John 13-17.

²⁸Underlining inserted.

Thus it can be demonstrated that God has had a magnificent purpose throughout all His association with man; and that this aim could be described in the terms of the communication definition of this research as a purposeful relationship for the sharing of Himself with man; thereby creating a common organism of reciprocal understanding and participation.

But, according to the principle noted in the previous chapter, it would seem that the presence of the "Creator" "near" the "creature," let alone "in" him, would tend to be very "coercive." How, then, did God communicate Himself to Man so intimately without disintegrating him; assimilating man into Himself? How did God actually make room for Man's freedom, reciprocal understanding and participation.

III. THE OUTWORKING OF GOD'S PLAN AS DESCRIBED

IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Having established the fact of God's purpose in communicating Himself to man, it is now intended to investigate the "process." An attempt will be made to discover how God overcame the "problems" of communication; determine whether He related Himself in ways which could be described by the current terminology of procedure; and observe whether the twentieth century analysis gives any clue as to His eternal activity as well as man's contemporary relationship and responsibility.

At this point the research could take one of at least two turns:

either listing the problems and processes and then seeking "proof" of their "corroboration;" or following the historical development with an attempt to observe along the way the relationship between contemporary terminology and the Book.

This investigator chose the second path because it seemed to him more relevant to the "dynamic" concept with which the study was dealing.

New Testament Introduction to the Old Testament Process

Even for this part of the study, the New Testament will be the point of authority. Through it has been confirmed the fact of God's purpose and some description presented. Therefore, the process will also be reflected essentially through its "eye." Obviously, in the confines of this paper only a beginning could be made.

Paul assures us as he writes to the Galatians, that there was a "process."

And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the gospel beforehand to Abraham, saying, "In thee shall all the nations be blessed" (Gal. 3:8).

...for it is written, "Cursed be every one who hangs on a tree"- that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith (Gal. 3:13b-14).

Now before faith came, we were confined under the law, kept under restraint until faith should be revealed. So that the law was our custodian until Christ came, that we might be justified by faith. But now that faith has come, we are no longer under a custodian; for in Christ Jesus you are all sons of God, through faith. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ. ...And if you are Christ's then you are

Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise (Gal. 3:23-29).²⁹

But when the time had fully come, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as sons. And because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, "Abba! Father!" (Gal. 4:4-6).³⁰

As we have already discovered, God apparently had created men for one purpose--to be His "sons." He intended to raise them to this level by offering them a portion of his "essence," a "share in His holiness."³¹

But Paul, the apostle, proposes a logical communication problem. After repeating God's ancient promise, "For 'everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved;'" he ponders...

But how are men to call upon him in whom they have not believed: And how are they to believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how are they to hear without a preacher? And how can men preach unless they are sent?...So faith comes from what is heard...(Romans 10:13-15a, 17a).

The writer to the Hebrews also emphasizes that...

...whoever would draw near to God must believe he exists and that he rewards those who seek him...without faith it is impossible to please him (Heb. 11:6).

The "heroes" of Israel, indeed of the Bible, are men who believed.³² But, as Paul asks, how did they arrive at this point of confidence; how could they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?

One should not be surprised at this dilemma. It has been observed before in the discussion of the communication process. The

²⁹Underlining inserted.

³⁰Underlining inserted.

³¹See above, p. 41.

³²Hebrews 11.

problem of vocabulary poses the problem of integrity, which naturally leads to the importance of faith and the value of information--"How can they believe in him of whom they have not heard?"

Indeed, in this investigation it has been ascertained that no genuine communication can occur without some kind of "mutual" vocabulary. It was also perceived that this "vocabulary" must ultimately be built upon freely believed information or facts, presented or confirmed by an interested communicator and somehow related to both communicating parties.

Old Testament Process in the Patriarchs

The "Hebrews" writer continues to suggest that God attempted to bridge the gap through speaking "In many and various ways...to our fathers by the prophets..." (Heb. 1:1).

Evidently in order to initiate the communication process, God proposed to begin with simple facts of confirmed information. Some of these early contacts are described in Numbers:

And the Lord came down in a pillar of cloud, and stood at the door of the tent, and called Aaron and Miriam; and they both came forward. And he said, "Hear my words: If there is a prophet among you, I the Lord make myself known to him in a vision, I speak with him in a dream. Not so with my servant Moses; he is entrusted with all my house. With him I speak mouth to mouth, clearly and not in dark speech; and he beholds the form of the Lord (Numbers 12:5-8a).

No explanation is given as to how God "talked" with these people any more than there is as to how he communicated with Adam. All that is known is that he could be "heard" "walking in the gar-

den."³³ Indeed, there may be a similarity between God's communication with Adam and that with Noah--it is said of him that he "walked with God."³⁴ In fact, this may be the greatest testimony made of any of the early men; "Enoch walked with God."³⁵

Another early point of contact noted was the altar. Noah "built an altar."³⁶ And he offered "sacrifices." Abraham built altars.³⁷ He likewise received "word" from God in a "vision,"³⁸ by "signs,"³⁹ and "messengers;"⁴⁰ as well as other unidentified means and unusual events.

The Lord "appeared" to Isaac.⁴¹ Jacob "dreamed" and God "spoke;"⁴² he "wrestled" with a "man" whom he called "God;"⁴³ and also erected altars. Joseph was led by God in dreams.⁴⁴

Resumé of Early Patriarchs

At this juncture it seems important to attempt to interpret these recorded "communications" from God in the light of the stated definition.

It has been determined that God ultimately wants to "share" Himself with men--to "communicate" Himself to them in a very intimate

³³Genesis 3:8. ³⁴Genesis 6:9. ³⁵Genesis 5:22,24.

³⁶Genesis 8:20. ³⁷Genesis 12:7,8; 13:4; 18.

³⁸Genesis 15:1. ³⁹Genesis 15:17. ⁴⁰Genesis 18.

⁴¹Genesis 26:2. ⁴²Genesis 28:10-22. ⁴³Genesis 32:24-30.

