

5-1-1952

A Biblical Study of Man in His Relationship to the Image of God

Mildred Wynkoop

Recommended Citation

Wynkoop, Mildred, "A Biblical Study of Man in His Relationship to the Image of God" (1952). *Western Evangelical Seminary Theses*. 82. http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/wes_theses/82

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.

APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis has been approved by the following
faculty committee:

First reader: Fennell Approved 5/15/52

Second reader: Elton Fuhrman Approved 5/15/52

A BIBLICAL STUDY OF MAN IN HIS
RELATIONSHIP TO THE IMAGE
OF GOD

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the
Western Evangelical Seminary

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

by
Mildred Bangs Wynkoop

May 1952

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM OF THE <u>IMAGO DEI</u> INTRODUCED.	1
	The problem.	1
	Statement of the problem	1
	Justification for the study.	2
	Limitation of the study.	4
	Review of the field.	5
	History of the problem	6
	Method of procedure.	11
II.	IMAGE AND LIKENESS	13
	Word study	15
	Hebrew word study.	15
	Septuagint word study.	19
	Greek word study	20
	Conclusions.	24
	Content of term image.	26
	Historical	26
	Catholic	26
	Reformation theology	27
	Arminian theology.	33
	Biblical study of the term, image.	38
	Evaluation of historical positions against Biblical analysis.	41

	iii
CHAPTER	PAGE
Analysis of the fall in relation to the image. .	47
III. THE IMAGE IN NATURAL (FALLEN) MAN.	49
Conscience and natural man	50
Law and the natural man.	51
Scriptural witness	52
IV. LIKENESS IN NATURAL (FALLEN) MAN	58
Historical statements regarding human nature . .	59
Biblical study of human nature	63
Jesus' estimate of human nature.	63
Paul's teaching about human nature	67
V. THE BENEFITS OF GRACE IN RELATION TO THE IMAGE OF	
GOD IN MAN	86
Grace.	88
Redemption	89
Life	93
Sonship.	97
Righteousness.	102
Holiness	103
Knowledge.	104
Conclusion	105
VI. THE PROCESS OF REDEMPTION.	108
Inter-relationship of Father and Son to the	
race of men.	112
Adoption as sons	112

CHAPTER	PAGE
Father-Son relationship within the God-head. . .	116
Relationship of the eternal Son to the race. . .	117
The Son reveals the Father	118
The moral basis of sonship	119
The terms of sonship	120
The manner of redemption	124
The function of faith.	127
The function of cleansing.	135
Transformation of character.	144
Christian ethics	145
Christian character.	146
VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	153
BIBLIOGRAPHY	158
APPENDIX	164
CHART I	165
CHART II	168
CHART III	171

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM OF THE IMAGO DEI INTRODUCED

I. THE PROBLEM

A proper conception of the Biblical usage of the term, Image of God in Man, is necessary to a full understanding of every phase of Soteriology. No proper doctrine of redemption is possible without an adequate doctrine of man for each theory of atonement is conditioned by a position regarding anthropology.

The Statement of the Problem. Christian theology has always held that men were made in the image of God and that that image was in some measure forfeited in the "fall" and that "in Christ" a restoration is effected. Within the framework of this simple statement, however, lies a great deal of difference of opinion. The whole scope of theological controversy in conservative Protestantism finds its points of departure, largely, from interpretations of what may be meant by the image of God in man. Though philosophy and the creedal statements are invaluable, a Biblical study of the problem more thorough than any of which the author is aware, is basic to a truly Christian view. To establish, if possible, a Biblical position regarding the image of God in man, noting any differences which may be involved in the terms image and likeness, and to determine whatever metaphysical and ethical consequences resulted from the fall, and the nature and manner of

recovery from these consequences, is the purpose of this study.

Justification for the Study. So essential, logically, is the concept of what constitutes the nature of man, that every theologian to which reference was made in this study made at least an introductory statement regarding it. It would seem presumptuous for another voice to seek a hearing, along with the impressive array of classic thinkers consulted, were it not for the fact, that few, if any, have given time, apparently, to a thorough Biblical study of the terms involved. One of the major difficulties to a critical student, is the disconcerting tendency of theologians to mix philosophical, psychological and religious terms in a single statement. The familiar expression used by practically every writer, to the effect that man is made in the natural and moral image of God, is not only unbiblical in terminology at least, but is also an example of the use of indiscriminate language to which reference has been made. It attempts, improperly, to parallel metaphysics and ethics, philosophy and religion, or being and attribute. This confusion of family terms results in confusion of concepts regarding both anthropology and soteriology. In practical considerations it makes the difference between the Catholic and Protestant concept of grace and the difference between Calvinistic and Arminian concepts of imputed and imparted holiness and what may be involved in the term "growth in grace."

Another difficulty to the theological student is the uncritical loyalty of so many theologians to historic precedent within a tradition. In too many cases, the defence of the position of the author regarding the image of God in man, lay within the dogmatic groove of his theological pathway, instead of honestly seeking the clear Biblical highway. The result was often a "circle" of argument, ungrounded Biblically and philosophically unsatisfactory, one man quoting another and never finding the "rest" of authority.

In many cases, also, doctrinal bias has preceded theological presuppositions and, consequently, Biblical interpretation. The important passage found in Romans 5:16-19, has been thereby seriously confused. The Reformed theologian, John MacPherson, found universal condemnation in this passage, while Professor Miner Raymond, the Arminian, was equally assured by the same passage of universal justification, and Henry Sheldon, a Wesleyan, saw in it the basis for universal freedom of the will.

A further difficulty lay in the almost total neglect of theological writers to drive back to the original Hebrew and Greek words in building a position regarding the image of God in man. No writer, within the scope of this research, was beyond falling, on occasion, before the temptation to compare and contrast English translations of the original and thereby

missing the more accurate teaching of Scripture.¹

A new inductive approach to the Biblical study of the image of God in man, is therefore, considered warranted, (1) because of the lack of consistency in the Wesleyan Arminian school, in particular, due to its failure to provide a solid Biblical groundwork for the doctrine of the image of God in man, and (2) because of that lack, no unequivocal statement is available regarding the nature and manner of the recovery of that image.

Limitation of the Study. The field to be covered by an adequate research into the nature of the image of God in man, its loss and recovery, is wide indeed. It sends its roots into every major theological problem and many minor ones as well. It would have been profitable to have explored every corollary of truth involved but a more or less strict limitation was placed about the barest essentials.

There are three major fields of investigation. First, in what does the image and/or likeness of God in man consist?

¹ Richard Chenevix Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1947), pp. III-IV.

By such investigations as these we become aware of delicate variations in an author's meaning, which otherwise we might have missed, where is it so desirable that we should miss nothing. . . as in those words which are the vehicles of the very mind of God Himself. . . The words of the New Testament are eminently the $\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\alpha$ of Christian theology, and he who will not begin with a patient study of these shall never make any considerable advances in this.

Are these terms used synonymously or is there a theologically significant distinction between them? Secondly, what effect did the fall of man and the entrance of sin have upon him in the above respects? Is he totally depraved? Is his humanity or essential nature altered? What is the hope of recovery? Thirdly, concluding from the above Biblical study that recovery is possible the question yet remains as to how fully that recovery may be effected and when and in what manner it is accomplished and under what agency. These questions mark the boundary of this study.

II. REVIEW OF THE FIELD

A brief review was made of the major Wesleyan theologians as well as those representing the Lutheran and Calvinistic tradition. Of the former, the following names were among those included: Richard Watson, William Burton Pope, John Miley, Miner Raymond, Henry Sheldon, Thomas Summers and H. Orton Wiley. James Arminius was also consulted. Of the latter, John Calvin, A. A. Hodge, A. H. Strong, John MacPherson, H. Martensen, William Shedd, J. Gresham Machen and Louis Berkhof, mainly, were read. The review included also, a brief survey of the Catholic doctrine against which both the Reformed and Arminian theories are held in deep protest. It seemed sufficiently true that while these protesting positions were held as a defence against the abuse of the

Catholic position, the basic insight of the Patristic Fathers regarding the problem was worthy of serious consideration. A number of authoritative sources were consulted, among them the Catholic Encyclopedia and a two volume set of books on the teaching of the Catholic Church, edited by the Rev. George Smith under the Bishop's official seal.

Contemporary positions, not in the stream of traditional orthodoxy, were not considered since a frankly Biblical position was sought and since these less orthodox views represent purely personal philosophies.

III. THE HISTORY OF THE PROBLEM

Classic theology has viewed the Imago Dei under one of two major classifications. Paul Ramsey's analysis² is clearly stated. According to him one view

singles out something within the substantial form of human nature. . . as the thing which distinguishes man from. . . other animals. . . All civilization may be viewed simply as an extension of man's thumb.

In this view, the Imago Dei may be considered a "divine spark" (the Stoic notion) or rationality (Aristotle's definition). It may be imagination or creativity (romantic influence) or moral capacity (Kant), but common to all of them is the idea of a native capacity in Man, which he possesses in his own

² Paul Ramsey, Basic Christian Ethics (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950), pp. 250-254.

right. The Greek notion of an inherent divinity may be dismissed from the present study as being completely non-Christian and from which many modern pseudo-Christian positions have stemmed. There is in them a tendency to "blur the distinction" between God and Man. But in this general classification stands most of conservative Protestantism. Though it holds to a clear distinction between man and God on one hand, it also holds to an equally clear distinction between man as created by God, and all other orders of creation, on the other hand. Even Augustine recognized the uniqueness of the human "spirit" and "mind," apart from its moral relationship to God.³

The second type of view is that which may be described as relational. Ramsey distinguishes this type from the first by noting its emphasis upon the "present responsive relationship to God." The analogy of a mirror is used rather than the analogy of sculpturing or painting characteristic of the first named view. Man, in proper relationship to God, mirrors his Maker's image, but is not in himself that image.

St. Augustine has become the classic defender of this second view, so far as the early Christian writers are concerned. Augustine, though he spoke of the mind as containing the image of God, defaced but still "capable of Him, and can be partaker of Him,"⁴ yet also spoke of the renewal and

³ Ibid., p. 256.

⁴ "On the Trinity," Book XIV, ch. 8, par. 11 (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Scribners, 1908, First Series, Vol. III).

"forming again" of the mind after the image of God.⁵ In this connection Augustine spoke of this "forming" of the mind as a renewal to God's "likeness" and it is this distinction between "image" and "likeness" which Catholicism later picked up and emphasized.

In an attempt to preserve both the substantial and relational conceptions of the Imago Dei, Catholic theologians have sharply distinguished between image and likeness. Adam, they say, was created a perfect human being, in the image of God, which consisted in his natural human reason.⁶ But upon this perfect humanhood was placed supernatural or habitual grace which raised him to a plane "altogether beyond the human."⁷ Man was further enriched with preternatural gifts which did not altogether transcend his nature, but were not essential to it. These gifts were immortality, impassibility, and integrity.⁸ In the fall man lost sanctifying grace and the preternatural gifts and this deprivation constitutes original sin. The essential image was left intact—simply unguarded—and only the likeness was lost. In contrast to the Reformed view that after the fall Man's Nature was intrinsically

⁵ Ibid., ch. 16, par. 22.

⁶ Ramsey, op. cit., p. 260.

⁷ George D. Smith, ed., Teaching of the Catholic Church (New York: Macmillan Company, 1950), I, p. 239.

⁸ Ibid., p. 239.

depraved and corrupted, a thing evil in itself which is a "fatal and truly horrible teaching."⁹ Catholic tradition says,

Adam indeed lost, by his sin, all his supernatural and preternatural gifts, but did not lose anything belonging to his nature as Man. All the elements, properties, and endowments that constituted his Manhood, he kept intact and unspoilt. So also the human nature that he handed on to his children was perfect in its kind, having in it no natural defect or infection or evil inclination that can be looked upon as the direct result of his sin.¹⁰

A child, however, born in original sin, is lost and is enrolled under Satan's flag and subject to his dominion, until he is baptized.

Hence, when the priest, in the prayer of exorcism, before baptism, admonishes Satan to 'go out and depart' from the child, he is not indulging in ecclesiastical rhetoric . . . he is speaking the language of stark realism. Hence it is easy to see the desire of the Church that children should be baptized as soon as possible, to put them beyond Satan's power, and enroll them in the Supernatural Kingdom of God.¹¹

Sanctifying grace, then, administered in baptism, is a positive reality superadded to the glorious natural endowments of the soul. It is the possession of additional glory rather than the mere absence of mortal sin.¹² This is the restoration of the "likeness" of God. In it, an order, "not natural to the soul" because it is supernatural and hence of a "higher order

⁹ Ibid., p. 333.

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 333-334.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 355.

¹² Ibid., p. 549.

of things," is added to Man. He is made a "partaker of the divine nature" (II Peter 1:4) in a way that Catholic theology considers to be no mere figure of speech.

It is not merely that our spiritual faculties of intellect and will establish a special likeness to God in our souls; that is true enough, but over and above this natural likeness to God a wholly supernatural quality is given to us which makes us to be of the same nature of God. . . the Holy Ghost deifies us. . . (and we pray at Mass) that we may be made partakers of his Godhead.¹³ (*Italics not in original*)

The preternatural gifts are not restored in this life but in the next. Sanctifying grace is permanent (habitual) therefore baptism is not repeatable.

Against this metaphysical and ethical dualism stand the Reformers who in rejecting the distinction between image and likeness are forced by philosophical necessity to distinguish between the "necessary" and "accidental" image to preserve any measure of humanhood in fallen man. However justified they may be in taking this "protestant" position, their Biblically unwarranted terminology gives rise to the soteriological problems already mentioned. Arminian theologians standing in Reformers tradition, but leaning toward Catholicism on the issue of free will, need to ground their position more Biblically in order to defend their conclusions.

¹³ Ibid., pp. 553-554.

V. METHOD OF PROCEDURE

This has been an inductive Biblical study, initiated with as little personal bias and prejudice as is possible in the human situation, and with the assumption implicit that the Bible is a divinely inspired document, genuine and authentic. It was the purpose of the writer to engage in a thoroughly objective investigation of that Book in order to clarify the confusing picture presented by Arminian theologians, especially in so far as their conclusions are taught relating to the manner of recovery of the image of God in Man.

The first problem was to determine the scripturalness of the phrase, "loss and restoration of the image of God." A word study of εἰκων in the Greek New Testament brought serious question as to the accuracy of the expression in so far as the immediate work of redemption was concerned. This led to an investigation of the Genesis account of man's creation and a Hebrew word study of the two terms צֶלֶם tselem (image) and דְּמוּת demuth (likeness). Every occurrence of these two words in every state and stem was observed, against its context, throughout the Old Testament, to determine the possible significant difference between them. Each term was then compared with the Greek equivalent in the Septuagint translation. It was then necessary to determine whether the terms image and

likeness, were consistently carried into the New Testament and used in essentially the same way as the corresponding Hebrew words in the Old Testament.

With these distinctions in mind one chapter was devoted to a Biblical study of the quality and condition of the image of God as it is retained by natural, fallen man. Since there are very few direct statements to this point, it was necessary to isolate by inductive study what in man was unchanged after the fall and what was altered and in what way, as it was mirrored in the expectations God had of men and the Biblical descriptions of fallen man. Man's whole relationship to law was involved here, and implicates his ethical conduct. A word study of *roûs* (mind) and its cognates, was necessary since the study of man's fallen condition centered around that term. This whole analysis demanded another chapter examining Biblically the nature of the deviation of fallen man from his original created perfection.

A further step in the investigation was a Biblical study of what redemption provides and in this research a more clear picture evolved as to the true nature of the image of God in man. Merely touched upon was the function of faith to the recovery effected in redemption. The last step was an investigation into the manner of the recovery of the image of God in man.

CHAPTER II

IMAGE AND LIKENESS

There seemed to be good reason to question the Reformers' decision against the Roman Catholic position on image and likeness. From earliest Christian history the Patristic Fathers had recognized a distinction between the two terms,¹ but the Roman Catholic divines had added to the distinction in kind, a separation in time, so that to them "likeness" had become a super-added gift of grace subsequently bestowed upon a perfect human being. This supernatural gift was that of supernatural or habitual grace which aided in the conflict between spirit and flesh, lifting spirit to a superior place over flesh.² This doctrine supported the dualism so deplored by Protestant theologians who substituted the doctrine of "vocation" in its place. Without real discrimination, the truths that may have resided in the Catholic position were cast out by the Reformers, with the error involved. Therefore, no thorough analysis of the Biblical doctrine of man could well avoid a re-opening of this issue.

There were three major reasons for re-opening the question relative to the possible difference in meaning

¹ A. A. Hodge, Outlines of Theology (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1880), p. 305.

² William G. T. Shedd, A History of Christian Doctrine (New York: Charles Scribner & Sons, 1865), p. 143.

between image and likeness, prior to the study of the loss and restoration of the image of God in man. In the first place, both the Catholic affirmation and the Protestant denial of the difference, with the consequent divergence of theology from that point, constituted it an issue of importance. In addition, Protestant theologians, while denying the probability of a difference in the meaning of these two terms, uniformly affirm that image must be conceived under two aspects, Essential and Incidental, or similar expressions, based purely on philosophical grounds, without Scriptural defence. This concession to philosophy is significant.

In the second place, Archbishop Richard Trench, the Biblical scholar of the last century, encouraged a questioning of the frequently made statement that the Hebrew and Greek pairs of synonyms contain no particular progression in thought. He proceeds on the assumption that Biblical writers were as discriminating and exact in their expressions (and more so) as secular writers of contemporary times. His illustrations from classic authors are overwhelmingly convincing. The aim of his admirable volume on Synonyms

has been to lead some into closer and more accurate investigation of His Word, in whom, and therefore in whose words, 'all the riches of wisdom and knowledge are contained.'³

³ Richard Chenevix Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1947), introduction.

The third reason developed as a result of a rather intensive Biblical study in which the words, image and likeness, were especially noted. The exactness and clarity with which each is uniformly used throughout the Old Testament is striking. There is no confusion or lack of careful discrimination in the choice of these terms in any passage. The peculiar distinctions of each are maintained throughout.

I. WORD STUDY

Hebrew Word Study. The Genesis account of the advent of man uses the two very different words to describe the event. The Hebrew word צֶלֶם , (image) is preceded by the preposition בְּ (b^e), and the word כְּדֹמְיוֹ , (likeness) by the preposition כְּ (k^e).

And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. . . And God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him: male and female created He them.⁴

As a preliminary observation it was interesting to note that although God's plan was to include both the image and likeness, in the full purpose for man the execution of the plan so far as original creation was concerned ended with the creation of the image.

Another observation was made regarding the affinity of the Hebrew word בָּרָא (create), to צֶלֶם (image), and עָשָׂה (make),

⁴ Genesis 1: 26, 27.

to לְדַמּוּת (likeness). "Let us make man in our image, after our Likeness," but "He created man in his image. In his image created he him. Male and female created he them." This seems to indicate that the "image" was an immediate creation of all that was essentially human. That this creation pleased God testifies to the perfection and moral quality of it. The first was perfect in so far as his original formation and equipment was concerned. There seems to be every evidence that in Adam's very structure and substance resided God's image. "Likeness" appears to be associated in these early chapters, at least, with a secondary phase of creation, "the making" and points to a less concrete, more abstract concept so far as man is concerned, which will be considered in another place. With this as a background, a more detailed study of the Old Testament terms seemed justified.

According to Gesenius,⁵ the word translated "image" (צֶלֶם) is a cognate of the verb צָלַח, to be shady or dark. From this concept of shade, the idea of shadow developed. A shadow then, being the dark portion cast in the outline of the original object, was an image. Gesenius referred to the Greek word σκία, as a proper synonym, which Thayer said was "an image cast by an object and representing the form of that

⁵ William Gesenius, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1893), p. 710.

object."⁶ After the reference to man as being made in the "image of God" in Genesis 9:6, in no other place in the Old Testament does image refer to man again. In every other case it is used as a representation of persons or things in some concrete form, idols, hewn or molten. There were images of things,⁷ of men,⁸ and of gods.⁹ Only in the creation account in Genesis 1 and the recapitulation of it in Genesis 5, (with the added statement regarding Seth's relationship to Adam), and an exhortation against taking human life¹⁰ is the term used of man in relation to his Maker. Image, everywhere in Old Testament usage, carries the idea of a concrete substance representing some idea or prototype. It is definite conformity to a pattern or mold.

Likeness stands in contrast to this idea, having in it more the thought of comparison, imitation, or becoming. B. Davidson said it meant, "to be or become like; in the Niphil, to resemble; in the Piel, to compare with or become like."¹¹

⁶ Joseph Henry Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (New York: American Book Company, 1886), p.578.

⁷ I Samuel 6:5; 6:11.

⁸ Ezekiel 16:17; 23:14.

⁹ Numbers 33:52; II Kings 11:18; Ezekiel 7:20.

¹⁰ Genesis 9:6.

¹¹ B. Davidson, The Analytical Hebrew & Chaldee Lexicon (London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, n.d.), p. CL11.

Gesenius¹² added the following: To liken in one's mind, to imagine, to think,¹³ to purpose,¹⁴ to remember.¹⁵

Beyond the three references to man's creation¹⁶ likeness is probably, in every other case in the Old Testament, used to introduce a figure of speech, "like unto beryl";¹⁷ "like the poison of a serpent";¹⁸ "like a lion";¹⁹ "like a pelican";²⁰ "like a roe."²¹ Other usages follow as obviously, "what likeness will ye compare unto (God)?"²² "out of the midst. . .came the likeness of creatures."²³ As was true with the word image, so also with the word likeness in that no reference past the early Genesis account, related it with man and God as in any sense referring to an original creation. Once,²⁴ only, "The day star, son of the morning" was said to

¹² Gesenius, op. cit.

¹³ Psalm 50:21; Isaiah 10:7.

¹⁴ Isaiah 14:24.

¹⁵ Psalm 48:10.

¹⁶ Genesis 1:26; 5:1; 5:3.

¹⁷ Ezekiel 1:16.

¹⁸ Psalm 58:4.

¹⁹ Psalm 17:12.

²⁰ Psalm 102:6.

²¹ Song of Solomon 2:9; 2:17; 8:14.

²² Isaiah 40:18.

²³ Ezekiel 1:5.

²⁴ Isaiah 14:14.

have declared he would "make himself like the Most High," but the context makes it quite clear that his aspiration was not to a moral likeness to God, but was a vicious challenge to His position as the sovereign of the universe.

Image has within it the idea of conformity to a pattern, objectively. It is the recipient of an action. It is the result of something. There is form and substance to it. It is passive. Likeness, on the other hand, implies activity on the part of the object. It is changed or changes itself from one quality or condition to another or resembles another object in some particular.

Even the prepositions serve to distinguish between image and likeness. The ב before וַיִּשְׁׁבֹּב ²⁵ primarily denotes the being and remaining in a place. "The original form is here (Genesis 1:26) conceived of as the rule or standard within which a copy is kept."²⁶ The כִּי preceding וַיִּשְׁׁבֹּב denotes resemblance, as, like, as if, "like a flock of sheep."²⁷

Septuagint Word Study. Continuing the investigation through the Septuagint translation of the Hebrew scriptures into Greek, the discovery was made that for וַיִּשְׁׁבֹּב the ancient

²⁵ Genesis 1:26.

²⁶ Gesenius, op. cit., p. 105.

²⁷ Judges 8:18; Job 11:10; Gesenius, op. cit., p. 440.

Greek scholars had put εἰκών and for ἡ γῆ, ὁμοίωσις ²⁸ and these translations and distinctions are consistently held throughout the entire Old Testament, according to Gesenius and Thayer and others.

Greek Word Study. The word εἰκών (image) in classical Greek usage came up through an interesting history. On the Rosetta stone it is used to designate a statue (εἰκόνα) of Ptolemy which was being built.²⁹ In other early records it was used for the description of individuals in official documents.³⁰ Thieme has well pointed out how the ancient practice of erecting εἰκόνας of their gods, would give force to such New Testament passages as Colossians 3:10 and II Corinthians 4:4.³¹ Of the ten occurrences, outside the book of Revelation (where the language is clearly symbolic), one refers to law, negatively. It is not the real thing but a shadow.³² One refers to man as the pattern for an idol;³³ one (in each of the Synoptics)

²⁸ Vetus Testamentum Graece (Lipsiae: Sumptibus Ernesti Bredtii, 1868).

²⁹ James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1949), p. 183.

³⁰ Loc. cit.

³¹ Loc. cit.

³² Hebrews 10:1.

³³ Romans 1:23.

to describe Caesar's picture on a coin;³⁴ one is applied to man made in God's image;³⁵ and one points to a heavenly image after the analogy of the earthly image which men bear here.³⁶ All of these usages suggest quite definite, concrete, objective entities, either the mold or that which is molded. The other five refer to Christ, himself, as the image of God, bearing various relationships to man.³⁷ The concreteness of the idea of image as revealed in a fairly careful attention to these passages should be noted. Also, it should be pointed out that of the two passages that speak of a change in man toward likeness to the image of Christ,³⁸ both are expressed in the progressive present tense, μεταμορφούμεθα (transformed)³⁹ and ἀνακαινούμενοι (renovation, renewal),⁴⁰

The same distinction between likeness and image was noticed in Greek usage as in the Hebrew. *ὁμοίωμα* and its cognates, according to Thayer means, "like, similar, resembling, correspondence to, to be or become like, to compare one thing

³⁴ Matthew 22:20; Mark 12:16; Luke 20:24.

³⁵ I Corinthians 11:7.

³⁶ I Corinthians 15:49.

³⁷ Romans 8:29; II Corinthians 3:18; II Corinthians 4:4; Colossians 1:15; 3:10.

³⁸ Romans 8:29; II Corinthians 3:18; Colossians 3:10.

³⁹ II Corinthians 3:18.

⁴⁰ Colossians 3:10.

with another or to make like."⁴¹ Moulton and Milligan⁴² said in part, "of like nature";⁴³ "same rank or station" (classical Greek); "in the same way."⁴⁴ As distinguished from εἰκών, which implies an archetype, the "likeness" or "form" in ὁμοίωμα may be accidental, as one egg is like another.⁴⁵ In examining the New Testament passages using this term, it was observed that, outside the book of Revelation, in the fifty-one places where the word is used, thirty-four introduce comparisons in parabolic form;⁴⁶ eight are comparisons of someone to physical, moral or spiritual qualities of another, such as, "tempted like as we are"⁴⁷ "like Melchizedec"⁴⁸ "in the likeness of sinful men"⁴⁹ "Elias was a man. . . of like passions with us."⁵⁰ Six or seven occurrences have moral and spiritual likeness to God, or Christ to his brethren, as a subject: "we shall be like him for we shall see him as he

⁴¹ Thayer, op. cit., p. 445.

⁴² Moulton and Milligan, op. cit., pp. 448-449.

⁴³ Acts 14:15; James 5:17.

⁴⁴ Hebrews 4:15; 7:15.

⁴⁵ Moulton and Milligan, Loc. cit.

⁴⁶ Matthew 7:24; Mark 4:30; Luke 7:31; etc.

⁴⁷ Hebrews 4:15.

⁴⁸ Hebrews 7:15.

⁴⁹ Philemon 2:7.

⁵⁰ James 5:17.

is";⁵¹ and others referring to the God-head and representations of it, as idols of gold, etc.⁵²

Trench considered this matter of very great importance. He said,

There is a twofold theological interest attending the distinction between εἰκών and the two words which are brought into comparison with it (ὁμοίωσις and ὁμοίωμα); the first belonging to the Arian controversy, . . . while the other is an interest that, seeming at first sight remote from any controversy, has yet contrived to insinuate itself into more than one, namely, whether there be a distinction, and if so, what it is, between the 'image' (εἰκών) of God, in which, and the 'likeness' (ὁμοίωσις) of God, after which, man was created at the beginning (Gen. 1. 26).⁵³

Whereas there are places where the terms might seem to be equivalents

When the Church found it necessary to raise up bulwarks against Arian error and equivocation, it drew a strong distinction between these two, one not arbitrary, but having essential difference in the words themselves for its ground.⁵⁴

εἰκών always assumes a prototype from which it has been derived and drawn; while ὁμοιότης, ὁμοίωσις, and words of this family express an accidental similarity or resemblance which implies no kinship. Only the term image could be applied to Christ in His relationship to God, never merely a likeness. The first

⁵¹ I John 3:2.

⁵² Acts 17:29.

⁵³ Trench, op. cit., p. 49.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 50.

is a family tie, a filial relationship; the second is simply an accidental superficial resemblance.

The Great Alexandrian theologians taught that the image was some thing common to all men, continuing even after the fall. They said that the likeness was something "toward which man was created, that he might strive after and attain it."⁵⁵

The Alexandrians, I believe, were very near the truth, if they did not grasp it altogether. . . We may be bold to say that the whole history of man, not only in his original creation, but also in his after restoration and reconstitution in the Son, is significantly wrapped up on this double statement; which is double for this very cause, that the Divine Mind did not stop at the contemplation of his first creation, but looked on him as 'renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him' (Col.iii.10); because it knew that only as partaker of this double benefit would he attain the true end for which he was ordained.⁵⁶

Conclusions. There are a number of conclusions which may be safely drawn from the foregoing analysis.

(a). From a Biblical standpoint it is legitimate to distinguish between "image" and "likeness" in reference to man's relationship to God. The Hebrew terms are distinct and almost never confused in usage throughout the entire Old Testament. The Septuagint consistently translates εἰκών for פְּדָיִם and ὁμοίωμα for דְּמֹתָיִם. The New Testament usage of "image" and "likeness" is even more exact and discriminating than the

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 52.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 53.

Hebrew use of the terms and carries out the same emphasis in each corresponding word. The doctrinal implications of this study have been reserved for its appropriate place in this research.

(b). It is not accurate nor Scriptural to speak of an image lost or defaced as a result of the fall. Nor is there Biblical warrant for speaking of a moment when the "image" is "restored." In fact, "restored" is an incorrect term, "renewed" or "transformed" in the progressive present tense, being the New Testament way of expressing whatever may be meant.

(c). "Image" includes all that is essential to human beings as such, in a very concrete way, including moral qualities which God was said to have found "very good."⁵⁷ Whatever God is, man is His outlined shadow, not after the analogy of the illusiveness of shadows but the "shadowing forth" of the essential features of the prototype. Conversely, without falling into gross anthropomorphisms, something definite may be known about God by a proper study of man since God said, in effect, that man was a finite picture of what He is, infinitely. In this assertion there is no thought of any pantheistic identification of God and man, nor any trace of equating deity with man as the Stoics did and as modern religious philosophies teach.

⁵⁷ Genesis 1:31.

(d). "Likeness" throughout the Hebrew and Greek language suggests a comparison of qualities of personality, a potential in moral and spiritual matters that hangs in the balance of human probation. The reality of "likeness" resides in the imagination, the purpose, and the inclination of the heart.

(e). It is evident that though "image" and "likeness" are distinct terms, no Scriptural authority is anywhere evident that "likeness" is a supernatural gift of grace, subsequently bestowed upon man after his creation, giving him original righteousness or sanctifying grace.

II. CONTENT OF TERM IMAGE

Historical. There has been a fairly wide divergence of opinion as to what the image of God may be. The frankly unbiblical opinions were ignored as being not pertinent to this study.

(1) Catholic. The decree from the Council of Trent serves to present a clear and authoritative statement of the Roman Catholic view.

"Cat. Council of Trent," Pt.2, ch.ii, Q, 19.--Lastly, he formed man from the slime of the earth, so created and qualified in body as to be immortal and impassable, not, however, in virtue of the strength of nature, but of the divine gift. But as regards the soul of man, he created it in his own image and likeness; gifted him with free-will and so tempered all his motions and appetites that they should at all times be subject to the control of

reason. He then added the admirable gift of original righteousness; and next gave him dominion over all other animals.--Ib. Pt. 2, Ch.ii, Q. 42, and Pt. 4, ch. xii., Q. 3.⁵⁸

They distinguished between image and likeness as follows: "by εἰκὼν an "image" was meant the natural, constitutional powers of man, intellectual and moral, as reason, conscience, free will.⁵⁹ ὁμοίωσις or "likeness" indicated the matured moral perfection resulting from the exercise of holy faculties.⁶⁰

Catholicism regards grace as a donum superadditum, as a higher gift which the Almighty added after He had created man; but at the same time, it maintains that human nature would still have been true human nature even without Divine grace.⁶¹

The matter is summed up by Bellarmine, concisely in "De Gratia," et Lib. Arbitrio I., c.6--

We are forced, by these many testimonies of the Fathers, to conclude that the image and likeness are not in all respects the same, but that the image pertains to the nature and the likeness to the virtues (moral perfections); whence it follows that Adam by sinning lost not the image but the likeness of God.⁶²

(2) Reformation theology has many voices, only a few of the representative ones of which will be noted.

Luther who spearheaded the new theology cool-headedly

⁵⁸ Cited from A. A. Hodge, Outlines of Theology (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1880), p. 306.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 305.

⁶⁰ Loc. cit.

⁶¹ H. Martensen, Christian Dogmatics (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1866), p. 140.

⁶² Hodge, op. cit., p. 305.

rejected Augustine's too neat trinitarian analogy but accepted the spirit of the ancient worthy when he said that since we have lost the image, we can never know what it really was, since Man is now so leperous and unclean.⁶³ Of the physical perfections even to the senses of hearing and sight, which Luther imagined, no mention need here be made, but only of the deeper meaning of image. He said,

Wherefore I, for my part, understand the image of God to be this;--that Adam possessed it in its moral substance, or nature;--that he not only knew God, and believed Him to be good, but that he lived also a life truly divine; that is, free from the fear of death and of all dangers, and happy in the favor of God.⁶⁴

So completely is this image lost, he thought, that to speak of it even, is to speak of a thing unknown, unexperienced and not in this life to be experienced.⁶⁵

John Calvin was less impressed with man's dignity as man than were the Roman Catholics.

Let it be understood, that, by his being made of earth and clay, a restraint was laid upon his pride, since nothing is more absurd than for creatures to glory in their excellence, who not only inhabit a cottage of clay, but who are themselves composed partly of dust and ashes.⁶⁶ . . . The image of God includes all the excellence in which the nature of man surpasses all the other species of

⁶³ Hugh Thompson Kerr, ed., A Compend of Luther's Theology (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1943), p. 80.

⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 82.

⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 83.

⁶⁶ John Calvin, Institutes (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1932), I, Book 1, Chapter XV, p. 171.

animals.⁶⁷

He felt that the image of God and with it all goodness was so far lost and gone that no possible human act or desire could be anything but evil. The slightest movement toward God was of God's own initiative with no possible co-operation from man. "He worked in us to will"⁶⁸ was his philosophy.

Hodge stated it in question and answer form. The answer to the question regarding the state of man at his creation was:

The likeness of man to God respected--1st. The kind of his nature; man was created like God a free, rational, personal spirit. 2nd. He was created like God as to the perfection of his nature; in knowledge, Col.iii.10; and righteousness and true holiness. Eph.iv.24; and 3d. In his dominion over nature. Gen.1:28.⁶⁹

This original righteousness, said Hodge, was natural in the sense that it was a moral perfection belonging to that nature, it is always essential to its perfection and would have been propagated had it not been lost. It is not natural

in the sense that reason or conscience or free agency are essential constituents of human nature. . .As a quality it is essential to the perfection, but as a constituent, it is not necessary to the reality of human nature.⁷⁰

That we are entirely dependent upon Scripture to make affirmation regarding this issue, was A. H. Strong's conviction.

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 175.

⁶⁸ Ibid., Book II, Chapter III, p. 267.

⁶⁹ Hodge, op. cit., p. 300.

⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 301.

Colossians 3:10 and Ephesians 4:24 furnished the ground for his position, concerning which he attempted to avoid so high a concept of man that no further progress was possible or so low a concept that from it he could not fall. To him, then, the "image of God" was, natural likeness to God, or holiness. Natural likeness is the ability to know self, and to determine self with moral ends in view. This natural likeness is inalienable and gives worth to the unregenerate. The moral likeness was a direction of the affections and will toward God. It was essential to this image, not as an essence of human nature, but as a moral disposition propagatable to Adam's descendants.⁷¹

"Man. . . is the free, personal unity of spirit and nature," said Martensen, "a spiritual soul, which is not held captive in corporeity. . ."⁷² He is a "copy in a state of created dependence what the divine Logos is as pattern, and as itself creative."⁷³ He is lord only in so far as he is servant.

The real relationship to God in the first Adam cannot have been a state of perfection, neither, on the other hand, a mere disposition, but rather a living commencement which contained within itself the possibility of a progressive development and a fulfillment of the vocation

⁷¹ Augustus Hopkins Strong, Systematic Theology (Rochester: Press of E. R. Andrews, 1886), pp. 261-263.

⁷² Dr. H. Martensen, Christian Dogmatics (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1866), p. 136.

⁷³ Ibid., p. 136.

of man.⁷⁴

If the divine likeness was not to be a mere gift, but rather a self-acquired attribute of humanity, it was necessary that the paradisaical condition should come to an end. The liberty of man had, therefore, to be brought within range of temptation.⁷⁵

MacPherson, a Presbyterian, felt that "etymology does not encourage the attempt. . .to make a regular and sharp distinction between image. . .and likeness,"⁷⁶ yet he did make use of the terms to indicate different aspects of the one endowment. The image was self-consciousness and personality as the ground of all human qualities, with likeness indicating the moral and religious aspirations, which if attained would bring perfect likeness to God. The full image involved a dignity and an ideal, an actual and a potential. Pointedly, he declared, "Protestant theology, . . .

would have escaped much confusion and many needless and unconvincing doctrinal refinements if it had not encumbered itself with the idea that it must define sin as the loss of the image, or of something belonging to the image. . .⁷⁷

for if the image were lost he would cease to be man. The "likeness of God," he said, "is properly regarded as the true destination of man, the ideal held out before him from the

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 152.

⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 155.

⁷⁶ John MacPherson, Christian Dogmatics (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898), p. 202.

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 203.

first for his ultimate attainment."⁷⁸

Matthew Henry, in his commentary said:

The two words (image & likeness) express the same thing, and making each other the more expressive; image and likeness denote the likeliest image. . . In his nature and constitution. . . In his place and authority. . . In his purity and rectitude. . . He was upright, . . . had habitual conformity. . . to God's whole will. . . There were no errors or mistakes in his knowledge. . . his affections were all regular.⁷⁹

Modern writers in the Calvinistic tradition concur in essence. Machen's view is essentially the same as the Calvinistic wing of Protestantism in that he takes a firm stand for an image in man which could be and was radically altered in the fall.⁸⁰ This position forces him to an imputation theory of restoration in which actual righteousness is impossible. "Saved people. . . are sinners,"⁸¹ he said.

W. T. Connor believes that it is the will in man as a factor of personality that distinguishes him as being made in the image of God. He must be capable of obedience or disobedience.⁸²

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 210.

⁷⁹ Matthew Henry, A Commentary on the Holy Bible (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., n.d.), I, p. 6.

⁸⁰ J. Gresham Machen, The Christian View of Man (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1947), p. 173.

⁸¹ Ibid., p. 260.

⁸² W. T. Connor, Christian Doctrine (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1945), p. 131.

L. Berkhof considers the following statements to be the teaching of Scripture.

1. The words "image" and "likeness" are used synonymously, and interchangeably and do not refer to two different things. . . .

2. The image of God in which man was created. . . is called "original righteousness," or more specifically, true knowledge, righteousness, and holiness. . . . It may be called the moral image of God. . . .

3. The image of God is not to be restricted to the original knowledge, righteousness, and holiness which was lost by sin, but also includes elements which belong to the natural constitution of man. . . (i.e), intellectual power, natural affections and moral freedom. . . (but which has been) vitiated by sin.

4. Spirituality.

5. Immortality.⁸³

(3) Arminian Theology. In the same tradition in so far as attitude toward Catholic doctrine is concerned, but diametrically in opposition to Reformed soteriology came James Arminius. "Man," he said, "is a creature of God, consisting of a body and a soul."⁸⁴ The body would not have been liable to death, if man had not sinned. The soul, created by infusion, is simple, immaterial and immortal. It has two faculties, understanding and will: understanding to comprehend truth, universal and particular and will as an inclination to good. Two habits inhere: Wisdom, to understand supernatural truth and Righteousness and the Holiness of

⁸³ L. Berkhof, Systematic Theology (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949), pp. 203-205.

⁸⁴ James Arminius, The Works of James Arminius, trans. by James Nichols (London: Longman, Rees, Orne, Brown and Green, 1828), II, p. 362.

Truth, by which the will was fitted and ready to follow what wisdom commanded. Some parts of the image are natural to man, i.e., to be spirit and to be endowed with power of understanding and of willing, but other parts are supernatural and accidental, such as knowledge of God and rectitude and holiness of the will according to that knowledge.⁸⁵

John Wesley, who spearheaded the holiness movement, taking his stand in the Arminian stream, in a sermon on "The New Birth" (John 3:7), said

God created man in his own image. . .not barely in his natural image. . .immortality. . .a spiritual being. . .nor merely in his political image. . .dominion. . .but chiefly in his moral image. . .righteousness and true holiness. . .(Since) God is love. . .man. . .was full of love. . .God is full of justice, mercy and truth; so was man in the beginning. . .He was created able to stand, and yet liable to fall.⁸⁶

Wesley was "semi-Pelagian" with his face toward Augustine. He was Pelagian in affirming human freedom and by defining sin as a voluntary transgression; he was Augustinian in his position on the reality of original sin and the need for divine grace. "Thus he sought to hold to human responsibility without human self-sufficiency."⁸⁷

⁸⁵ Ibid., pp. 362-363.

⁸⁶ John Wesley, The Works of John Wesley (New York: J. Emory and B. Waugh, 1831), I, p. 400.

⁸⁷ George Allen Turner, "Is Entire Sanctification Scriptural?" Unpublished doctrinal thesis for Harvard University, 1946, p. 146.

Wesley's view of fallen man becomes a further commentary of his view of man's original condition.

The Fall completely reversed the conditions of human life. Primitive perfection was replaced by total corruption of man's nature. . . .He. . .suffered spiritual, temporal, and eternal death ('The Doctrine of Original Sin,' 1757, W., IX, p. 245). Both God's favor and the imago Dei in which he was created were now utterly lost ('What is Man?' 1788, W. VII, p. 230. 'The Heavenly Treasure in Earthen Vessels, 1790, W. VII, p. 344). . . . Once the image of God, he is now stamped with the image of the devil:. . .'⁸⁸

Wesley did not think the natural and political image of man was totally lost, but he considered this irrelevant to salvation. Justification, to Wesley, meant liberation from the guilt of sin and sanctification meant liberation from the inherent power and root of sin and the restoration of God's image.⁸⁹

The commentator of early Methodism, Adam Clark, thought "The image and likeness must necessarily be intellectual, his mind, his soul, must have been formed after the nature and perfections of his God."⁹⁰

Pope represented a school of Wesleyan Arminian theology farther removed from Calvinism than Arminius or Wesley. For

⁸⁸ Harald Lindstrom, Wesley and Sanctification (London: The Epworth Press, 1946), p. 26.

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 19.

⁹⁰ Adam Clark, The Holy Bible, with a Commentary and Critical Notes (Cincinnati: Applegate Company, 1859), p. 38.

him, the image was both Essential and Indestructible (which is always, in the "holy record regarded as uneffaced and un-effaceable," he contended), and Accidental and Amissible, a part of the image which was effaced but renewed in its moral lineaments. This Accidental image manifested the free spirit of man reflecting "Divine holiness in a perfect conformity of mind, feeling, will, which was lost through sin: not utterly lost only because redemption intervened."⁹¹

Joseph Benson, was in general agreement.

In our image, after our likeness--Two words signifying the same thing. . .In soul of man. . .we look for divine image. . .Like God, man's soul is a spirit, immaterial, invisible, active, intelligent, free, immortal, and, when first created, endowed with a high degree of divine knowledge, and with holiness and righteousness. . .He was also invested with an image of God's authority and dominion.⁹²

Very carefully John Miley leads his readers to the assertion that it is the spiritual nature which was originally like God. The intellectual and emotional and moral nature testified to likeness as did the implicit sense of holiness.⁹³

Raymond concluded that

it is obvious that the term 'image of God'. . .is an indefinite description of likeness, the likeness consisting

⁹¹ William Burton Pope, A Compendium of Christian Theology (New York: Phillips and Hunt, 1875), I, pp. 423-424.

⁹² Joseph Benson, The Holy Bible. . .with Critical, Explanatory and Practical Notes (N.Y.: Carlton & Phillips, 1854), I, p. 19.

⁹³ John Miley, Systematic Theology (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1892), p. 407.

not so much in any one feature of the image as in a general similarity.⁹⁴

Man, therefore, was a spirit, a conscious subject of thoughts, emotions and volitions, and he was perfect, in completeness and adjustment. He was created in, not endowed with, the image so that its loss would constitute him less than a man.

Daniel Steele offered a refreshingly different point of view. He apparently ignored the primal condition of man as a thing past and forever gone and asserted that in Christ a new order was established. No longer are we to look back to restoration to an old image but forward to conformity to the image of the New Man, Christ Jesus, not back to Adam's perfection but forward to sonship which implies "life" and "likeness" to God. The new order is to be a "partaker of the divine nature."⁹⁵ Love and holiness are the two qualities which characterize this new order of being, this likeness to Christ.⁹⁶ He summarized the new "togetherness" of Christ and believers thus:

- | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Crucified together, | (Gal.ii.20) |
| 2. Quickened together, | (Col.ii.13) |
| 3. Raised together, | (Eph.ii.6) |
| 4. Seated together, | (Eph.ii.6) |
| 5. Sufferers together, | (Rom.viii.17) |
| 6. Heirs together, | (Rom.viii.17) |
| 7. Glorified together, | (Rom.viii.17) ⁹⁷ |

⁹⁴ Minor Raymond, Systematic Theology (Cincinnati: Cranston and Stowe, 1877), pp. 38-39.

⁹⁵ II Peter 1:4.

⁹⁶ Daniel Steele, Milestone Papers (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1876), pp. 9-18.

⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 25.

Oswald Chambers said, "The Image of God in its primary reference to man must refer to the hidden or interior life of man."⁹⁸

Wiley, perhaps the most prominent contemporary Wesleyan Arminian theologian, sums up the position by saying that the image belongs to man's "inmost creaturely constitution,"⁹⁹ and that original righteousness was included.¹⁰⁰ The Natural or Essential image comprised, spirituality, knowledge (with the moral qualities implied) and immortality.¹⁰¹ The moral or incidental image "has to do with the rightness or wrongness in the use of"¹⁰² the powers represented in the natural image. The moral image was lost in the fall. Justification adopts man into the family of God, "sanctification restores the image of God."¹⁰³ In this he concurs with John Wesley.¹⁰⁴

Biblical Study of the Content of the Term Image.

There is little if anything said directly in the Old or New

⁹⁸ Oswald Chambers, Biblical Psychology (Cincinnati: God's Revivalist Office, 1914), p. 13.

⁹⁹ H. Orton Wiley, Christian Theology (Kansas City: Kings Highway Press, 1941), II, p. 29.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 31.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., pp. 32-34.

¹⁰² Ibid., p. 38.

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 470.

¹⁰⁴ Wesley, op. cit., p. 369.

Testament concerning the exact meaning of the image of God in man. The clearest implications come from the New Testament.

Jesus declared positively that "God is Spirit" and men can only worship him "in spirit and truth," or, as spiritual beings sustaining to Him the relationship of truth.¹⁰⁵ To this point, Paul wrote to the Corinthians, asserting that only the spiritual in man could know and fellowship with God.¹⁰⁶ The spiritual aspect of man, though never to the disparagement of the physical, is everywhere in Scripture recognized as the essence of his being. "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."¹⁰⁷ It is man's spirit that has an affinity for God.

By legitimate implications also, it may be affirmed, because of the nature of the entire New Testament message, that man is a responsible being, possessed of faculties of intelligence, volition and affections.

Man's moral capacity is most clearly implied as being a constituent element in his created being. Man was chosen before the foundation of the world to be holy and without blame in love;¹⁰⁸ and that he should be "to the praise of his

¹⁰⁵ John 4:21-24.

¹⁰⁶ Matthew 10:28.

¹⁰⁷ Matthew 10:28.

¹⁰⁸ Ephesians 1:4.

glory."¹⁰⁹ Conformity to the image of his Son, though spoken of the new image as something foreknown and predestined,¹¹⁰ could also be predicated of the original image. Knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις), "correct knowledge of things ethical and divine"¹¹¹ was part of the image,¹¹² as was also "righteousness and true holiness" (or "truth holiness," ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας).¹¹³

Old Testament. Upon the basis of these New Testament statements, legitimate conclusions may be drawn from the creation account. Dominion is clearly not, of itself, the image,¹¹⁴ as some would assert. It is more likely to be a demonstration of the image and as such, points to its essential features. Having the image, dominion was possible. Perhaps what was involved in dominion was the purpose of creation.

(a) It points to a complete transcendence of mind and spirit over matter, a concept which strikes sharply across the contemporary philosophy which sees mind struggling to free itself from the clutches of the clinging earth.

¹⁰⁹ Ephesians 1:12.

¹¹⁰ Romans 8:29.

¹¹¹ Thayer, op. cit., p. 237.

¹¹² Colossians 3:10.

¹¹³ Ephesians 4:24.

¹¹⁴ Miley, op. cit., p. 407.

(b) Dominion infers self-consciousness and self-determination.

(c) It implies intelligence and hence an intelligent personality.

(d) It implies intellectual and moral freedom.

(e) It implies an intelligent stewardship of responsibility with the understanding of personal merit and penal sanctions.

(f) Dominion was a delegated power, not autonomously possessed. As such it implies an ability to understand the commands of God, who was his authority, to choose according to His will and to fellowship with His person.

To recapitulate; man, as an image of God, was spirit as well as body, intelligent, moral, holy, related to God in context of truth. George Watson expressed it aptly when he said, "God is our nearest relative."¹¹⁵

III. EVALUATION OF HISTORICAL POSITIONS AGAINST BIBLICAL ANALYSIS

Three major historical points of view have obtained in Western Christendom. The Roman Catholic position separates sharply between image and likeness, not only in the formal aspect but also in time so that image may exist without likeness

¹¹⁵ George D. Watson, Our Own God (Cincinnati: Revivalist Office, 1904), p. 1.

with no penalty to essential human-hood. The image includes all the bodily and natural qualities. It is all that can be included in the term natural man. Likeness is the supernatural addition or the spiritual qualities which, without radical moral change, alters man's metaphysical structure. Man, as man, in this view is too good. It is a goodness tinged with a deistic relationship to God which leaves him devoid of a religious faculty.¹¹⁶ The "gift of grace" is essentially superficial and actually amoral. Sin is not so much in the realm of personal relationship between God and man as in a rejection of the human agency which dispenses grace, namely, the Church. In view of the foregoing Biblical investigation, it is the opinion of the writer, that the basic error in the Roman Catholic position is not primarily in distinguishing between the terms image and likeness, but in improperly identifying likeness with metaphysical being. Image and likeness become parallel concepts. Apparently, this idea has no foundation in Scriptural teaching.