⁴⁴Genesis 37:37; 5-11.

fashion. But, if they are to remain uncoerced, research has detected that this needs to be an independent choice. If they are to "choose," they must have "information."⁴⁵ If they are to have "information," it is presumed that it must come from God; for He is the only One who is knowledgeable in this matter. But that seems to put God in the "monopoly propaganda" position.⁴⁶

So, in order to lead man to the intended "reciprocal understanding and participation," God "established" a simple but "clearly defined, mutually comprehended relationship" with Himself, which, "if properly received," could ultimately bring about the desired result.⁴⁷

Man's basic "freedom," therefore, was "protected" by God in letting him "choose" his god. But God also protected Himself and the ultimate communication, by providing the possibility of "referred" or "confirmed information from whatever man's choice might be.

This was accomplished by placing man in a "perfect" physical setting with ample provision for management and creative development and then making only one demand; which was in the terms of his environment (on the edge of his natural, conscious experiences) -- "But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for...you shall die" (Gen. 2:16-17).

Evidently God was providing a relationship in which His goodness and provision would elicit appreciation and recognition in

⁴⁵See above, p. 26.

⁴⁶See above, p. 23.

⁴⁷See above, pp. 24, 37.

belief and obedience.

If man had "obeyed" the "law," he would have thereby acknowledged God as his God. Apparently only then, on the basis of this "faith," could God have begun to safely and freely describe Himself to man, define man to Himself and "share" Himself and His great purposes.⁴⁸ But man did not "obey." He chose to be his own "god;" thereby reflecting on the integrity of the Creator as well as assuming an impossible responsibility.

Hardly realizing what he had done, man was seeming to coerce God. This act, then, had the necessary effect of changing not only the outer environment or relationship of man ("sent...forth from the garden"); but also his inner environment (he was "afraid," ashamed and defensively suspicious--"The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me fruit of the tree,...")⁴⁹

This change created a great deal of "noise" problem for the continuing "transmission" of the message and necessitated a negative vocabulary in the interrelationship also; because of the basic lack of confidence.

But, as we have noted, God's "line" of communication had been "dynamic," protecting not only the integrity of man but also that of the message; so that even the negative result proved that God had spoken the "truth" and therefore confirmed the information that God

⁴⁸Hebrews 11:6; note p. 53 above. ⁴⁹Genesis 3:23 and 8-13.

must be God. In fact, the "death" which He had foretold as a consequence of disobedience, seems to be the major "point" of communication from Adam to Noah. About all that is recorded is that men were born and died.⁵⁰ Possibly redundancy?

But God continues to strive to "establish" in the mind of men the truth that He is God, the author(ity), by attempting to motivate confidence and choice. Noah was called upon to "believe" God in spite of much apparent practical, physical evidence to the contrary.⁵¹ And Noah "found favor in the eyes of the Lord;" he "walked with God;" and "did all that God commanded him."⁵² Evidently Noah believed God on the basis of only a small amount of confirmed information and was willing to "trust" for the rest.

Later Patriarchs

Abraham too had to be challenged at this point of the faith relationship.

And he Abraham believed the Lord; and he reckoned it to him as righteousness (Genesis 15:6).

"By myself have I sworn, says the Lord, because you have done this, and have not withheld your son, your only son, I will indeed bless you, and I will multiply your descendants as the stars of heaven and as the sand which is on the sea-shore. And your descendants shall possess the gate of their enemies, and by your descendants shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, because you have obeyed my voice."⁵³

This man Abraham is more remarkable than most realize. Much

⁵⁰Genesis 4-6:8. ⁵¹Genesis 6:9-22. ⁵²Genesis 6:8,9,22.

⁵³Genesis 22:16-18; with alternate reading in verse 18.

evidence points to the fact that he came from and lived among people who were under the influence of innumerable dieties. One of the writers in Dummelow's Commentary tells of the discovery of a clay tablet from approximately the time and place of Abraham. On each side of the tablet were six columns, every one containing more than 150 lines. On almost every line was the name of a diety. These "gods" had human form and all the human foibles. It is hardly any wonder that Abraham and his associates faced such confusion and immorality among the people of their day.⁵⁴

It was in such an environment that Abraham "believed God." He heard, believed and obeyed that "Father" who has, according to the New Testament, always been seeking such to worship Him in "spirit and in truth."⁵⁵

God, then, seems to accelerate the process of communication by giving great promises, including a "son of promise," Isaac.⁵⁶ Having a believing man, evidently made possible a renewed relationship of positive communication.

Nor is it merely a coincidence that God arbitrarily chooses the younger of Abraham's grandsons, Jacob; rather than his older brother, Esau to carry on the line of the "promise."⁵⁷

⁵⁴J. R. Dummelow, ed., A Commentary on the Holy Bible (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908), p. xvii.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. xviii; John 4:24.

⁵⁶Genesis 21:1-3

⁵⁷Genesis 25:19-26.

Résumé of Later Patriarchs

But even for these "ancient" ones the initial communicating test was in the "framework" of a clearly defined relationship; which drew on elements from their environment and promised blessing only for belief or reception evidenced by participation or obedience.⁵⁸

Through these covenant-"codes" and the obedient response of these men, God was able to begin to build a proper "definition" of Himself and of man's privilege of relationship to Him. It could be understood by any who would "hear" and "believe:" that God is God and that He always does as He says (Adam); that those who believed in Him were "saved" and "blessed" (Noah); furthermore, that God was "promising" something for "all the nations of the earth" (Abraham); and this blessing was going to come through the descendents of the man Abraham, in the way God would choose (Jacob).

So, it can be observed, that God was not only working to establish a relationship with just one individual or even one family; He was evidently beginning to create the vocabulary through which He could communicate to the whole world.

Though Abraham was called "the friend of God,"⁵⁹ he as one individual was not "complete" enough to be the "resevoir" of all the necessary information for God's final "promise," or "word."

⁵⁸Genesis 9:1-17; 22:15-18.

⁵⁹James 2:23; II Chronicles 20:7; and Isaiah 41:8.

Process Through Law

In the law, it would be a group, not just one individual who had to "believe." For bearing the burden of such a responsibility, Israel was to have blessings never to be afforded any other nation. But if they did not properly regard the goodness of God, they would still be used by Him, even as Adam, to "prove" that His statements were true because they were confirmed by fact.

God's purpose was that they become a unit, an organism of communication: a "kingdom of priests;" "a holy nation;"⁶⁰ "a people holy to the Lord;" "chosen for his own possession;"⁶¹ "the people of God" with whom he was willing to dwell.⁶²

The same relationship through covenant-promise which had been established with Adam, Noah and Abraham, was therefore enlarged to include a nation. The Law became the "code," a "custodian," as Paul describes it⁶³--a guardian and a guide. A guardian, in the sense of a standard to continue to protect the integrity of the Name and authority of God and His message as He identified Himself intimately with men; a guide in the sense of becoming a framework within which God could also continue to communicate with them His relationship to them,

⁶⁰Exodus 19:6. ⁶¹Deuteronomy 14:1-2. ⁶²Leviticus 26:12.

⁶³The word is "schoolmaster" in the Authorized Version. Burton Scott Easton in an article, "Schoolmaster" in the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia (Grand Rapids, Mich: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1939), IV, 2702; believes it should be "tutor." His description of the paidagogos, led to the words guardian and guide. This comes from Galatians 3:24-25 and Exodus 20:20.

their relationship to Him and His ultimate purpose for them and the world.

Now God was going to set these basic ideas into a code by which they would be established in the life and continuing history of a nation. From the New Testament vantage point it can be seen that God began to let one people "dramatize," in their history, who He was and what He wanted to do in and through all men.

Jesus "summed up" the whole law and the prophets by quoting significant verses from them for a group of Pharisees and their spokesman.⁶⁴

And he said to him, "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind. This is the great and first commandment.⁶⁵ And a second is like it, You shall love your neighbor as yourself.⁶⁶ On these two commandments depend all the law and the prophets.

And so it was, there were at the center of the law, ten words-- a Decalogue. The first four defined man's relationship to God, as the only God.⁶⁷ The next six defined man's relationship to man, under this one God.⁶⁸ All the remainder of the code was a "spelling out" of this basic vocabulary.

God took great pains to explain Himself as "one;"⁶⁹ as a spirit-

⁶⁴Matthew 22:34-40. ⁶⁵Matthew 22:37 from Deuteronomy 6:5.

⁶⁶Matthew 22:39 from Leviticus 19:18. ⁶⁷Exodus 20:1-11.

⁶⁸Exodus 20:12-17. ⁶⁹Deuteronomy 6:4.

ual being--idolatry and crude anthropomorphisms were absolutely condemned. They were to know that He is "holy," "righteous" and "just."⁷⁰ It was also important for them to understand that He is "longsuffering," "merciful," and "forgiving."⁷¹ As He led them out of Egypt He wrote into the very fibre of the nation the fact that He was the redeemer-deliverer.⁷²

Possibly the most significant idea communicated was that since He is holy, He requires them to be holy. As Dummelow puts it, God established an "indissoluble bond between religion and morality."⁷³ Nor was this holiness merely static. They were called upon to be just, righteous and kind in their relationship to other men. A very complete moral "code" was pronounced, dealing with slaves, fighting, animals, property, strangers, money lending, etc. Holiness was ultimately described not only in man's relationship to God, but more specifically in his responsibility to himself and other men.

Leviticus records God's willingness to associate with them and describes the proper "way of approach" to Him. The multitude of prohibitions and condemnations apparently intend to reveal to them their present negative relationship to God and their resultant need of a reconciler. Though they declare themselves ready to obey God in this code; they do not, and so very soon feel the need of assistance as

⁷⁰Exodus 3:5; Leviticus 20:7. ⁷¹Exodus 15:13; 20:6; 34:6-7.

⁷²Exodus 6:6. ⁷³Dummelow, op. cit., p. xvii.

did their ancestors.⁷⁴

Newer ideas such as that of a prophet, a spokesman for God; and mediator, a spokesman for man are also carefully "written" into the life and work of their leader, Moses.⁷⁵ Moses likewise becomes the referent for, embodies such concepts as: redeemer-leader, judge, commander-in-chief, ordainer of priests and definer of kings.⁷⁶

The tabernacle, the dress and ritual of the priests--each present the vocabulary of "spiritual" communion. Orderliness and cleanliness in relationship are spelled out in their sanitation and social laws.⁷⁷ God is always shown as wanting and therefore being the "first" and the "best."⁷⁸

But, on the other hand, God so completely identifies Himself with them and their concepts that He "clothes" Himself with a "cloud" on the mountain of Law, and in their travel; He manifests His presence in the "ark" box; He "roars" in the thunder of Sinai and "fills" their tabernacle with His "presence."⁷⁹

God promises them that if they will "walk in" these "statutes" He will bless them and their land, and protect them from their enemies "forever," but if they will not listen to Him, He must desolate

⁷⁴Numbers 21.

⁷⁵Exodus 32:11-14; Numbers 16:48; Deuteronomy 5:5; 10:7-29.

⁷⁶Deuteronomy 17:14 ff.; Leviticus 8:10 ff.; Exodus 18:13; 17:15.

⁷⁷Mostly Leviticus. ⁷⁸Exodus 34:18-25 and others.

⁷⁹Exodus 40:34-35; Numbers 8:89; Exodus 25:22; 19:6; 13:21.

them and turn them over to their enemies.⁸⁰

Résumé of Process Through Law

Thus it has been observed that in the idea of the Law, there is a continued call to faith and fellowship; founded now on a considerable body of manifestly confirmed information and rapidly growing vocabulary. In spite of the neglect and inadequacy of Israel to properly comprehend or follow the Law, it had nevertheless become their framework of relationship to God on the basis of the faithfulness of the few. And from this there was even a growing sense of appreciation and participation among some.