The Reformed position, both Lutheran and Calvinistic, deny any real distinction between image and likeness. In this they preserve two radical departures from Catholic theology, pertinent to this study, namely, the absolute sovereignty of God and the total depravity of man. They said that sin did

¹¹⁶ MacPherson, op. cit., p. 204.

not separate a natural image from a supernatural addition but that since image and likeness are identical, every part of man was deranged by the fall. There was radical difference of opinion between Reformation leaders, differences that influence theology today. Luther did not seek the imago Dei in any of the natural endowments of man but only in original righteousness which was totally lost in the fall.¹¹⁷ Calvin, on the other hand, distinguished between the natural and moral images. He saw all the natural endowments in the natural image and spiritual qualities (as opposed to spiritual being, as the Catholics held) in the moral image. "The whole image was vitiated by sin, but only spiritual qualities were entirely lost in the fall."¹¹⁸ But so altered was fallen man in both these views that actual righteousness could never be acquired in his human existence. So "unable" is he that only by irresistible grace can God provide even a judicial salvation to the "elect." Man is counted righteous by imputation only and receives the "gift of perseverance" in place of the Catholic "gift of grace." Sin, then, is that lack of conformity to God's will implicated in a deformed "image" and may also be said to be personally amoral. In the light of the Scriptural study, it is the opinion of the writer that the

¹¹⁷ Berkhof, op. cit., p. 202.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 203.

Reformed view is more in keeping with Biblical teaching than the Catholic view in its monistic concept of human nature but less consistent in its failure to recognize the proper distinction between image and likeness.

Wesleyan Arminian theology seeks to correct the errors in both Catholic and Reformed theology within the setting of the prevailing Protestant context. They have maintained a distinction between the Essential image and Accidental image, the inamissible from the amissible, the natural from the moral while they deny the difference between them. They have said the image was lost or marred by sin, and restored in Christ but at the same time affirming as Pope did, that the image is ineffacable. To preserve the dignity of man and his moral freedom on the one hand, and the total dependency of man on God for his salvation on the other, they have taken a position rather difficult to defend, namely, that part of an image was lost, another part retained, thereby separating constituent parts of man. They are technically caught in the dualism of Catholic theology which they deplore.

In a word Calvinists say the image with its primitive holiness is so defaced as to make actual restoration impossible in this life. Arminians are divided. One group stands essentially with the Calvinists on the extent of depravity but affirms prevenient grace for all. The other group divides the image into Essential and Accidental or natural and moral,

saying that the moral is lost but the natural retained, thereby preserving free will and the possibility of restored holiness.

In view of both the Scriptural distinctions and historical interpretations it would perhaps be harmonious with the spirit of both to say that a clear distinction should be maintained between image and likeness but that they are in no sense separate entities or faculties, but rather two aspects of a single creation. In the judgment of this writer, it would be truer to Biblical usage and not in violation of Christian thought to distinguish by the terms Actual and Potential, as MacPherson has done, or even as Substantial and Relational,¹¹⁹ the Actual or Substantial including everything from self-consciousness to primitive righteousness and the Potential or Relational obviously referring to the adjustment and development required to maintain an integrated image. It would be inaccurate to say either or both were lost in a primary sense. Can image describe a truly moral quality? Does not the very connotation of moral, require a probationary choice which the term image, as used in the Old and New Testaments, cannot sustain? Following the same reasoning, is not likeness more conformable to all that probation implies? Is it not the fulfillment of God's original expectancy when He

¹¹⁹ Ramsey, op. cit., p. 261.

made man to be conformed to the image of His Son?¹²⁰ An analogy, not carried too far, may be helpful. Suppose a child is born, as perfect as medical science considers is possible. He is both actual or substantial, in every human respect, and he is also possessed of the ability and responsibility of growth and social adjustment. But the pituitary gland fails to function so growth and development is inhibited. As a result the failure is reflected in a deformed body, and soon a man's face peers grotesquely out of the body of a child. If the gland were capable of intelligent choice the analogy would be more apt for all that is meant by human responsibility is involved here. (Nor is it the thought of the writer that human goodness evolves out of resident native virtues). The qualities essential to true humanhood, intelligence, volition, and inclination or disposition, when functioning in a proper relationship to God, namely, in love and obedience, produce in time a mature and full grown man whose very perfection is a praise to his Maker's glory. If, however, the spiritual pituitary gland (or the human disposition) repudiates its responsibility and purpose of existence and refuses to perform its normal function, not only is the whole body hurt but the gland itself, becomes diseased and corrupting.

¹²⁰ Romans 8:29.

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE FALL IN RELATION TO THE IMAGE

The Biblical record of the fall of man, is the source material from which the following brief analysis has been made. Man's relationship to God and things, depended on his attitude toward one law which God hung in the moral universe. It was simple, but it was law--"Thou shalt not. . ." By breaking that single law, man challenged God's veracity, integrity and authority. He no longer stood in the relationship of truth to Him, hence his holiness was lost. He doubted God's integrity and blocked the one avenue of fellowship between man and God, faith. He rejected His authority and set himself up in God's place and became a moral rebel in an orderly universe. There were natural results and divine penal sanctions. The natural results were depravation in every area of his being due to deprivation of the Holy Spirit, the source of holiness and spiritual life. His intellect was darkened because he no longer was in contact with truth. His will was perverted because believing a lie he persisted in pursuing error. His affections were degraded because loving himself his whole life drive was perverted. He had sinned and became a sinner. But beyond the natural was the divine sanction, "Thou shalt surely die." Justly, the wrath of God turned upon the rebel. It was not an impulsive, ungoverned anger, but the just and solemn sentence of a righteous judge made in full accordance with a prearranged contract. Condemnation and the curse of death fell as a black

shadow upon man from God's righteousness shining behind a violated law. "He lost the life of God: he was separated from him, in union with whom his spiritual life consisted. The body dies when it is separated from the soul; the soul when it is separated from God. . . 'He was alienated from the life of God'.¹²¹

As dominion was not the "image" but a demonstration of the powers resident in the image, so the withdrawal of the delegated commissions was not of itself loss of the image but a demonstration of God's estimate of the moral unfitness of man to rule.¹²² Having usurped the place of God he lost his vice-royalty. He was a deposed prince, compelled to serve that which he was made to master. He retained the faculties of lordship but lost his "portfolio."

In order to more fully determine the content of the term "image" it is necessary to discover by inductive Biblical study what change, if any, occurred in man as a result of the fall. A clearer picture will develop when God's expectancy of fallen man is discovered.

¹²¹ Wesley, op. cit., I, pp. 400-401.

¹²² Raymond, op. cit., p. 65.

CHAPTER III

THE IMAGE IN NATURAL (FALLEN) MAN

That even fallen man stands in a morally responsible relationship to God is the clear teaching of Scripture from Genesis to Revelation. There is difference of opinion as to how man may meet that responsibility, depending upon traditional or individual theological presuppositions. Calvin and Jonathan Edwards were uncompromising advocates of the position Augustine conceived, i.e., that the exhortations in the Bible to right choice and holy living could only be directed to the elect who were regenerated and illuminated by the Holy Spirit and thus able to hear and to know. The genius of Arminianism is the emphasis upon true moral responsibility, not to the extreme of Pelagian moral autonomy but in affirming the universality of grace to all lost men, whereby each is afforded the power to choose or reject the provisions of Christ's offering. It is difficult to see how the New Testament can be intelligible apart from some measure of belief in human freedom, extending beyond the change effected by the Fall. There are two Biblical appeals that give this statement weight: one is the appeal to the fact of conscience; the other to the fact of law and these become two witnesses to the responsible nature of fallen man.

I. CONSCIENCE AND NATURAL MAN

The function of conscience in those outside the province of special revelation and law is clearly stated in the first three chapters of Romans. It precedes law.¹ It is as binding as law.² Violation of it carries the same penalty as broken law.³ It, apparently, represents the moral structure of righteousness, once active in Adam's inner nature. It remained in fallen man to approve or disapprove conduct in the light of objective standards of law. It must once have been the subjective "law written in the heart"⁴ which, because of the progressive degrading of human intelligence, volition and affection, was rendered less and less dependable as a guide to truth. However, as a hand mistress to law, it is retained as a reliable remnant of that which God first planted in the image of God in man. Paul's frequent reference to a good conscience⁵ would strengthen this position. It is a factor of primal moral importance. A proper regard for its function in man is absolutely essential to human integrity.

¹ Romans 2:14-15.

² Romans 2:12; 14-16.

³ Romans 1:18ff.

⁴ Jeremiah 31:33.

⁵ I Timothy 1:5; 1:19; II Timothy 1:3; etc.

II. LAW AND THE NATURAL MAN

The law was undoubtedly given to preserve in objective form that which was originally implicit in man's proper relationship to God. Paul's statement, "having in the law the form of knowledge and of the truth"⁶ gives authority for saying that the law is the structure of righteousness but not its essence or spirit. God put man in paradise under law, subjective, yet clearly known, but it rose up to condemn when it was violated. In like manner, Moses' law was not an innovation but the objectification of that which had always sustained knowledge of God and maintained truth.⁷

The law did not nor does it of itself, separate God and man. It has been shown that direct communication existed between them before the fall, in spite of, nay, because of the order sustained by law. Sin broke that fellowship by violating law, the structure of righteousness. Man has yet the capacity for fellowship but he has marred the facilities for communication. His facilities were set at right angles against the law of God. In that position, from man's point of view, the law seems like a barrier to God. Rather, it is, as Paul told the Galatians, a school-master or tutor to lead men to

⁶ Romans 2:20.

⁷ Galatians 3:19.

Christ.⁸ Men lost truth when they lost God. The law is the "form" of truth which fallen man can understand. It is not the purpose of this paper to develop a philosophy of law, as pertinent as it would be to the line of argument, but only to establish the fact that fallen man has, in God's sight, personal responsibility to law as a form of the truth he once sustained to God. There are a number of reasons for making this assertion.

III. SCRIPTURAL WITNESS

Jesus clearly taught that the law of Moses properly received, with the reading of the prophets should have led men to such an understanding of His Person as to command their acceptance of Him. To the two disheartened disciples on the way to Emmaus, He said, "O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken. Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into his glory? And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them all the scriptures the things concerning himself."⁹ And in another place He said, "Ye search the scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me; . . ."¹⁰

⁸ Galatians 3:24.

⁹ Luke 24:25-27.

¹⁰ John 5:39.

Paul's solemn charge against both Jews and Gentiles as recorded in the first three chapters of Romans was on the basis of man's ability to understand and keep God's law. Even the heathen held truth, and the indictment was that they held it in unrighteousness.¹¹ He specifically said that they knew God but that they refused to glorify Him as such.¹² They, also, knew the ordinance of God and the punitive sanctions involved and deliberately repudiated that which they knew and delighted in their disobedience.¹³ No clearer statement can be made than the one in this passage, to the effect that God considered man a morally mature and emotionally responsible person, intellectually qualified to discharge that responsibility solemnly. If this were not true, God's wrath would be not only absurd but immoral.

Even the seventh chapter of Romans, clearly reveals Paul's teaching concerning the capacity of natural fallen man. He has will¹⁴ which is capable of moral choice, though it, of itself is rooted in an evil inclination and hence impotent to lift man out of sin into righteousness. But he may will the good. He may even "delight in the law of God after the inner

¹¹ Romans 1:18.

¹² Romans 1:19-20.

¹³ Romans 1:32.

¹⁴ Romans 7:18.

man,"¹⁵ a possibility which adds terrible condemnation to those who use that faculty to delight in evil.¹⁶ His aspirations may be noble and good and right. Jesus recognized that ability, "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts, etc. . ."¹⁷ Natural man has not lost the faculty of aspiring to a proper pattern of life, even to a godly life.

Even to preserve a right condition of conscience is man's responsibility.¹⁸ The obligation to direct the love faculty properly is a personal moral choice.¹⁹ Evil men are not first deceived and then deceiving, but they deliberately deceive and then become deceived.²⁰

But is natural man responsible to the law of God? Apparently even here he is not so far gone from his original condition but that he is not. Both the rich, young, ruler who could tell Jesus he had kept the law from his youth up and be "loved" by Him for it,²¹ and Paul, who could testify, "I. . . as touching the righteousness which is in the law (was) found

¹⁵ Romans 7:22.

¹⁶ Romans 1:32.

¹⁷ Luke 11:13.

¹⁸ I Timothy 4:2.

¹⁹ II Timothy 3:2.

²⁰ II Timothy 3:13.

²¹ Mark 10:21.

blameless,"²² are examples of the power of human beings to sustain a proper relationship to the law.

Man, then, is intellectually responsible, volitionally responsible, emotionally responsible and morally responsible. He is responsible to law, to truth, and to all the revelation of God. God judges him and pours out His wrath upon disobedience. Every exhortation, and command in Holy Writ is made on the assumption that man can hear and understand and obey. There is not a law for the sinner, another for a Christian much less a third and intermediate system for unsanctified believers. There is one standard only with divine approval for those who keep it and divine condemnation for those who do not. The approval and condemnation, moreover, is personal, not merely the impersonal consequences of natural law. "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight."²³ "Father, I have sinned against heaven and against thee."²⁴

G. Campbell Morgan saw in this fact of responsibility to God the dignity and worth of the image of God in man. By being put in a place of dominion he would be

reminded of his relation to God and called upon to respond thereto. . . This conception of the relation between man and God creates that consciousness of what sin is, which fills the soul with fear. The determined prostitution of

²² Philippians 3:6.

²³ Psalm 51:4.

²⁴ Luke 15:18, 21.

powers which are akin to God, to purposes of evil, is terrible indeed.²⁵

The conclusion seems warranted that all the properties of human personality which have in any way to do with him as a morally responsible agent, are preserved even in fallen man. He may know enough about God to recognize Him as Creator and Lord. He is responsible for any failure to possess this knowledge, as though that kind of ignorance may have moral considerations. He has sufficient will to effect a change in life's direction and he comes under divine condemnation for directing his will against truth. He can desire right things and love God's law. In all the research of the author in this field not a single passage of Scripture was found which gave any hint that any man was absolved from responsibility for sin because of the loss of any facet of the image of God in him. There were no texts which provided the slightest excuse for sin even for a day. In fact, the force of Biblical condemnation for sin in the most depraved and alienated of men from God, becomes one of the most striking features of the Book. No message in all literature is so unequivocally against evil and demands such a high and noble response from man, and so robs him of comfort for his failure.

What then, is wrong with man? Has any significant alteration occurred within him since the fall? To determine what

²⁵ G. Campbell Morgan, Living Messages of the Books of the Bible (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1912), I, pp. 21-22.

may have been forfeited and to discover the area and nature of that forfeiture by Biblical study is the purpose of the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

LIKENESS IN NATURAL (FALLEN) MAN

Fallen man, though possessed of normal human faculties, able to know and do the law, and responsible for his moral attitudes and acts is yet said to be dead in trespasses and sins.¹ He is born in sin and is a partaker of the curse of sin,² which is death. It will be necessary to determine Biblically what may be the nature and extent of this death. Whatever death means, it is obvious that it is not a lessening of human responsibility in any measure, for moral capacity and moral responsibility stand or fall together. Whatever may lessen moral responsibility suggests a corresponding loss of capacity for moral existence and this in turn would rob mankind of the peculiar and distinctive dignity which makes him human. It is the opinion of the writer that three concepts are bound together into one inseparable whole, no one aspect of which can be touched without undermining the entire structure; man, as created in the image of God, man, as possessed of moral capacity, and man, as morally responsible. All these are necessary to real intelligence. If this be true, the metaphysical image of God in man, of necessity, remains intact

¹ Ephesians 2:1.

² Romans 5:12.

even in fallen man. Likeness, then, if the preceding observations have been correct, would be found in the realm of human personality where moral probation operates. Is this in keeping with the tenor of conservative theological opinion? And will a Biblical study of human nature bear out those assumptions?

I. HISTORICAL STATEMENTS REGARDING HUMAN NATURE

John Wesley held a dark view of man. In his sermon, "Salvation by Faith" he said:

His heart is altogether corrupt and abominable; being 'come short of the glory of God,' the glorious righteousness at first impressed on his soul, after the image of his great Creator. Therefore having nothing, neither righteousness nor works to plead, his mouth is utterly stopped before God.³

In the sermon, "The New Birth" these words are found:

Although man was made in the image of God, yet he was not made immutable. This would have been inconsistent with that state of trial in which God was pleased to place him. He was therefore created able to stand, and yet liable to fall. . . . Man did not abide in honor. . . . In that day he did die, he died to God, the most dreadful of all deaths. He lost the life of God. . . . And in Adam all died. . . . The natural consequence of this is, that every one descended from him comes into the world spiritually dead.⁴

Yet Wesley regarded man as morally responsible. This is brought out in his sermon "The Almost Christian" which is a description

³ Herbert Welch, ed., Selections from the Writings of the Rev. John Wesley, M. A. (New York: Abingdon Cokesbury Press, 1918), pp. 17-18.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 46-49.

of a moral man, whose righteousness avails nothing before God.