Whatever the case, it was now certainly a source of a great variety of material to be used in transmission--entropy was reduced to a minimum; redundancy was possible without monotony; there were growing numbers of specific referents for certain basic ideas. But total response and participation were needed to consummate, to communicate this "truth."

Process in the Prophets

God's exceeding patience and longsuffering are clearly confirmed in the next fifteen hundred years of history. During the period of occupation of the land under Joshua, they specifically disobeyed by not destroying all the idols and by keeping some of the spoil of battle for themselves, in addition to other things. This led them into a period when they were described by the phrase, "every

⁸⁰Leviticus 26:1-45.

man did that which was right in his own eyes."⁸¹

Were it not for God's mercy in "coming upon"⁸² certain men and women to "raise them up" as deliverers, the history of these people would surely have closed at that time.

Out of their exasperation and recognition of the need for consistent leadership and mutual protection, they clamoured for a king. God sent them kings; finally delivered them and when the king believed and obeyed, rapidly expanded their wealth and power beyond their expectation.

In their new hour of temptation, God sent them prophets who reminded them of the requirements of the Law, God's organ of communication. But as they more and more neglected the Law and submitted to the expedencies of the day, the "men of God announced God's "necessary" judgment, doom and desolation.

Prophets like Amos and Hosea not only reasserted the moral claims of Jehovah in reference to Israel; but as Israel was disciplined by other nations, they began to introduce the idea of the provision of God for all men. These men continually strove to show the people the divine meaning of their history.⁸³ They called them to repent; to remember the consistent confirmed facts which God had given; they read "righteous judgment" in the movement of the surround-

⁸¹Judges 17:6; 21:25.

⁸²Judges and I Samuel.

⁸³Amos 9:7; Isaiah 2:2-3; 19:18-25.

ing nations.⁸⁴

So, when the nation ran head-long toward desolation and exile, God was still able to transmit the "deeper" significance of the Law. As Micah denounced the wrongs of the people and predicted the downfall of Jerusalem, he also "looked" for another "king" like David who would restore their lost glory.⁸⁵

Isaiah declared that only a "remnant" could escape the punishment which was about to fall upon the people, but he too believed in a "better" kingdom ruled by Immanuel, the Prince, the "shoot out of the stock of Jesse."⁸⁶

Résumé of the Process in the Prophets

"Faith" was still the basic issue.⁸⁷ They did not believe God. But for their good and the ultimate communication of His purpose, God had to demand their adherence to His commands.⁸⁸

Each "jot and tittle" was important in His self-communication.⁸⁹ It was the whole and "perfected" Law that fully communicated God and His message. If He had let one thing slip, there would have been a perversion of their understanding of His "nature" and His desired relationship to men--"He could not deny Himself."⁹⁰

⁸⁴Jeremiah 12-15; Ezekiel 16 and 20; Jeremiah 44.

⁸⁵Micah 3:12; 5:2 ff. ⁸⁶Jeremiah 7:3; 13-16; 9:67; 11:1-10.

⁸⁷Romans 3:1-4; Hebrews 4:1-2. ⁸⁸Romans 3:4; Psalm 51:4.

⁸⁹Matthew 5:18. ⁹⁰Numbers 20:10-12; II Timothy 2:13.

One can also perceive the process of redundancy as all the basic concepts of the Law were reiterated over and over by the prophets, kings and events in the life of the nation; whether the people believed or not: God's unity and authority; His patience and mercy; His justice and holiness; His provision and protection; their need of Him and their basic rebellion against Him; His willingness to forgive, receive, restore and even inhabit them.

Indeed, it was in this setting of their national disintegration and despair, that God had finally been able to begin to more adequately purify and spiritualize the meaning of their national life.

Résumé of the Process in the Old Testament

So one sees that all the necessary vocabulary for communication was by this time "woven" into the "fibre" of their national life.

All the elements and problems of the communication science which research has described, are illustrated in the recorded association of God with man as focused in the Old Testament.

God's ultimate goal, it has been ascertained, was to inhabit men for the purpose of making them individual and collective participants in His activity.

In order to accomplish this without coercion it was necessary to establish a clearly defined, mutually comprehensible relationship with man. This He initiates through a clearly stated "word" of prohibition. If this one "word" had been accepted, believed, then the

integrity of God as author(ity) and of man as receiver would have been confirmed, established and God could have used this environment of mutual confidence (adequate comprehension) to continue to enlarge the communicating vocabulary.

But, the Man, did not believe or would not accept the "word" of God and so impugned the integrity of God and thereby disintegrated himself. Were it not for an evidently very significant motive of interest and purpose on the part of God--this act by man would probably have been the end of the "human" "experiment."

But God had established a "dynamic" relationship so that even man's initial and continued unbelief are used as a persevering environment of relationship, though negative.

From this point God was observed as both attempting to establish an integrated faith relationship with man, and build an adequate vocabulary for His proposed self communication.

It was shown that the contemporary concepts of encoding, transmission, redundancy, entropy could be used in describing the divine process of establishing vocabulary, maintaining integrity, eliciting faith, confirming information and stimulating action or motion toward reception.

It was also demonstrated that when there was proper reception of God's authority; there was created a living organism through which He could freely, intensely and increasingly share Himself toward ultimate reciprocal understanding, participation and union.

IV. THE OUTWORKING OF GOD'S PLAN IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Thus far in the investigation of the Scripture, it has been discovered that the age-long purpose of God has been to dwell in man by His Spirit. It likewise has been observed that God has carefully communicated into the life of one nation the whole vocabulary necessary to convey to all men this divine goal. But it also has been demonstrated that an idea to have real meaning, to be fully comprehended, must be shown to have a referent; it must be confirmed or fulfilled. Thus one looks again to the New Testament to see the Law consummated.

Jesus, The Fulfillment of the Law

...Jesus, who though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men (Philippians 2:6-7).

This was the event toward which all previous history evidently had moved. God, Himself, in the Son, "stepped down" into His creation, "became flesh and dwelt among us..."¹

It was "when the time had fully come" that "God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law..."² And the purpose? "...to redeem those who were under the Law, so that we might receive adoption as sons."³

¹John 1:14.

²Galatians 4:4.

³Galatians 4:5.

How was He to be recognized? If they truly understood the "Scriptures" they would know Him "because," Jesus declared, "...it is they that bear witness to me."⁴

In the same discourse He challenged them with...

"...If you believed Moses, you would believe me, for he wrote of me. But if you do not believe his writings, how will you believe my words?" (John 5:46-47).

At the synagogue in His "home town" of Nazareth, Jesus startled His neighbors by reading from the prophet Isaiah certain statements which were traditionally interpreted to refer to the Messiah; and then He announced, "Today this scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing."⁵

These people of His "own country" were not impressed. But many others were "amazed." For with "authority and power" He "commanded," "spoke" and "taught." He even became famous in the region.⁶

So, if they did not believe Him by His words, they should have been alerted by His actions. He gave them ample opportunity.

God had established certain "signs" or "symbols" by which His "Son" could be recognized, only a very few of which can be included in this brief analysis.

Once, when John the Baptist sent some of his disciples to ask "Are you he who is to come, or shall we look for another?"

⁴John 5:39.

⁵Luke 4:16-30.

⁶Luke 4:36-37; Matthew 7:28-29.

Jesus answered them, "Go and tell John what you hear and see: the blind receive their sight and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good news preached to them. And blessed is he who takes no offense at me."⁷

These were portions of Isaiah which prophesied of "Him who was to come."

In fact, Jesus evidently became almost exasperated by His people's blindness.

It was the feast of the Dedication at Jerusalem; it was winter, and Jesus was walking in the temple, in the portico of Solomon. So the Jews gathered round him and said to him, "How long will you keep us in suspense? If you are the Christ, tell us plainly." Jesus answered them, "I told you, and you do not believe. The works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness to me, but you do not believe, because you do not belong to my sheep. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give them eternal life, and they shall never perish, and no one shall snatch them out of my hand. My Father, who has given them to me, is greater than all, and no one is able to snatch them out of the Father's hand. I and the Father are one."

The Jews took up stones again to stone him. Jesus answered them, "I have shown you many good works from the Father; for which of these do you stone me? The Jews answered him, "We stone you for no good work but for blasphemy; because you, being a man, make yourself God." Jesus answered them, "Is it not written in your law, 'I said, you are gods'? If he called them gods to whom the word of God came (and scripture cannot be broken), do you say of him whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world, 'You are blaspheming,' because I said, 'I am the Son of God'? If I am not doing the works of my Father, then do not believe me; but if I do them, even though you do not believe me, believe my works, that you may know and understand that the Father is in me and I in the Father."⁸

⁷Matthew 11:2-6. Quoted from Isaiah 35:5-6; 61:1.

⁸John 10:22-39. Underlining inserted.

That crowd of Pharisees tried to "arrest" Him but He "escaped from their hands."

A few believed Him but most (even His disciples) finally forsook Him. As Isaiah had sensed He was "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief..."⁹

But it was mostly the religious and political leaders of Judaism who recognized in Jesus a threat to their security and leadership and turned the people against Him.¹⁰ As He broke their traditions and astonished the people with His teaching, they accused Him of plotting to destroy their Law.

Jesus replied,

"Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfill them. For truly, I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the law until all is accomplished (Matt. 5:17-18)."

Actually, Jesus' teaching had the effect of continuing to purify and deepen the work and purpose of the Law.

"You have heard that it was said to the men of old, 'You shall not kill; and whoever kills shall be liable to judgment.' But I say to you that every one who is angry with his brother shall be liable to judgment; whoever insults his brother shall be liable to the council, and whoever says, 'You fool!' shall be liable to the hell of fire" (Matt. 5:21-22).

The real problem was their misunderstanding of their own scriptures. They comprehended them to be an end in themselves, when God had meant them to be merely the basic tools of further

⁹Isaiah 53:3.

¹⁰Matthew 27:20.

communication.* They had become convinced that the Law was the way to salvation and righteousness. They were exceedingly "grateful" for the fact that though they were only a small, subjugated and seemingly insignificant nation; yet they were the only ones who worshipped the one true and living God; they were the only nation that abhorred idols, had the oracles of God Himself and were "free" from the "sinfulness," the licentiousness of the nations around them. They would not even associate with such "rubbish."

They alone were "righteous" and could pray

'God, I thank thee that I am not like other men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even like this tax collector. I fast twice a week, I give tithes of all that I get' (Luke 18:11b-12).

But, for their good, the good of the nation and the good of ultimate purposes of God in their lives and the lives of all men, Jesus rebuked them severely.

"Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for you tithe mint and dill and cummin, and have neglected the weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy and faith; these you ought to have done, without neglecting the others. You¹¹ blind guides, straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel!"

He also warned the people that unless their "righteousness" exceeded "that of the scribes and Pharisees," they would "never enter the kingdom of heaven."¹²

¹¹ Matthew 23:23-24. Note also Leviticus 27:30 and Micah 6:8.

¹² Matthew 5:20.

*John 5:39; Matthew 22:29.

This apparent conflict between Christ and the Law continued and became a major source of problem in the early church. All because those to whom it was given had missed the purpose of the Law.

As we have noted, the Jewish leaders had become so captivated by the prospect of future "power" and "glory" and in keeping the minute laws and traditions in order to bring this to pass; they had become "blind" to many things.¹³

Actually, Paul declared, the Law had not been intended as an instrument of "righteousness" at all; but rather as a revealer of sin.¹⁴ The "Law came in to increase the trespass..."¹⁵

The Law was their "schoolmaster" "to bring" them "to Christ," that they "might be justified by faith."¹⁶ It had uncovered their sinful, "covetous" hearts in the blazing light of God's holy, just and righteous love.¹⁷ It left them condemned.¹⁸ The yearly sin-offerings, feasts, sacrifices, rituals were obviously helpless against such "wickedness."¹⁹

God alone could forgive sin²⁰ and even then someone must bear

¹³Romans 2:17-24.