What is implied in being almost (a Christian)? . . . First, heathen honesty. . . By the rules of this they were taught that they ought not to be unjust, etc. . . . Again, the common heathens allowed, that some regard was to be paid to truth as well as to justice. . . Yet, again, there was a sort of love and assistance, which they expected one from another.⁵

In John Fletcher's "Third Check" he makes plain the difference between death and moral inability, though not directly.

. . . there are different degrees of spiritual death, which you perpetually confound. (1) Total death, or a full departure of the Holy Spirit. This passed upon Adam, and all mankind with him, when he lost God's moral image . . . (2) Death freely visited with a seed of life in our fallen representative, and of course in all his posterity . . . (3) Death oppressing this living seed. . . (4) Death prevailing again over the living seed, after it had been powerfully quickened. . . (5) The death of confirmed apostates, who, by absolutely quenching 'the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus,' the second Adam, are fallen into the miserable state of nature and total helplessness, in which the first Adam was when God preached to him the Gospel of his quickening grace. These are said by St. Jude to be twice dead.

.
If you read the Scriptures without prejudice, you will see that there are several degrees of spiritual life, or quickening power. (1) The living 'Light which shines in the darkness' of every man during the day of his visitation. (2) The life of the returning sinner. . . (3) The life of the heathen, who, like Cornelius, 'fears God and works righteousness' according to his light. . . (4) The life of the pious Jew, who like Samuel, fears God from his youth. . . (5) The life of the feeble Christian. . . who is 'baptized with water unto repentance'. . . (6) The still more abundant life of the adult or the perfect Christian.
.⁶

⁵ The Works of the Rev. John Wesley, A. M. (New York: Hunt and Eaton, N.D.), Sermons Vol. I, p. 20.

⁶ The Works of the Reverend John Fletcher (New York: T. Mason and G. Lane, 1836), pp. 159-160.

Moule's analysis of man included a strong moral responsibility. Though in the fall man could and did lose righteousness, he retained the Image, of which he affirmed, "whatever fatal disorder touched it; he is for ever personal, moral, responsible."⁷ To him, this view of the image, alone, makes man capable of redemption and regeneration. Of fallen man he says:

There is not change in the nature, or the constitution of man, which retains all its noble parts and faculties. Man is still 'living soul'; spirit, souls, and body; still has conscience and will. But the 'habit' of the personality the state of the 'subject' of all these parts and faculties, is distorted. . . 'Man knows good and evil' (Gen. iii.5,22).⁸

"How broad and deep and dark the abyss between a dead sinner and a child of God born of the Spirit," said Daniel Steele. He then suggested some of the differences.

The one feels the heart throb of a new life; the other lies pulseless in the sepulcher of spiritual death. The one is God-centered, gravitating upward, drawn by the magnetism of love; the other is self-centered, moving downward with the accelerating velocity of depravity. The one throbs through all the mystery of his being with the pulses of a divine life; the other is insensible to those spiritual truths which thrill the former with unutterable rapture. Though both obey the decalogue and minister their charities to the needy, the one acts with a single eye to the glory of God; the other is actuated by a highly refined selfishness. The obedience of the one is freedom; of the other, servility.⁹

⁷ H. C. G. Moule, Outlines of Christian Doctrine (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1889), p. 159.

⁸ Ibid., pp. 169-170.

⁹ Daniel Steele, Milestone Papers (New York: Eaton and Main, 1876), pp. 15-16.

M. L. Haney spoke in the same vein, confirming the idea that though man lost something very important in the fall, he retains all that is essential to moral, and hence, intelligent life.

It will be found there is something in man's consciousness which points to this high origin and a perfect past. Every penitential tear, every throe of restlessness, every wail of sorrow for transgression gives voice to a knowledge of the spiritual kingdom of our race. Thus have all generations, in heart, if not by word, proclaimed: 'That God created man in his own image.'-Gen.1:27.¹⁰

C. W. Brown clearly states that nothing of the natural image is lost in the fall. It is that image and a trace of the moral image that makes man capable of salvation, he says.¹¹ The spiritual, which is the natural image cannot be destroyed.¹² The moral image gave man an instinct to reach out after God, the loss of the image caused the opposite tendency in man's soul and Adam transmitted that tendency to all mankind.¹³

Another spokesman for contemporary conservative theology, analyzes the effect of death to be, a darkened understanding, a deceitful and desperately wicked heart, a defiled conscience and mind, an enslaved will and a race in bondage to Satan, sin and death.¹⁴

¹⁰ M. L. Haney, Inheritance Restored (Chicago: The Christian Witness Co., 1897), pp. 2-3.

¹¹ Charles Ewing Brown, The Meaning of Sanctification (Anderson: The Warner Press, 1945), p. 75.

¹² Ibid., p. 76.

¹³ Ibid., pp. 76, 68.

¹⁴ Harry E. Jessop, Foundations of Doctrine (Chicago: The Chicago Evangelistic Institute, 1938), p. 8.

II. BIBLICAL STUDY OF HUMAN NATURE

Jesus' Estimate of Human Nature. Jesus said a great deal about man, for it was to him He came and for him He died and

His persistent use of the title, 'Son of Man,' for Himself, marked His identification with humanity, and suggested the truth that the final understanding of human nature must result from a knowledge of Himself.¹⁵

His teaching regarding human nature falls into two concepts, both of which are pertinent to this study: first,

those which reveal man ideally, or essentially, that is, according to a Divine purpose; and secondly, those revealing man actually or experimentally, that is, as Jesus found Him.¹⁶

Man, ideally, is revealed in The Man as He lived. Remembering the statement in the book of Hebrews to the effect that He "hath been in all points tempted like as we are, without sin,"¹⁷ the wilderness temptation becomes a commentary upon the nature of man. In that temptation physical life was recognized, "Command that these stones become bread."¹⁸ In it, also, the spiritual life was recognized, "Cast thyself down: for it is written, He shall give His angels charge

¹⁵ G. Campbell Morgan, The Teaching of Christ (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1913), p. 113.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 114.

¹⁷ Hebrews 4:15.

¹⁸ Matthew 4:3.

concerning thee."¹⁹ But beyond this, man's vocation, or the purpose of God, is implied, "All these"-the kingdoms of the world-"will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me."²⁰ Jesus' answer to all these is His estimate of the worth of man and his place in the economy of God's creation. The true sustenance of human life is the Word of God, the true object of human life is the worship of God.²¹

The true unity of man's being is stated in the words of Jesus:

The lamp of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness.²²

In other words, a single-hearted man, or one with a pure motive, only can realize the purpose for which he was made.

James' exhortation to men who are "unstable," because "double-minded"²³ points up the force of this passage.

The primacy of the spiritual over the physical in man is the teaching of Jesus in the following passage:

Be not afraid of them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is

¹⁹ Matthew 4:6.

²⁰ Matthew 4:9.

²¹ Morgan, op. cit., p. 115.

²² Matthew 22:23.

²³ James 1:8; 4:8.

able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna.²⁴

What shall a man be profited, if he gain the whole world, and forfeit his life? or what shall a man give in exchange for his life?²⁵

A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth.²⁶

The full implications of the probationary life of man has nowhere been more clearly stated than in the answer of Jesus to the questioner who wanted to know what constituted the greatest commandment.²⁷ All the demands of a perfect law, He said, would be satisfied in the voluntary and deliberate response of a complete and thoroughgoing love to God. "The love of God is the master-law of life."²⁸ Equally as important to probation, in its recognition of self-consciousness as the ground of responsible choice, is the command to love others as self. This, too, is on a voluntary basis, and equates the personal estimate of self with the estimate in which he holds others. Only in this careful balance and direction of affection and attention, can the full dignity of man be realized.

Over against this "ideal" view of man stood actual man as Jesus saw him. Men, who possessed an active capacity

²⁴ Matthew 10:28.

²⁵ Matthew 16:26.

²⁶ Luke 12:15.

²⁷ Matthew 22:37-40.

²⁸ Morgan, op. cit., p. 121.

for the highest as expressed in a love for their children were "evil" and hurtful and murderous in other relationships. "If ye, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children,--"²⁹ was a recognition of the dual condition of human beings: the capacity for good, immorally occupied in dispensing an evil influence. This thought is even more vividly declared in another place where the idea of a responsible person (as evidenced by the standard of judgment, namely, "his words") is joined with the idea of an evil heart. "O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? . . .(yet) By thy words thou shalt be condemned."³⁰

Jesus always located sin in the "heart" of man. In the same heart that should have been occupied with loving God, He discovered the source of evil. "From within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications. . ."³¹ The proof of man's defilement is the array of evil things which proceed from him.

The unregenerate, spiritually dead condition of men is revealed in the conversation with Nicodemus, "That which is flesh is flesh; that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. . .

²⁹ Matthew 7:11.

³⁰ Matthew 12:34-37.

³¹ Mark 7:21; Matthew 15:17-20.

ye must be born again."³² The natural appetite of the unregenerate is described, "Men loved darkness rather than light because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light."³³

The prodigal dissipation of the one faculty which links man to God, namely, his faith, will, according to Jesus be the final basis of judgment. "He that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God."³⁴

He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.³⁵

Paul's Teaching about Human Nature. Paul's thorough understanding of human nature furnished a background through which a profound revelation could be made of the nature of sin in man. Among his figures of speech are these, "old man,"³⁶ "body of sin,"³⁷ "flesh,"³⁸ "law of sin," and "body of death,"³⁹

³² John 3:5-7.

³³ John 3:19-20.

³⁴ John 3:18.

³⁵ John 5:24.

³⁶ Romans 6:6; Ephesians 4:22; Colossians 3:9.

³⁷ Romans 7: 5 and many more.

³⁸ Romans 7:23-24.

³⁹ Romans 8:6.

"carnal mind,"⁴⁰ "bondage of corruption" and "root of bitterness,"⁴¹ if Paul wrote the book of Hebrews. Other descriptions include, "dead. . . in trespasses and sins,"⁴² "alienated from the life of God,"⁴³ "spirit of the world,"⁴⁴ "the sin which dwelleth in me,"⁴⁵ and "a reprobate mind,"⁴⁶ "sin" (*ἁμαρτίας*) in many places, "law of sin and death"⁴⁷ and "natural (*φύσις*) man."⁴⁸ It is in his more extended discussions, however, that a complete picture of the nature and results of sin is best seen.

The first picture is in Romans.⁴⁹ It is the story of the degradation effected through the perversion of the faculty of intelligence. The just wrath of God is revealed against those who "hinder truth in unrighteousness." The first challenge man hurled at God was against His veracity.⁵⁰

⁴⁰ Romans 8:21.

⁴¹ Hebrews 12:15.

⁴² Ephesians 2:1ff.

⁴³ Ephesians 4:17ff.

⁴⁴ I Corinthians 2:2.

⁴⁵ Romans 7:20.

⁴⁶ Romans 1:28.

⁴⁷ Romans 8:2.

⁴⁸ I Corinthians 2:14.

⁴⁹ Romans 1:18-32.

⁵⁰ Genesis 3:1.

Here in answer, the charge is made against man, capable of knowing truth, that he is hindering, or holding down or retaining (κατεχόντων) truth and that moral issues are involved in doing so. The measure of truth he may know is sufficient to incite him to the worship of God. Even natural man may know enough about the eternal power and "god-ness"⁵¹ of God, (1) by natural revelation, ("that which may be seen"), and (2) by intuition, ("the invisible things. . .are clearly seen"), to render his darkness, inexcusable. The charge is also made against man, that as one responsible for his volitional powers, and "knowing God" he refused to glorify Him as God. This parallels Adam's sin in challenging the goodness and worthiness of God and who willfully set about, in disobedience, to obtain wisdom which was, in his estimation, maliciously withheld from him by God. Paul said the result was a "senseless heart," darkened, because in professing wisdom it became foolish. The third charge Paul makes is that man dethroned the Creator and set up other gods in His place. This substitution could only be tolerated by those who had exchanged a lie for the truth, and the result was an open door to unspeakable sensual depravity. The course of sin was from a refusal to acknowledge the sovereignty of God,⁵² down to positive relish

⁵¹ Romans 1:19.

⁵² Romans 1:28.

of sins known to be worthy of death.⁵³ A thoughtful analysis of this passage reveals (1) that Paul considered men fully responsible for their deflection from righteousness, (2) that rejection of God's authority was deliberate and on an intelligent basis and (3) that perversion in every faculty was the consequence of this deliberate rejection.

Another graphic Pauline description of the source of sin and the course of depravity is found in the book of Ephesians.⁵⁴ Paul, in this passage, in exhorting the Ephesians to holiness, warns them against returning to the "vanity of mind" characteristic of the heathen mind. Vanity (ματαιότης) according to Thayer, is a purely Biblical word meaning devoid of truth, perversion, and depravation.⁵⁵ This condition characterized the blinded heathen mind (νοῦς). Resulting from this perversion of mind is a "darkened understanding" (διανοία). It is the "ignorance" (ἀγνοίαν) occasioned by blindness of heart, a moral condition, that has "alienated" (ἀπηλλοτριωμένοις) them from the "life of God." Thayer translates alienate, "those who have estranged themselves from God."⁵⁶ This estrangement, it may be assumed on the strength of the

⁵³ Romans 1:32.

⁵⁴ Ephesians 4:17-19.

⁵⁵ Thayer, op. cit., p. 393.

⁵⁶ Thayer, op. cit., p. 54.

passive voice used in the Greek text, was volitional. It was a deliberate choice. They, having cast off from themselves all feeling, "gave up" to uncleanness and complete moral apostasy resulted. The depth is reached in the last phrase, "with craving." That faculty given for the purpose of loving God with holy abandonment, by a deliberate series of immoral choices now is used to love debauchery with the same abandonment. This is the progression, a mind devoid of truth, blindhearted ignorance, and moral insanity.

Some further light upon the nature of this depraved condition can be gained from the parallel passage immediately following in which a series of contrasts is presented.⁵⁷ "Ye have not so learned Christ."⁵⁸ The first contrast is in relation to truth. Instead of a mind devoid of truth, by moral choice, there is a mind filled with truth "as it is in Jesus."⁵⁹ The second contrast is between a "darkened understanding,"⁶⁰ occasioned by a hardening of the heart, and a renewed "spirit of the mind."⁶¹ This thought is amplified by the terms "old

⁵⁷ Ephesians 4:25-32.

⁵⁸ Ephesians 4:20.

⁵⁹ Ephesians 4:21.

⁶⁰ Ephesians 4:18.

⁶¹ Ephesians 4:21.

and "new man." The third contrast is between moral insensibility with its evil works⁶² and a high degree of moral sensitivity with good works.⁶³ Those contrasts serve to sharpen the concept Paul had in mind, of what sin is and does.

A third passage illuminates the Pauline conception of the result of sin to the image of God in man. In Colossians, it is another contrast that provokes a deeper understanding of this truth. An alienated mind(*διανοία*) is the opposite pole to one "holy, without blemish and unreprouable before him."⁶⁴ The deep inwardness of the perversion is strongly emphasized in all of these passages. A cast of mind underlies the kind of life men live. And behind the cast of mind is an attitude toward truth and God as absolute Lord. And for it all men are held accountable and responsible. At no time is leniency in conduct ever justified because of perversion in intellectual or moral faculties.

It will be noticed that in most cases, especially in Pauline theology, that *νοῦς*, or some cognate, is associated with this source of perversion. There are numbers of related words and derivations of *νοῦς* but the following seem to be related more particularly to the subject at hand: *διάνοια* and

⁶² Ephesians 4:19.

⁶³ Ephesians 4:25-32.

⁶⁴ Colossians 1:21-22.

φρονήμα. *roûs*, first of all, is translated simply, mind. There is, however, a more penetrating and discriminating analysis. Thayer says it contains the idea of perceiving, understanding, feeling, judging, and determining. It is an intellectual faculty, but also, a capacity for spiritual truth, of perceiving divine things, of recognizing goodness and of hating evil.⁶⁵ A review of its uses in the New Testament book by book, was helpful in ascertaining the peculiar inflection of meaning. God gave the heathen over to a reprobate mind.⁶⁶ A different law warred against the law of Paul's mind.⁶⁷ With the mind Paul served the law of God but with the flesh the law of sin.⁶⁸ In a burst of spiritual insight Paul cried, "O the depth of the riches of both the wisdom and knowledge of God. . . For who hath known the mind of the Lord?"⁶⁹ Paul exhorts to be renewed in the spirit of the mind.⁷⁰ We are to be fully persuaded in our own mind.⁷¹

In the Corinthian letter the word is used three times. Believers are to be perfected together in the same mind and

⁶⁵ Thayer, op. cit., p. 429.

⁶⁶ Romans 1:28.

⁶⁷ Romans 7:23.

⁶⁸ Romans 7:25.

⁶⁹ Romans 11:33-34.

⁷⁰ Romans 12:2.