¹⁴Romans 3:20; 7:7.

¹⁵Romans 5:20.

¹⁶Galatians 3:24.

¹⁷Romans 7:7-9; 1:20; Job 25:4; Leviticus 11:44.

¹⁸Romans 3:9,19

¹⁹Hebrews 9:1-10; 10:1; Colossians 1:21.

²⁰Romans 5:21.

the consequences of the Law for God dare not seem to deny Himself.²¹

Christ came, then, to fulfill the Law, to consume all its predictions, types and patterns;²² to assume all its burden,²³ to bear all its penalties,²⁴ to carry into effect all its customs,²⁵ clarify its purpose and manifest its God.²⁶

He was The Prophet,²⁷ The Priest,²⁸ The King²⁹ of Whom all other prophets, priests, and kings had only been communicating "signs."³⁰ He was the true Redeemer-Deliverer,³¹ the Mediator,³² the Reconciler,³³ the Revelator³⁴ of whom all former had been merely divine "symbols."³⁵

The Law, it has been shown, had been provided only to estab-

²¹Numbers 23:19; Romans 3:3; Galatians 3:13; II Timothy 2:13; Isaiah 53:5-11.

²²Hebrews.

²³Acts 3:17-26; Galatians 3:13; Hebrews 9:1-15.

²⁴Romans 3:25; 4:25; Isaiah 53:5-6; 5:6.

²⁵Luke 2:27,42; 4:16.

²⁶I John 4:9

²⁷Acts 3:17-26; 7:37; Deuteronomy 18:15,18.

²⁸Hebrews 7:21-25.

²⁹Hebrews 1:3; 2:9.

³⁰Hebrews 8:5; 9:9; 10:1.

³¹Ephesians 1:7.

³²I Timothy 2:5; Hebrews 8:6.

³³Colossians 1:17-23.

³⁴I John 4:9.

³⁵Colossians 2:17.

lish the necessary defined relationship with man to lead Him on to "better"³⁶ things. Jesus therefore was the end of the Law³⁷ and the beginning of faith,³⁸ the new "covenant,"³⁹ the new point of relationship in the continuing stream of God's self disclosure.⁴⁰

But as has been stated, the Law, to have any temporal meaning, must have a referent, a fulfiller. Until the consummation of the Law, one must technically obey all of it to show one's belief in it and verify its communicating information. Therefore all it could do for humans was to expose them and point beyond.

But when Christ came, He completed it, fulfilled it in Himself; He took its place. No longer were men to place their confidence in the Law by obedience, but now they were to believe in Christ in order that the "just requirement of the law" could, by His Spirit, "be fulfilled" in them!⁴¹

Jesus, The Pioneer and Perfecter of Faith

Jesus Christ not only fulfilled the Law, but was also the "pioneer and perfecter"⁴² of faith, the "captain of our salvation."⁴³

³⁶Hebrews 7:19,22; 8:6; 9:23. ³⁷Romans 10:4.

³⁸Romans 10:1-13; Galatians 3:24; Acts 13:38-39.

³⁹Hebrews 8:1-13.

⁴⁰John 1:1; 14; 18.

⁴¹Romans 8:1-17; 1:17.

⁴²Hebrews 12:2.

⁴³Hebrews 2:10.

His life became the New Testament, the new covenant, code vocabulary of communication. In His life He described and established the standard, the pattern of His followers' ministry: giving, seeking and serving in the environment of mutual love.⁴⁴ It was to be a new way. No longer "slaves," but friends, sons, heirs, through the Spirit.⁴⁵ All things were theirs.⁴⁶

Even His disciples could not understand. At His death they were thrown into consternation--they had not comprehended the spiritual vocabulary.⁴⁷

And they did not really understand until the Spirit came "in."

How beautifully Christ communicated this truth, comforting them and preparing them for further fulfillment of the "promise."⁴⁸

"Believe in God, believe also in me,"⁴⁹ He had assured the consternated disciples. Faith was still the great issue. They had to begin to trust Him.

"I am the way, and the truth and the life,"⁵⁰ Jesus had continued. And to their uncomprehending ears He declared, "...He who

⁴⁴Matthew 20:25-28; 18:10-14; Luke 22:24-27; I John.

⁴⁵Romans 8:14-17; John 15:15.

⁴⁶I Corinthians 3:21-23.

⁴⁷Mark 14:46-52; Luke 24:13-25.

⁴⁸John 13-17; See above p. 40.

⁴⁹John 14:1.

⁵⁰John 14:6.

has seen me has seen the Father..."⁵¹

"Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in me; or else believe me for the sake of the works themselves," He asserted.⁵²

Then He began to lead them toward the great "promise of the Father."

Truly, truly, I say to you, he who believes in me will also do the works that I do, and greater works than these will he do because I go to the Father. Whatever you ask in my name I will do it, that the Father may be glorified in the Son; if you ask anything in my name, I will do it.

If you love me you will keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Counsellor, to be with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it neither sees him nor knows him; you know him, for he dwells with you and shall be in you (Jn. 14:12-17).

I will not leave you desolate; I will come to you.⁵³

After this Jesus spoke of His departure; their coming spiritual insight to "see" Him; their "life" because He lives; the indwelling of the Son in the Father; their indwelling in Him and He in them; and the manifestation of the Son to those who love Him.⁵⁴

But, the disciples asked how would He manifest Himself to them and not the rest of the world?

This feedback gives Jesus an opportunity for some more valuable redundancy.

If a man loves me, he will keep my word, and my Father

⁵¹John 14:9.

⁵²John 14:11.

⁵³John 14:18; underlining inserted.

⁵⁴John 14:19-21.

will love him, and we will come to him to make our abode with him.⁵⁵

They are introduced again to "the promise." It is "the Counselor, the Holy Spirit" who will make all this possible. He will "teach" them. His "peace" is the parting gift. They need not be "troubled." Yes, He is going "away" from them, but "to the Father." These concepts He plants so that when they take place there would already be a neucleus vocabulary for definition and explanation;⁵⁶ even as the Father-God had selected, refined, defined and implanted the proper vocabulary in order that the Son might be comprehended.

Jesus had spoken to them about greater works than He.⁵⁷ Now He began to delineate what this meant. In fact, He had opened the evenings' activities by becoming their servant and washing their feet.⁵⁸ So, also He reminds them that they must abide in Him as the "true" vine and submit to the "vinedresser's" pruning in order that they may bear "much fruit" for the Father's glory. The "full" joy of Christ was to be the reward for such participation "in" Him and the Father.⁵⁹

Their new found "joy," position and power must be tempered by the "love" which Jesus describes as the central commandment of His

⁵⁵John 14:23-24.

⁵⁶John 14:25-31.

⁵⁷John 14:12.

⁵⁸John 13:3-17; Luke 22:27.

⁵⁹John 15:1-11; Hebrews 12:2.

way. And this "love" is defined in Him--by His love for them in giving His life. They are now His friend, and He will give His life for His friends in order that these whom He has chosen may "go out" and bear "fruit."⁶⁰ He leads the way--He is the pioneer and perfecter.

At this point they are warned not to be shocked if they are hated by the world. The world does not love those who are not of the world. They will be no different than their "master." Since He was hated, they will be hated. But this must not stop their witness. The coming Counselor who "proceeds from the Father" will still witness to the world and so must they.⁶¹

Jesus said all this to keep them from being discouraged and "falling away," to strengthen them and give them adequate vocabulary or information by which to perceive and use their coming experiences. It is so much easier to bear and understand the things which are expected.⁶²

And so Jesus continues to gently introduce them to the Holy Spirit who will come to abide in them as Counselor and Guide; and who will convince the world of its sin, of His righteousness and of the coming judgment. Even as Jesus was comforting them at that time, so would He in the future by His Spirit.⁶³ First "Jesus"

⁶⁰ John 15:12-17.

⁶¹ John 15:18-27.

⁶² John 16:1,4.

⁶³ John 16.

and then the "Holy Spirit" would take the place of the "schoolmaster" of the Law.

The climax of this "hour" was Jesus' prayer for them. This terrified, confused group of men were about to be thrust out on their own. God was about to place on them the awful responsibility of communicating to the whole world the promise which He had made in Himself before the world began; the fruit of centuries of hoping, living and dying was about to be fulfilled. He seemed to be beginning then for their benefit His mediatorial ministry.⁶⁴

They were about to discover that even as the law was only a means to an end, so was Christ's earthly ministry.

He was "with" them but would be "in" them--this was their only hope.⁶⁵ As God had clothed Himself in Israel and more perfectly in Christ; now He would be "formed" in them.⁶⁶

They were to be the witnesses,⁶⁷ the lights,⁶⁸ the ministers.⁶⁹ The world must see their good works and glorify their Father in heaven.⁷⁰

They were to become as one under the Law that they might win those under the Law; as one outside the Law to those outside the Law

⁶⁴John 17; I Timothy 2:5.

⁶⁵John 17:26.

⁶⁶Galatians 4:19.

⁶⁷Acts 1:8.

⁶⁸Philippians 2:15.

⁶⁹Matthew 20:26.

⁷⁰Matthew 5:16; John 15:8.

that they might win those outside the Law; to the weak as weak. They were to be all things to all men that by all means they might save some.⁷¹

With the "promise of the Father"⁷² dwelling within, they, as sons of God, would be able to take up their cross, like the Master; and through participation in His suffering carry on His ministry; sharing with the world the spiritual message and life which before had been hidden in God--they would be a living organism, the new temple of God, the contemporary "body of Christ."

V. RÉSUMÉ OF THE PROCESS IN THE BIBLE

Thus this investigation has gone the full circle, starting with the "promise of the Father" it attempted to discover whether God's activity in association with man could be described in the terminology of the contemporary science of communication. It was discovered that this could clearly be done. Next it was demonstrated that in the events and teaching of both the Old and New Testament, one not only has the record of God's self-revelation, but also the divine and logical pattern of this communication; which when finally concluded, was seen to result in the actual fulfillment of the "promise" of God as He shared Himself in, with and through men by the Spirit.

⁷¹I Corinthians 9:19-23.

⁷²See above, p. 40.

CHAPTER IV

THE SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

CHAPTER IV

THE SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I. SUMMARY

The aim of this investigation has been to discover something of the concept of Biblical Communication in order to relate it to the understanding of our contemporary responsibility of Christian education.

After careful study in the semantics of the word and its contemporary use, "communication" was defined as: the purposeful establishment of a clearly defined, mutually comprehended relationship in order to share one's self freely with someone else; which if properly received, results in a common organism of reciprocal understanding and participation.

Some of the currently defined procedures of the communication concept were then delineated, such as: encoding, noise, transmission; redundancy, entropy, and reception. These were observed to be prerequisites to the establishing of any basic communication relationship. It was determined that they were quite distinguishable in the process of God's association with man.

It was also demonstrated that there are certain problems or principles which emerge out of the communication concept. These were expressed as: vocabulary, integrity, faith, information, referent, and motive. These were likewise manifested to be discernable in the

Divine Communication.

It was then shown that, in the light of the definition, God had a purpose; and this goal was defined as a desire to share Himself with man by imparting His Spirit to them.

Next it was revealed that God consistently sought to establish with man a clearly defined, mutually comprehended relationship: as in the cases of Adam, Noah, Abraham, the Children of Israel and finally Christ.

God was also clearly seen as permitting uncoerced decision in all the initial response to His authority.

Proper reception or faith was likewise revealed to be the key by which God created with man an intimate relationship which might be described as a common organism of reciprocal understanding and participation: as in the Law, the Church and the Spirit-filled, fulfilled, perfected individual.