⁷¹ Romans 14:5.

judgment.⁷² "Who hath known the mind of the Lord?"⁷³ Those (who are spiritual) have the mind of Christ.⁷⁴

Elsewhere are the following: "vanity of mind,"⁷⁵ "be renewed in the spirit of your mind,"⁷⁶ and "puffed up by a fleshly mind."⁷⁷ Paul exhorted the Thessalonians to be not shaken in mind.⁷⁸ Gross Materialism ("supposing godliness a way of gain") characterizes the "corrupt mind" destitute of truth,⁷⁹ and men of corrupted mind withstand truth and become reprobate concerning faith.⁸⁰ To Titus he said, "even their mind and conscience is defiled."⁸¹

From these passages it becomes clear that the νοῦς is a faculty which relates itself morally to truth. It judges between good and evil and chooses between them. When wrongly related to truth it becomes reprobate and corrupt, leading to immoral decisions. It needs renewal and transformation and

⁷² I Corinthians 1:10.

⁷³ I Corinthians 2:16.

⁷⁴ Loc. cit.

⁷⁵ Ephesians 4:17.

⁷⁶ Ephesians 4:23.

⁷⁷ Colossians 2:18.

⁷⁸ II Thessalonians 2:2.

⁷⁹ I Timothy 6:5.

⁸⁰ II Timothy 3:8.

⁸¹ Titus 1:15.

when rightly related to truth approximates even the mind of Christ. Of the total of seventeen references, eight describe a depraved condition, two deal with renewal, and three with the condition of the mind of the regenerate. Four are miscellaneous references in the same vein.

Διάνοια, another cognate of *νοῦς*, means, according to Thayer, "a faculty of understanding, feeling and desiring," mind or spirit, a way of thinking and feeling.⁸² It is found seven times in the New Testament. It is the word found in the synoptics to express the comprehensiveness of love to God, "thou shalt love God with all. . .thy mind."⁸³ The Old Testament promise of law written within the mind is twice mentioned in Hebrews.⁸⁴ The believer's mind is twice mentioned by Peter, "gird up the loins of your mind,"⁸⁵ and "I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance."⁸⁶ Twice reference is made to the unregenerate mind, "desires of the flesh and mind"⁸⁷ and "enemies in your mind."⁸⁸ From this, the deduction is made that this faculty of *διάνοια*, has to do with the bent of the

⁸² Thayer, op. cit., p. 140.

⁸³ Matthew 22:37; Mark 12:30; Luke 10:27.

⁸⁴ Hebrews 8:10; 10:16.

⁸⁵ I Peter 1:13.

⁸⁶ II Peter 3:1.

⁸⁷ Ephesians 2:3.

⁸⁸ Colossians 1:21.

mind, the direction of affection. It is not blind feeling but a moral persuasion. It is, in natural man, an enemy of God. It may be called to give account of itself by its possessor. It is in need of divine cleansing.

Noῦμα, is used four times. The ending "μα" denotes result.⁸⁹ So the term means "that which thinks,"⁹⁰ or the thinking and purposing faculty. Three times in the Corinthian letter Paul uses it in connection with the blinding of this thinking, purposing faculty. The inability to understand the Old Testament was the veil by which "their minds were blinded";⁹¹ "the God of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving."⁹² This is the faculty through which Eve was betrayed, "I fear, lest as the serpent beguiled Eve. . . your minds (purposing faculty) should be corrupted."⁹³ Remembering this, Paul's benediction in Philippians is of special moment, "The peace of God. . . shall guard your. . . thoughts" (*νοήματα*).⁹⁴ One of the most direct clues to the seat of sin is here revealed. This thinking, purposing faculty is the area where

⁸⁹ William Douglas Chamberlain, An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941), p. 12.

⁹⁰ Thayer, op. cit., p. 427.

⁹¹ II Corinthians 3:14.

⁹² II Corinthians 4:4.

⁹³ II Corinthians 11:3.

⁹⁴ Philippians 4:7.

evil is introduced. Unbelief is the sin of this faculty. Unbelief blinded the minds of the Jews to the revelation of Christ. Unbelief permits the god of this world entrance into the sanctuary of the moral life of man. It was this way that Eve was tempted and fell. It is here that corruption resides. It is this area that the peace of God can guard to preserve from sin.

The other Greek word translated mind in the English that is significant to this investigation is *φρόνημα*. The verb *φρονέω* will be considered first. Thayer says it means "to direct one's mind to a thing. . .to be intent within yourselves" to a purpose, to pursue.⁹⁵ Moulton and Milligan elaborates on this idea. "It seems always to keep in view the direction which thought takes."⁹⁶ They give an example from classical Greek "'Soueris changed her mind, left the mill and departed. . .'" The phrase *νοῶν καὶ φρονῶν* 'being sane and in my right mind' is common."⁹⁷ It is found nine times in the New Testament.⁹⁸ Five times it refers to believers having "the same mind" about things. Twice the exhortation is given to have the mind of Christ and twice the

⁹⁵ Thayer, op. cit., p. 658.

⁹⁶ Moulton and Milligan, op. cit., p. 676.

⁹⁷ Loc. cit.

⁹⁸ Romans 8:12; 12:16; II Corinthians 13:11; Galatians 5:10; Philemon 2:5; 3:15, 16, 19; 4:2.

reference is to preoccupation with the things of the flesh and earthly things. With this review, the significance begins to develop. A cognate of $\varphi\rho\omicron\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ is the noun $\varphi\rho\omicron\nu\eta\mu\alpha$ which with the suffix $\mu\alpha$ also indicates the result of that which the verb has done. It is, then, an inclination, or set of mind. Moulton and Milligan gives the content of " $\varphi\rho\omicron\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ (as) the general bent of thought and motive."⁹⁹ Its most significant use is in Romans 8:7. "The mind of the flesh is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can it be ($\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\nu\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$)."¹⁰⁰ There are three other occasions where this word is used and all of them are in this same chapter. The Spirit knows the mind of the Lord, obviously, the deep desire, passion of God's heart.¹⁰⁰ The other two are most revealing in their use. The "mind of the flesh" is death.¹⁰¹ This unquestionably refers back to the first commandment in the garden, "If ye eat. . . ye shall die." This death then is the curse for sin, and this sin is the one which was cursed. "The mind of the spirit, is life and peace"¹⁰² is not only a poignant contrast but a promise of hope for the complete reversal, in this life, of that age-long curse.

⁹⁹ Moulton and Milligan, op. cit., p. 676.

¹⁰⁰ Romans 8:27.

¹⁰¹ Romans 8:6.

¹⁰² Romans 8:6.

There is one more striking analogy that no review of the sin problem can evade. That analogy is death. It does not seem to be vital to this investigation to question the entire scope of man's being which may be included under the curse of death. It may or may not include physical death.¹⁰³ But it is almost univervally agreed that spiritual death is most certainly the most significant fact of the condition of fallen man. It is a striking fact, also, that so many of Paul's descriptions of the sin nature include some reference to death.

God decreed death as the penalty for breaking law. Whatever else may be included in the condition of fallen man, death is most particularly the major one. As has been shown, death is associated with the idea of *φρόνημα*, which is the deepest disposition or inclination of the soul. All other faculties of fallen man are affected, secondarily, by sin. Perversion has resulted from a deliberate choice against God and truth. But here we find, apparently, the heart of sin, so far as man is concerned, for it is here he experiences death as the curse of sin in its primary sense. Whatever this death means, Paul says it is passed from father to son, from Adam on

¹⁰³ W. Robertson Nicoll, The Expositor's Greek Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, n.d.), p. 627.

Paul, no doubt uses death to convey various shades of meaning in different places, but he does not explicitly distinguish different senses of the word; and it is probably misleading rather than helpful to say that in one sentence 'physical' death is meant and another 'spiritual' death. . . . All that 'death' conveys to the mind entered into the world through sin.

to every human soul.¹⁰⁴ This death is co-extensive and concomitant with sin.¹⁰⁵ Eight times in Romans alone sin and death are considered as inseparable companions. The "body of death" made true righteousness impossible.¹⁰⁶ All are under the sentence of death. Christ died for the ungodly.¹⁰⁷ We can know we have passed, as a consequence, from death unto life.¹⁰⁸

It is not possible to present an extended analysis of the term death, here, but the general argument would be less convincing than otherwise if some suggestion of its meaning were not included. Since there are so many theories regarding the meaning of death as Paul uses the term, a philosophy of death seems more in order than a more detailed statement. In this vein, Albert Barnes suggested an answer. In speaking of the sense of the word, he said,

The passage before us (Romans 5) shows in what sense he intended here to use the word. In his argument it stands opposed to 'the grace of God, and the gift by grace' (ver. 15); to 'justification' by the forgiveness of 'many offences' (ver. 16); to the reign of the redeemed in eternal life (ver. 17); and to 'justification of life' (ver. 18). To all these, the words 'death' (ver. 12, 17) and 'judgment' (ver. 16, 18) stand opposed. . . . The evident

¹⁰⁴ Romans 5:12.

¹⁰⁵ Romans 5:21.

¹⁰⁶ Romans 7:24.

¹⁰⁷ II Timothy 1:10.

¹⁰⁸ I John 3:14.

meaning is, that the word 'death,' as here used by the apostle, refers to the train of evils which have been introduced by sin. . . . In contrasting with this the results of the work of Christ, he describes not the resurrection merely, nor deliverance from temporal death, but eternal life in heaven. . . .¹⁰⁹

This same idea of contrast is recognized by G. Campbell Morgan. He saw a three-fold contrast in the fifth chapter of Romans.

The first contrast is between the trespass and the free gift. . . the death sentence upon sin, and grace abounding. (And) The disparity is indicated by the phrase 'much more'. . . .

The second contrast is between the issue of the trespass and the free gift, and therefore between judgement and justification. . . The disparity is again indicated by the phrase 'much more'; and the super-abounding victory of justification is remarkably indicated by the fact that judgment means the reign of death over men, while justification means the ability of men to reign in life. . . .

The final contrast is between the reign of death and the reign of grace. . . the reign of sin in death, and the reign of grace through righteousness unto life. Again the disparity is marked by the phrase 'more exceedingly,' revealing the fact that in grace over-whelming provision is made for victory over sin.¹¹⁰

In the absence of more specific definitions, it seems wise to rest, for the time being, upon the contrasts made in the New Testament between death and life (*θάνατος* and *ζωή*) which are everywhere set one against the other, and which will be presented more fully in the next chapter. Death seems to

¹⁰⁹ Albert Barnes, Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Romans (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1866), p. 125.

¹¹⁰ G. Campbell Morgan, The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1909), pp. 72-73.

depict the finality of the hopelessness which is man's lot under the curse of God. It does not, however, mean loss of any human faculty. Rather it describes the separation which exists between God and man. All the powers of personality remain alert and active¹¹¹ but oriented about a center other than God, its only proper center. Love, the most active faculty of the human personality, when centered in God, is termed in the New Testament, ἀγάπη, and is said to satisfy all the demands of the law of God and man.¹¹² But when that same faculty attempts to expend its energy upon itself, the very faculty itself loses its high quality and its expression is reduced to the category of the antithesis of love, namely, lust. Paralleling this observation, and related to it, is that regarding life and death. In the spiritual nexus there is spiritual life and derived holiness. In the absence of that nexus is death or lack of holiness, which is depravity.

This new nature is 'the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness;' and it is this new man which forms the spiritual nexus of the body of Christ. It is the channel way of blessing, - the sole medium of the Spirit's indwelling presence.¹¹³

To this point of view, Wesley gives argument. In speaking of the death which sin occasioned he said,

¹¹¹ Romans 7:5-24.

¹¹² Matthew 22:37-40; Romans 13:10.

¹¹³ H. Orton Wiley, The Psychology of Holiness (An unpublished manuscript of lectures), Lecture V, p. 14.

He lost the life of God: he was separated from him, in union with whom his spiritual life consisted. The body dies when it is separated from the soul; the soul when it is separated from God. (Of this death), he gave immediate proof: presently showing by his behaviour, that the love of God was extinguished in his soul.¹¹⁴

Fletcher was unusually lucid at this point.

The word dead, etc., is frequently used in the Scriptures to denote a particular degree of helplessness and inactivity, very short of the total helplessness of a corpse. We read of the deadness of Sarah's womb, and of Abraham's body being dead; he must be a strong Calvinist, indeed, who, from such expressions, peremptorily asserts, that Sarah's dead womb was as unfit for conception, and Abraham's dead body for generation, as if they both had been 'dead corpses'.¹¹⁵

His discussion of the body of death in Romans 7, is equally pointed.

Dead as he (Paul) was, could he not complain like the dry bones, and ask, 'Who shall deliver me from this body of death?'¹¹⁶

A final but strong argument is that in Paul's letter to the Ephesians. Standing in contrast to the three-sided personality of men as they are in proper relationship to Christ is the picture of men "dead in trespasses and sins."¹¹⁷ The picture is not of death, as stulted senses or annihilation, but of very active faculties in varying relationships. The "Spirit of Christ" which is a test of men's relationship to Christ¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ Welch, op. cit., pp. 48-49.

¹¹⁵ Fletcher, op. cit., p. 158.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., p. 159.

¹¹⁷ Ephesians 2:1.

¹¹⁸ Romans 8:9.

is contrasted with the "spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience."¹¹⁹ The "mind of Christ"¹²⁰ which the "spiritual" have, stands against the "desires of the flesh and mind."¹²¹ The "love of Christ" which "constrains" a Christian¹²² has become, in fallen man "the lust of the flesh."¹²³ Death, then, must be the separation of the race from the immediate presence and power of the Holy Spirit, with the consequent loss of righteousness. The work of Christ in bringing life (ζωή) in place of death, is in harmony with this concept and will be developed in a later chapter. Spiritual death and life, are synonyms with sin and holiness, and are properly understood as basically in relationship to God.

There are a number more word pictures in the New Testament regarding the nature of sin and the damage it occasioned but perhaps this established without serious question the heart of the matter. There are several pertinent observations to be made. The mind, or personality, as representing the intellectual, volitional, and affectional natures in man, is the seat of moral perversion. This three-fold mind, in relating

¹¹⁹ Ephesians 2:2.

¹²⁰ I Corinthians 2:16.

¹²¹ Ephesians 2:3.

¹²² II Corinthians 5:14.

¹²³ Ephesians 2:3.

itself to truth determines the moral quality of man. When this mind rejects truth, willfully, perversion and corruption result. Knowledge, as an implicit intuition of things divine is lost by moral default. In no case in the Bible is the mind considered as merely a thinking machine, a morally compounding tower of pure reason. Its exercise is always enmeshed with moral matters. It is the whole man responding to the truth of God in fullest personal responsibility.

CHAPTER V

THE BENEFITS OF GRACE IN RELATION TO THE IMAGE OF GOD IN MAN

A Biblical study of what Christ came to do for men ought to confirm the previous conclusions or point up their weaknesses and error. The research, to this point, has indicated the probable impropriety of the common expression, the lost and restored image of God in man. It has seemed obvious to the writer that no essential element in the image of God in man was lost in the fall. The whole area of sin and its primary consequences lies in the personality of man, as it stands in relation to God, i.e., in his heart or mind, which has been shown to include his intelligence, his volition, and his affections. Death, the primal consequence of sin, has plunged the entire race of men into an existence completely separated from ethical union with God. All the powers of personality are devoted to ends out of harmony with God's will and purpose. Their very exercise in this environment is self-perverting. There is both error and truth in Augustine's assertion that natural man is totally depraved and unable to do any good thing.¹ The error, according to Arminian theology,

¹ John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1932), Vol. I, Book ii, Chapter 1, pp. 226-228.

is in supposing that every part of every faculty in man is as morally vile as it is capable of being. It has been shown that the capacity for good and right is not lost. The truth in Augustine's teaching is that no man can, by the exercise of his highest faculties, and under the most ideal conditions, make himself righteous in the sight of God, for he is not morally autonomous but separated eternally (but for the grace of God), from the source of righteousness. Standing, as he does, in the image of God, man is, yet, totally unlike his prototype, Christ. His mind is not the "mind of Christ," his spirit does not conform to the "Spirit of Christ," nor is his expression of love any measure of the quality of the "love of Christ." Paul's statement is the true description, "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God."² Yet the possession of mind and spirit (or will), and affection, constitutes him capable of redemption. If the redemption of Christ operates in the realm of moral relationships, where the effects of the fall have been seen to reside, a study of the various phases of redemption ought to bring into clearer focus the nature of the loss sustained in the fall and God's estimate of that which is essential to manhood, and what likeness is apt to be.

² Romans 3:23.

I. GRACE

Grace is the one word which makes the whole scheme of redemption intelligible. It is not within the scope of this study to examine this term critically. It is only necessary to link the fact of God's grace to the plan of salvation.

Sin against God is treason against the Lawgiver and Judge and except it be covered by the atoning blood of Jesus Christ will eventuate in eternal damnation.³

Through the atoning blood of Jesus Christ there is grace for everyone. No one is as bad as he would be were he left to the full consequences of his sin. The good in man is not the residue of man's original holiness but the preventing grace of God which preserves the basic structure of man to savability. "This unconditioned grace lifts man from the estate of a demon."⁴ It is the teaching of Arminian theology that final rejection of this prevenient grace is what constitutes the sin against the Holy Ghost for which there is no forgiveness. This does not in any measure limit the mercy of God, but is a "judicial consequence of the sinner's own persistent disobedience and neglect."⁵ It is perhaps enough to say that grace is the bridge God has thrown across the impassable gulf between fallen man and Himself, over which man may return

³ J. B. Chapman, Terminology of Holiness (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1947), p. 28.