II. CONCLUSIONS

1. That the concept and process of communication is exceedingly complex.

2. That since God is the creator and initial communicator, He, therefore is the initiator of the capacity, necessity and process of communication.

3. That this fact makes His procedure in communication of exceeding importance to those who are attempting to share information about Him.

4. That He has in one of His communication instruments, the Bible, presented the basic principles of communication.

5. That these principles might be described as, essentially:

Motivation - the prerequisite purpose or desire necessary to the initiation of any sharing.

Referent - the requirement of a clear definition to insure comprehended sharing.

Information - the necessity of mutual comprehension as the basis of mutual confidence.

Faith - the requisite belief in self and others necessary before there is willingness to share; the foundation of integration.

Integrity - the indispensability of mutual freedom in the process of sharing.

Vocabulary - the consequent organism created by the proper reception of communication which results in reciprocal understanding and participation.

6. That because these principles emerge from the association of God with man, they are at the core of all communication and education, including Christian education.

7. That the Church, therefore, has vast responsibility in creating the proper environment and using adequate vocabulary for sharing God.

8. That the Scriptures give us not only principles but also illustrate the process of communication - The careful encoding of the intended message; the sensitive listening to feedback for adequate evaluation of code and transmission; the proper consideration of the environment of the receiver and the adequacy of the transmitter

to carry the intended message; the thoughtful consideration of the kind, level, quality and adequacy of the receiver for the intended transmission; the patient redundant rephrasing, resaying, reliving--all in order to insure mutual comprehension and proper reception.

9. That ultimately the only true measure of adequate communication is the evidence of common organism in willing, free, reciprocal understanding and participation.

10. That ultimate "truth" is personal, dynamic, living; for God shares Himself, not mere knowledge of Himself or things related to Himself.

11. That the larger and more diverse the organism, if properly related to its author(ity), the greater the resources for communicating such an intricate and complex concept as the Divine.

III. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. This study, itself needs to be perfected. There needs to be more thinking, writing and discussion in the field of Biblical philosophy and theology.

2. This study has implications in the field of theology that ought to be explored--especially revelation and inspiration and possibly also the nature of God, of man and salvation.

3. From such studies should emerge the principles which can be extended, applied and implemented in the "practical" areas of teaching methods and tools, preaching, evangelism, missions, and

pastoring.

4. There should be some insight from this paper relative to the problem of constructing instruments of evaluation for the materials, methods and results of Christian outreach.

5. This research should probably not only be sharpened, but also compared to other contemporary approaches in the field of the philosophy of education and of Christian education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BIBLE

Revised Standard Version, The Holy Bible.

B. COMMENTARIES

Bruce, F. F. Commentary on the Book of Acts. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954.

Dummelow, J. R., ed. A Commentary on the Whole Bible. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947.

Morgan, G. Campbell. The Acts of the Apostles. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1924.

Orr, James M., ed. International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1939.

C. DICTIONARIES

Allen, F. Sturges. Allen's Synonyms and Antonyms. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1921.

Crabb, George. English Synonymes. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1891.

Shipley, Joseph T. Dictionary of Word Origins. Littlefield, Adams and Company, 1961.

Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged. Springfield, Mass.: Merriam Company, 1934.

D. CHRISTIAN COMMUNICATION

Blunt, Hugh Francis. Life With The Holy Ghost. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1942.

Carver, W. O. The Self-Interpretation of Jesus. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press, no date.

- DeWire, Harry A. The Christian As Communicator. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.
- Dillistone, F. W. Christianity and Communication. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956.
- Farrar, F. W. The Bible, Its Meaning and Supremacy. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1897.
- Henry, Carl F. H., ed. Revelation and the Bible. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1958.
- Kreemer, H. The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World. London: The Edinburgh House Press, 1938.
- _____. The Communication of the Christian Faith. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956.
- Laeuchli. The Language of Faith. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Laymon, Charles M. The Message of the Bible. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.
- Moreau, Jules L. Language and Religious Language. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.
- Nide, Eugene. Message and Mission. London: Hamish Hamilton Ltd., 1960.
- Peritz, Ismar J. Old Testament History. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1915.
- Perrow, Maxwell V. Effective Christian Communication. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1962.
- Phillips, J. B. Making Men Whole. London: Collins Press, 1955.
- _____. Your God Is Too Small. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962.
- Robinson, H. Wheeler. Redemption and Revelation. London: Nisbet and Company, Ltd., 1942.
- Shoemaker, Samuel M. The Experiment of Faith. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1957.

Thomson, James G. S. S. The Old Testament View of Revelation. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960.

Young, Edward J. The Study of Old Testament Theology. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1959.

E. GENERAL COMMUNICATION

Asheim, Lester, ed. The Future of the Book. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1955.

Babcock, Clarence Morton, ed. Ideas in Process. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1958.

Bennis, Warren G., K. D. Genne, Robert Chin, eds. The Planning of Change. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1961.

Berlo, David K. Process of Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1960.

Boyd, Malcom. Crises in Communication. New York: Doubleday, 1957.

Bradford, Curtis. The Communication of Ideas. Boston: Heath, 1951./

Bryson, Lyman, ed. The Communication of Ideas. New York: Institute for Religious and Social Studies, 1948.

Carnap, Rudolf. Introduction to Semantics. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942.

Carpenter, Edmund Show. Explorations in Communication. Boston: Beacon Press, 1960.

Chase, Stuart. The Tyranny of Words. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1938.

_____. and Merian Tyler Chase. Power of Words. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1954.

Cherry, Colin. On Human Communication. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1957.

Korzybski, Alfred. Science and Sanity. New York: The International Non-Aristotelian Library Publishing Company, 1933.

Pei, Mario. The Story of Language. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippencott Company, 1949.

Richards, Ivor Armstrong. The Meaning of Meanings. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc. 1923.

Ruesch, Jorgen. Nonverbal Communication. California: University of California Press, 1956.

Schramm, Wilbur, ed. The Process and Effects of Mass Communication. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1954.