⁴ Ibid., p. 25.

⁵ Ibid., p. 29.

to Him if he will. The various phases of grace will now be examined with the thought of mind of discovering the area in man in which grace operates and the possibilities of grace in cancelling out the effects of sin.

II. REDEMPTION

The first word of gracious origin is redemption. It is not used as often in the New Testament as other words which will be noted but it becomes a key idea to the whole Christological economy. Christ in the New Testament would be essentially meaningless apart from the concept of redemption. But, as with other terms, its spiritual significance had to be developed to the purpose for which it was to be used in its central sense. New Testament writers borrowed all the rich Old Testament meaning of the word and adapted it to express the highest work of Christ for men. It comes from the Hebrew words לִפְדּוֹת and פָּדָה which mean "to release on receipt of ransom."⁶ This suggests the idea that men are helpless captives to an enemy and that by adequate payment according to a pre-arranged plan, release may be granted and the captive set free.

An idea of its general usage is gained from a passage in Luke where two disappointed, disillusioned disciples told the risen Lord, whom they did not recognize, that it had been

⁶ Joseph Henry Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (New York: American Book Company, 1889), p. 384.

their hope that Jesus would have been "he which should have redeemed Israel."⁷ Here a purely national and political release was conceived. Anna, the prophetess, spoke to those in the temple concerning a redemption both national and religious.⁸ It remained for Jesus and Paul to add the deepest spiritual significance to the word.

Redemption in this larger sense, Thayer says means "To let one go free on receiving a price."⁹ It was, to Trench, one of the "Three grand circles of images, by aid of which one set forth to us in the Scriptures. . .the inestimable benefits of Christ's death and passion."¹⁰ It is a word used to express the "recall of captives from captivity through the payment of a ransom for them."¹¹ Linked with this word and its cognates are all those statements of Scripture which speak of sin as slavery, and of sinners as slaves;¹² of deliverance from sin as freedom, or cessation of bondage.¹³

⁷ Luke 24:21.

⁸ Luke 2:38.

⁹ Thayer, op. cit., p. 65.

¹⁰ R. C. Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948), p. 289.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 290.

¹² Romans 6:17, 20; John 8:34; II Peter 2:19.

¹³ John 8:33, 36; Romans 8:21; Galatians 5:1.

In its spiritual sense three phases of the meaning of redemption are noticed. (1) Christ is the redeemer. "The redemption that is in Christ Jesus" Paul declares, is by grace.¹⁴ In the preamble to the letter to the Ephesians Paul presents Christ, "in whom we have redemption through his blood."¹⁵ As in the Ephesian letter so in the Colossian letter, forgiveness of sins is coupled with redemption in Christ, "the Son in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins."¹⁶ A strong expression is found in Galatians, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us";¹⁷ and "God sent forth His Son. . .to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons."¹⁸ The writer to the Hebrews said, "Christ . . .by his own blood. . .obtained eternal redemption for us."¹⁹

(2) It is a redemption from the bondage of sin and iniquity and from the curse of the law as the above passages also show. In addition, two other passages are explicit: "For this cause he Christ is the mediation of the New Testament, that by the means of death, for the redemption of the

¹⁴ Romans 3:24.

¹⁵ Ephesians 1:7.

¹⁶ Colossians 1:13.

¹⁷ Galatians 3:13.

¹⁸ Galatians 4:5.

¹⁹ Hebrews 9:11-12.

transgressions. . .under the first testament, they. . .might receive. . .eternal inheritance,"²⁰ "Our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."²¹

(3) Redemption in a larger context is also indicated. There is to be a day of redemption, unto which men are sealed by the Holy Spirit of God.²² In that day, not only will redemption of the body be accomplished but also that of the whole creation which has apparently been under the bondage of corruption along with men themselves.²³

Redemption, therefore, is an important word to this study. Its use indicates that all men are held captive by sin and its consequences, with no price with which they may obtain deliverance. Christ put Himself into a relationship to the race of men in which He could, by His own life, pay the full price which stood against men. The result is freedom from the enslavement to sin, life in place of death, and adoption into the family of God.

²⁰ Hebrews 9:15.

²¹ Titus 2:15.

²² Ephesians 1:14; 4:30.

²³ Romans 8:19-23.

III. LIFE

Another word which looms large in New Testament soteriology and which takes on real significance in this research is the word ζωή (life). Out of the one hundred and thirteen occasions of the use of the word, sixty-two times it clearly holds out a promise of life which is not simply continuation of physical existence. About sixty times Christ is said to be the fountain and giver of life, "in him was life,"²⁴ and "I am the way, the truth and the life."²⁵ "Whosoever believeth on him (Christ). . . (shall have) everlasting life."²⁶ Over forty references clearly state that it is eternal life that is meant and many more references imply the same idea. But more directly to the point of this investigation are the direct references to a promise of life in contrast to death. There are three Greek words in the New Testament translated life; βίος, ψυχή, and ζωή. Βίος seems to be limited to the term of earthly existence and any preoccupation with this world to the exclusion of more vital interests. One passage will illustrate, "No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life."²⁷

²⁴ John 1:4.

²⁵ John 14:6.

²⁶ John 3:16.

²⁷ II Timothy 2:4; also Luke 8:14; I Timothy 2:2; I Peter 4:3; I John 2:16. βιωτικός pertaining to life, Luke 21:34; I Corinthians 6:3; 6:4.

ψοχή' is used many times but in every case with the meaning limited to human existence on earth although often with an ethical connotation. It is the living, breathing part of man which, animates the body,²⁸ has value over material interests,²⁹ is to be held lightly for Jesus' sake,³⁰ was what Jesus gave for sinners, and what men offer God for others.³¹ ζωή', on the other hand, (though it may duplicate somewhat the meanings of the other words), refers to another aspect of life not in the New Testament included in βίος and ψοχή'. Trench has given a clear and convincing analysis of this word. He said that the classical usage has been reversed in the New Testament, (βίος, in classical Greek contained an ethical connotation which ζωή', (which was the vital principle, and limited to this life), did not possess. It was, however, this very feature of the word which New Testament writers used to sharpen the expression of the spiritual quality they wished to emphasize. ζωή' is the true antithesis of θάνατος (death) (Romans 8:28; I Corinthians 5:4) which is the result of sin.

Revealed religion, and it alone, puts death and sin in closest connection, declares them the necessary correlatives one of the other (Genesis 1:3; Romans 5:12); and, as an involved consequence, in like manner, life and holiness.

²⁸ Matthew 2:20.

²⁹ Matthew 6:25.

³⁰ Mark 8:35.

³¹ I John 3:16.

It is God's word alone which proclaims that, wherever there is death, it is there because sin was there first; wherever there is no death, that is, life, this is there, because sin has never been there, or having once been, is now cast out and expelled. In revealed religion, which thus makes death to have come into the world through sin, and only through sin, life is the correlative of holiness. . . So soon as this is felt and understood, $\zeta\omega\acute{\nu}$ at once assumes the profoundest moral significance. . . Of that whereof we predicate absolute $\zeta\omega\acute{\nu}$, we predicate absolute holiness of the same. Christ affirming of Himself, $\epsilon\gamma\omega\acute{\nu} \epsilon\iota\mu\iota \eta\zeta\omega\acute{\nu}$ (John 14:6; I John 1:2). . . implicitly affirmed of Himself that He was absolutely holy. . . No wonder, then, that Scripture should know of no higher word than $\zeta\omega\acute{\nu}$ to set forth the blessedness of God, and the blessedness of the creature in communion with God.³²

It follows that in passages like Ephesians 4:18, the true significance is only caught when life is so interpreted. In this case, it means that the heathen were cut off from the only one who absolutely lives, in fellowship with whom alone any creature has life.³³ Only this interpretation of life, does justice to the statement in Galatians 5:25, "If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk."

With this distinction in mind, a brief review of some of the passages wherein $\zeta\omega\acute{\nu}$ is used will take on more significance. (1) The promise of life in place of death is strong and clear, "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life."³⁴ The entire

³² Trench, op. cit., pp. 94-95.

³³ Ibid., p. 95.

³⁴ John 5:24.

fifth chapter of Romans is an exposition of the same contrast, death by Adam, life in Christ. Again, "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."³⁵ Death has been abolished and life and immortality brought to light in Christ.³⁶ This death in which men find themselves, then, can be more clearly analyzed against the backdrop of its antithesis *ḥayāt*. Paul said those in sin were "alienated from the *ḥayāt* of God,"³⁷ estranged from the very source of life or holiness.

(2) It has already been observed that Christ not only was the personification of life and holiness,³⁸ but that the promise of life in men, was through faith in Him. The conditions of receiving life are simple. Faith is declared to be an absolute necessity. "He that believeth on him is not judged: he that believeth not hath been judged already."³⁹ Faith must be in the Person of the Giver of life. This will be treated more fully in the next chapter. Repentance is also associated with the reception of life in a few places.⁴⁰

³⁵ Romans 8:2.

³⁶ II Timothy 1:10.

³⁷ Ephesians 4:18.

³⁸ John 11:25.

³⁹ John 3:18.

⁴⁰ Acts 11:18; II Peter 3:9.

(3) The fulness of redemption as associated with the second coming of Christ is expressed as life. "When Christ, who is our life, shall be manifested, then shall ye also with him be manifested in glory."⁴¹ Also

For indeed we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but that we would be clothed upon, that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life.⁴²

There are many other references to this same idea, which do not need to be developed here. Especially significant are the ones using the term "quickened"⁴³ and all those relating to the "new birth."⁴⁴

This contrast between life and death argues most eloquently the moral implications of the plan of salvation.

IV. SONSHIP

Following naturally from the idea of life is the analogy of birth and sonship, which suggests a relationship to God not necessarily implied in merely, life. One may be born, hence alive, yet not a son. It will be seen how carefully the distinction is drawn in the New Testament.

⁴¹ Colossians 3:4.

⁴² II Corinthians 5:4.

⁴³ Ephesians 2:5; Colossians 2:13.

⁴⁴ John 3:5-8; Galatians 6:15.

Two passages indicate the purpose of creation and might be called God's blueprint for men. "Whom he foreknew, he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first born among many brethren."⁴⁵ The Son, as man's prototype, is clearly revealed. He "foreordained us unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto Himself."⁴⁶ The proposed filial relationship, via adoption, is equally clear. Against this expressed purpose of God, it may be observed that Adam was never called the son of God, even in his Paradisiacal existence.

The coming of life in place of death is, by the Apostle John, put under the analogy of birth, and is once so expressed by Peter. Men are born of the Spirit,⁴⁷ by the will of God,⁴⁸ but by faith.⁴⁹ This birth (or begetting from above, as the Greek word, ἀναγεννάω, indicates), is not of "corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the word of God,"⁵⁰ and emphasizes its spiritual and ethical character. The following are the "signs" of such a birth:

⁴⁵ Romans 8:29.

⁴⁶ Ephesians 1:5.

⁴⁷ John 3:3-7.

⁴⁸ John 1:12-13.

⁴⁹ Galatians 3:26.

⁵⁰ I Peter 1:23.

1. He that doeth righteousness is born of God.⁵¹
2. He that is born of God doth not commit sin.⁵²
3. Everyone that loveth is born of God.⁵³
4. Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God.⁵⁴
5. Whosoever is born of God overcometh the world.⁵⁵

Sonship, on the other hand, is on a higher level. There are two Greek words which are translated into the English as son, τέκνον and υἱός. It is of interest to know that never was Jesus referred to as τέκνον, but always υἱός, except as a small child when the word was παῖδιον. Redeemed men are called both τέκνα and υἱοί, with reasons for each which do not seem pertinent to this investigation.

The Galatian epistle, very clearly distinguishes between sonship and servant-hood. This is possibly the same difference Paul makes in the Corinthian letter between babes in Christ and full adulthood, or between the carnal and spiritual persons.⁵⁶ He said, "Thou art no longer a bondservant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir through God."⁵⁷ The

⁵¹ I John 2:29.

⁵² Ibid., 3:9.

⁵³ Ibid., 4:7.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 5:1.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 5:4.

⁵⁶ II Corinthians 3:1.

⁵⁷ Galatians 4:7.

writer to the Hebrews suggests the same contingency. "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth."⁵⁸ The purpose is plain. "That we may be partakers of his holiness."⁵⁹

The "signs" of sonship are different than those of birth.

1. Sons of God, blameless and harmless, without re-buke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world.⁶⁰
2. As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.⁶¹
3. Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.⁶²
4. A son is an heir of God.⁶³
5. The Spirit beareth witness that we are children (sons) of God.⁶⁴
6. If we are children (sons), then we are heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ.⁶⁵
7. The creature shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children (sons) of God.⁶⁶

Daniel Steele in a discussion on another subject suggests

⁵⁸ Hebrews 12:6.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 12:10.

⁶⁰ Philippians 2:15.

⁶¹ Romans 8:14.

⁶² Galatians 4:6.

⁶³ Ibid., 4:7.

⁶⁴ Romans 8:16.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 8:17.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 8:21.

that sonship implies likeness.⁶⁷ The above references bear out this thought. A new relationship to God is emphasized by birth. Whereas, before birth, the whole man is oriented about sin, afterward he is oriented about God, and he sins no more. The whole change is in relation to sin. The born-again man "sinneth not" but "doeth righteousness." On the other hand, the son among many things shines as a light, is led by the Spirit of God, is a joint-heir with Christ and enjoys "glorious liberty." The whole idea is close association with God and with the consequent appropriation of His qualities. "The sons of God, in their measure, are the brightness of his glory."⁶⁸ There have been given "exceeding great and precious promises, that by these ye might be made partakers of the divine nature."⁶⁹ To this, Steele comments, "To be partaker of one's nature is to have not its identity, but its characteristics."⁷⁰ It is worthy of note, also that sonship is always protected from pantheistic identification by the use of the commonly understood idea of adoption. By this means the two ends are served, one to maintain a sharp distinction between God and man, the other to lift up the idea of likeness of character, inhering

⁶⁷ Daniel Steele, Milestone Papers (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1876), p. 16.

⁶⁸ Steele, op. cit., p. 17.

⁶⁹ II Peter 1:4.

⁷⁰ Steele, op. cit., p. 17.

in the voluntary Father-son relationship.

V. RIGHTEOUSNESS

The next most noticeable term which expresses that which grace was given to provide is righteousness. The Greek word for righteousness, *δικαιοσύνη*, has an interesting etymological history which cannot be more than touched, here. Its root was *δικ*, (to show or point out); *δικη*, then, meant, the thing which is right, or justice.⁷¹ Of the many noun forms, (with judicial rightness as a central meanings), *δικαιοσύνη*, is used with a noun suffix, which indicates personal quality.⁷² A righteous person is one in the state of being *δίκαιος*, and is such as he ought to be.⁷³

In the writings of Paul *ἡ δικαιοσύνη* has a peculiar meaning,

opposed to the views of the Jews and Judaizing Christians. They the Jews . . . supposed they secured the favor of God by works conformed to the requirements of the Mosaic law, as though by way of merit; and that they would thus attain to eternal salvation. But this law demands perfect obedience. . . which no one has rendered. Hope of salvation then is only in Christ's expiatory sacrifice for the sins of men . . . The way to obtain this hope is only through faith. . . and this faith is reckoned by God to man as *δικαιοσύνη*.⁷⁴

⁷¹ William Douglas Chamberlain, An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament (New York: Macmillan, 1941), p. 10.

⁷² Ibid., p. 12.

⁷³ Thayer, op. cit., p. 149.

⁷⁴ Loc. cit.

To this judicial righteousness the New Testament adds with imperative insistence an actual state of righteousness as the following passages indicate: "except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of heaven";⁷⁵ "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?";⁷⁶

Shall we sin, because we are not under law, but under grace? God forbid. Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or obedience unto righteousness?"⁷⁷

The hunger for righteousness, Jesus said would be satisfied.⁷⁸ Men are to live righteously in this present life.⁷⁹ Righteousness is a test of Christian experience.⁸⁰ True righteousness is by faith,⁸¹ and not by works..⁸²

VI. HOLINESS

Another system of cognates covers what the English has rendered, holy or sanctified. Peter reminded his readers that

⁷⁵ Matthew 5:20.

⁷⁶ Romans 6:2-3.

⁷⁷ Romans 6:15-16.

⁷⁸ Matthew 5:15.

⁷⁹ Titus 2:12.

⁸⁰ I John 3:4-10.

⁸¹ Romans 9; 10:10; Galatians 5:5; Philippians 3:9.

⁸² Philippians 3:9.

they should be "holy even as God is holy."⁸³ God called men, not to uncleanness, but to holiness.⁸⁴ Jesus' prayer on the eve of his death was for the sanctification of believers,⁸⁵ and He is to present his church a glorious church "holy and without blemish,"⁸⁶ Believers are corrected and chastened, that they might be "partakers of his holiness."⁸⁷ So important is this moral cleansing that without it men shall not see God,⁸⁸ because God's will is that they might be sanctified.⁸⁹

VII. KNOWLEDGE

One other promise of grace stands out clearly, namely, the promise of knowledge. It is a knowledge of a very special kind, apparently that which had been cut off in blindness, by sin. Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, in a burst of spiritual vision, caught the significance of it. "To give knowledge of salvation. . .by the remission of their sins."⁹⁰

⁸³ I Peter 1:15-16.

⁸⁴ I Thessalonians 4:7.

⁸⁵ John 17.

⁸⁶ Galatians 5:27.

⁸⁷ Hebrews 12:10.

⁸⁸ Hebrews 12:14.

⁸⁹ I Thessalonians 4:3.

⁹⁰ Luke 1:77.

Goodness and knowledge are related in Romans 15:14. One of the most striking passages to be found is in the second Corinthian letter where Paul said that blinded minds, not able to see the light of the gospel of Christ had become darkened because of unbelief.⁹¹ But to them who had renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, and had come to terms with truth,⁹² God had given the light of the knowledge of the glory of God.⁹³ Hence, this knowledge which is restored to redeemed men is a spiritual understanding of divine things and Persons and is conditioned by faith in God and obedience to His will. Paul, in another place, said that the new man was being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him,⁹⁴ by which it may be inferred that a proper rectitude of mind is included in moral renovation.

Conclusion. The proposed benefits of grace, to fallen man, points most clearly to God's estimate of man's essential qualities and the purpose for which he was made. The fact of God's grace testifies to the esteem in which God holds mankind. He could have destroyed Adam and the entire race in him, and created another creature which would have held his Maker in

⁹¹ II Corinthians 4:4.

⁹² Ibid., 4:2.

⁹³ Ibid., 4:6.

⁹⁴ Colossians 3:10.

proper honor, but God regarded man so highly that He, at awful cost to Himself, provided a recovery from sin and its effects.

According to the argument in this study, the fall, of itself, did not rob man of any essential constituent part of his being. What it did do, was to throw his whole being into disharmony, - with God, first, and in himself as a consequence. In saying this, two errors must be avoided. One error is in thinking that the essence of the fall was merely personality disorientation. According to this theory, any adequate re-orientation of personality would constitute redemption. Rather, it could be said in keeping with the Scriptural evidence recorded in this study, that it was the immoral attempt at orientation of the person about the self, as center, instead of God, which was the sin which brought moral and spiritual disorientation. Depravity or racial sin would be the fruit of this personal sin. The second error against which to guard is the idea that the accrued depravity and personality defects lessens moral responsibility. Though man is born in spiritual death, that is, separated from ethical union with the Holy Spirit, yet every faculty of personality is active and free to prompt the acceptance of the provisions of grace which are extended to every man.

Redemption has been seen to be the promise of recovery from the bondage of sin, not on the merits of the sinner's obed-

ience but through the merit of another, namely, Christ. Through faith in Him man's obedience is lifted to the realm of true morality. Life, or reunion with God, ethically, is the first step in the recovery as it actually touches man. It would be incorrect to say, according to the author's opinion, that the image of God in man is restored. It is more accurate to say that the image, once dead in trespasses and sins (or active in sin), is now alive unto God.

Righteousness and holiness are renewed and active ethical relationships which accompany the revived image. But it is sonship which begins to throw light upon the word, likeness. It will be recalled that in the Genesis record, God purposed to make man in His image and likeness, but in the accomplishment of His purpose only the image was created. Likeness was left in question. Since adoption as sons (Ephesians 1:5), and conformity to the image of Christ, God's Son (Romans 8:29) are the New Testament interpretations of God's original purpose, could not these be the characteristics of the molded likeness to God, formed in the furnace of moral probation, which could not, by their very nature, be built into the original image by fiat creation? It is the difference between original righteousness and true holiness.

CHAPTER VI

THE PROCESS OF REDEMPTION

It has been shown that a distinction can and must be made between the image and likeness of God in man. The image has been stamped upon every individual person, there being no constituent difference between natural and redeemed man. Without question, the repercussions of sin leave a growing residue of evil effects so that even the earth groans under the burden of it, and all men suffer limitations of body and mind because of it. God said to Adam that the ground would be cursed for his sake,¹ and Paul said the whole creation groans and travails in pain.² Whatever may be meant by this, (for there is some obscurity in it), certainly the direct statement of God is very clear regarding the sin of man, " I am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation."³ Because of this, Paul states that "we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened."⁴ But the hurt to the imago Dei is secondary and incidental, hence redemption touches it but incidentally until

¹ Genesis 3:17.

² Romans 8:22.

³ Exodus 20:5.

⁴ II Corinthians 5:4.

the restoration of all things,⁵ and the redemption of the purchased possession.⁶ This general conclusion is in harmony with revealed truth, in that the New Testament nowhere speaks of recovery in relation to an image, nor does it refer to a restoration of the imago Dei as any aspect of redemption.

When this investigator sought New Testament passages to substantiate the theory that men are restored to the image of God, none could be found. Rather, of the ten New Testament references to image, five were miscellaneous references: (1) A coin bore the image of Caesar.⁷ (2) Depraved men made images like themselves, to worship.⁸ (3) Man was made in the image of God.⁹ (4) Redeemed men bear the image of the earthly but will bear that of the heavenly.¹⁰ (5) The law is not the very image (or image itself) of things to come.¹¹ The five remaining references are all of Christ, as he relates to the Father or as men are related to Him. (1) Christ is the image of God.¹² (2) Christ is the image of the invisible

⁵ Matthew 17:11.

⁶ Ephesians 1:14.

⁷ Matthew 22:20.

⁸ Acts 1:23.

⁹ I Corinthians 11:7.

¹⁰ I Corinthians 15:49.

¹¹ Hebrews 10:1.

¹² II Corinthians 4:4.

God, the first born of all creation.¹³ (3) Men are to be conformed to the image of God's Son,¹⁴ (4) and renewed unto knowledge after the image of him who created him.¹⁵ (5) Those who behold the glory of the Lord are changed into the same image from glory to glory.¹⁶ There is one occasion in the New Testament where the English word image is used to translate another Greek word. In the book of Hebrews Christ is said to be the "very image" of God's substance.¹⁷ But in this case it is the Greek word *καρὰ κτῆος*, which is in the original text with somewhat the same meaning as its transliteration into English, character, and as such, adds value to this study.

It has been Biblically established that man was created in the image of God. But the New Testament seems to point to Christ, as God's image, who is now the prototype of the "new man"¹⁸ which redemption proposes. The "new man" is created in Christ Jesus.¹⁹ He is to partake of the divine nature,²⁰ which

¹³ Colossians 1:15.

¹⁴ Romans 8:29.

¹⁵ Colossians 3:10.

¹⁶ II Corinthians 3:18.

¹⁷ Hebrews 1:3.

¹⁸ Colossians 3:10.

¹⁹ Ephesians 4:24.

²⁰ II Peter 1:4.

is righteousness and "truth" holiness.²¹ God's original intention was that men should be molded to the image of Christ,²² and that he "should be holy and without blemish before him in love."²³ The Son, who was the effulgence of the Father's glory and the very character of the Father is the prototype of that image to which man must be molded.

It is in this realm of likeness, representing as it has been shown to do, the moral capacity of men, that grace operates. The entire New Testament message stresses a moral likeness to Christ as the purpose implicit in creation,²⁴ as the goal of redemption,²⁵ and as the test of Christian experience.²⁶

This thought introduces the two major concerns of this chapter. The first has to do with the interrelationship of Christ and the race of men, as prototype and antitype. The second deals with the method of redemption.

²¹ Ephesians 4:24.

²² Romans 8: 29.

²³ Ephesians 1:4.

²⁴ Romans 8:29.

²⁵ Matthew 5:16.

²⁶ Romans 8:9.

I. INTERRELATIONSHIP OF FATHER AND SON TO THE RACE OF MEN

"Adoption as sons" is an arresting expression and one that has assumed an ever enlarging significance to this study. This section, adoption as sons, is offered as a personal opinion based upon Scriptural usage and interpretation alone, with whatever confirmation of key statements that were available from other sources. It does not alter the general argument of the study but if it can be defended successfully, does strengthen the final conclusions.

Because of the fact that in the creation account the likeness of God in men was left an open question, and because Adam was never called the son of God, and because Paul, in Romans, said that the original purpose of God was that men were to be conformed to the image of His Son, and in the Ephesian letter said that they were predestined to the adoption of sons ($\sigma\iota\omicron\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu$) through Jesus Christ, the writer is of the opinion that Adam's probation should have culminated in sonship. This would have consummated the creation purpose of God. Adam's failure robbed him of all probationary rights and possibilities. It cut him off from the life of God. The purpose and function of grace is to restore men to the level of probation and hence to the possibility of sonship as originally intended. This, then, is the process of redemption; life, then sonship. Though Paul is the only New Testament writer who speaks of adoption, the idea of sonship as distinct from justification is a common teaching. Jesus taught it in the

parable of the prodigal son, when the erring boy was made to say that he was glad to confess that he was not worthy to be called a son, but was willing to be but a hired hand. The point is in the act of the father, who, by proper ceremony, restored sonship to the lad who had forfeited it.²⁷

T. Rees, in refuting the Catholic position which identifies adoption with baptismal regeneration and thereby sacrifices the essential element of conscious sonship, says,

The new birth and adoption are certainly aspects of the same totality of experience, but they belong to different systems of thought, and to identify them is to invite confusion. The new birth defines especially the origin and moral quality of the Christian experience as an abstract fact, but adoption expresses a concrete relation of God to men.²⁸

This investigator concurs with this commonly held conservative theological distinction between the new birth and adoption, but feels that there may be Biblical grounds for entertaining the suggestion that these two aspects of salvation could be separate events. The following observations have strengthened this suggestion. John said that those who had received the "Light" and who had been born of God were not thereby made sons but were given "the power to become the sons of God."²⁹

²⁷ Luke 15:19-24.

²⁸ T. Rees, "Adoption," International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, I, p. 59.

²⁹ John 1:12-13.

It will be recalled that the terms and tests of sonship are of a different nature than that of the new birth. The analogy of adoption, while it must not be forced unduly, does, on the face of it, imply a very conscious act of choice on the part of both parties to the event. Paul, in using the figure of adoption, spoke of a custom, fully understood by all his readers. Though the Jews did not practice it under their law, both Greeks and Romans around them did.

In Greece a man might during his lifetime, or by will, to take effect after his death, adopt any male citizen into the privileges of his son, but with the invariable condition that the adopted son accepted the legal obligations and religious duties of a real son.

For the adoption of a person free from paternal authority, the process and effect were practically the same in Rome as in Greece.³⁰

A further reason for the conviction that the above suggestion may have Biblical validity arises from a distinction which Paul seems to make in Romans 8:15 and Galatians 4:1-7 between servants and sons. In both passages he employs the term adoption. The "spirit of bondage" does not refer to the spiritually dead, (the parallel figure of Romans seven), but to the regenerated state, peculiar to spiritual infancy. The passage in Galatians corroborates this and both are remarkably reminiscent of the discussion in the Corinthian letter regarding babes in Christ.³¹ W. B. Godbey, in commenting on

³⁰ Rees, op. cit., p. 58.

³¹ I Corinthians 3:1-3.

the verse in Romans 8 concerning adoption makes a strong point of this contrast in spiritual states. The state in which the "spirit of bondage" dominates, appertains to the

entire period of spiritual infancy, beginning at birth, i.e., regeneration, and running up to majority, i.e., sanctification, where you enter spiritual manhood. Upon examination you readily see that these two periods are but counterparts in the history of the same individual, the servile character predominating during spiritual infancy, while you need 'nurses' and 'guardians' and the filial having pre-eminence during your majority, when you are competent to take care of yourself and consequently no longer under the 'nurses' and 'guardians.'³²

. . . in the sanctified experience the filial relation comes to the front, throwing into eclipse the former period of spiritual infancy, . . .³³

In both of the above passages adoption is said to become the grounds upon which redeemed men are made "joint-heirs" with Christ. This relationship makes a believer who is now a son of God, also, by implication a "brother" to the divine Son of God. Though the common term, "Elder Brother," is not Biblical, yet the spirit of it is correct in the light of the usage in the letter to the Colossians in which Paul calls Christ the "firstborn of every creature."³⁴ If men were predestined to the adoption of sons and to be conformed to the image of God's Son it is evident that there is some vital relationship between Christ, as Son of God and the race of men, and that that

³² W. B. Godbey, Commentary on the New Testament (Cincinnati: Revivalist Office, 1899), V, p. 131.

³³ Ibid., p. 132.

³⁴ Colossians 1:15.

relationship is involved in the redemptive process. It is not in the province of this study to attempt a thorough investigation of this field, but enough needs to be established to defend the statement that all of redemption centers about Christ as the image of God and that it is to the image of Christ and not a lost and restored image of God, that believers are to be conformed.

The Father-Son relationship within the God-head has a direct bearing upon the matter under consideration. God, as Father, who proposed sonship in men, could only be revealed by the Son. To be eternally Father, Christ must be eternally Son. This relationship is unique. No other person is son as the Second Person of the God-head is to the Father.

Angels and men have been called sons of God, in an improper and metaphorical sense, but they have never been styled, 'only begotten', nor indeed, 'sons', in any such distinguishing and emphatic manner as Christ is. They are sons by adoption, or faint resemblance; he is truly, properly and eminently, Son of God, and therefore, God, as every son of man is, therefore, truly man.³⁵

Origen introduced to theology the paraphrase

'Eternal Son,' and with strict propriety, since all the interior relations of the God-head are of necessity eternal.³⁶

³⁵ Richard Watson, Theological Institutes (New York: Waugh & T. Mason, 1934), I, p. 542.

³⁶ William Burton Pope, The Person of Christ (London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 1875), p. 7.

The Relationship of the Eternal Son to the Race is in this way revealed. "It is in the Person of the Son that God unites again our race to Himself."³⁷ In creating man in the image of God and later revealing that the Second Person of the God-head was the Son, in an eternal relationship, it is clearly seen that something of the capacity for sonship must be in the constituent nature of man. It is this involvement of the Son in our creation that constitutes Him the "first born."

He is the 'first born before every creature'. . . the apostle signifies, not simply that the Son was begotten before the creature—a declaration that is included but does not fully explain this most unusual phrase—but that the intelligent creation, and especially man, the elect creature of God, was made after the image and likeness of the Son, with the elements of a nature capable of being partaker of the Divine. . . Hence, we dare to believe, magnifying the distinction of our birthright, that we had received His nature before He assumed ours.³⁸

Girdlestone has pointed out that it is the word likeness, not image, which describes the manner in which Christ took the form of man.³⁹ God sent "His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh."⁴⁰ Christ took on him the form of a servant, "and was made in the likeness of men."⁴¹ This is significant in the light of this study. The Son is the image of God, (not

³⁷ Loc. cit.

³⁸ Pope, op. cit., pp. 9-10.

³⁹ Robert Baker Girdlestone, Synonyms of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans' Publishing Company, 1948), p. 307.

⁴⁰ Romans 8:3.

⁴¹ Philipians 2:7.

made in the image), and is therefore, the first born of all creation. But His participation in the race is under terms of likeness as is to be the relationship of the race to Him. This likeness, however, is the likeness of $\sigma\chi\eta\mu\alpha$, or outward appearance, rather than $\muορφη$, which indicates the more fundamental and thorough character which was to be man's reciprocal approximation to Him.⁴² The reason for the Pauline declaration thus becomes evident, when he said that men were to be conformed to the image of God's son. Having been made in His image, metaphysically, men are obligated to become like Him ethically, in His moral lineaments as revealed in His perfect Sonship.

The Son Reveals the Father. The first revelation of Jesus to men was by means of the term Son. He was Son of man and Son of God, a revelation of His dual nature and dual relationship. Quite simply, as Son he disclosed God as Father. Though glimpses of the "Father-hood" of God are seen in the Old Testament,⁴³ it took Jesus, as the incarnate Son to fully manifest this peculiar aspect of God's possible relationship to men as Father. If the previous reasoning has been correct, mankind, in Adam, in falling away from the plane of probation, because of the divisive nature of the sin in the garden of

⁴² Richard Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1947), p. 263.

⁴³ Isaiah 63:16; 64:8.

Eden, lost, also, his concept of God as Father. Man, in sin, could only understand God as judge. Revelation, culminating in Christ, was that of God as Father and the possible relationship to Him which was originally intended. Jesus clearly taught that it was just this concept that He came to reveal. "Show us the Father," Philip urged. Jesus answered, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet thou hast not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."⁴⁴

The Moral Basis of Sonship. The Jews had also claimed God as Father, and it was in the discussion of this idea that Jesus was able to inject the moral implications of the truth He came to reveal concerning the Fatherhood of God. They said, "We have one Father, even God." Jesus countered, "If God were your Father, you would love me; . . . but ye are of your father, the devil."⁴⁵ The terms of father-hood and sonship, as moral relationships, are plainly taught here.

In all this it can be seen the sense in which men were created in the image of God, - the Triune God being the specific pattern for concrete human-hood. If the relationship of Father and Son is intrinsic to the Trinity, whose image men bear, something of that same capacity must be a part of the moral structure of man. The Son, in this eternal relationship

⁴⁴ John 14:8-9.

⁴⁵ John 8:39-44.

must be, then, the moral prototype toward which moral probation was designed and toward which men were to be conformed by the filial obedience of free love. In this sacred relationship, the function of love is supreme. In the God-head, perfect mutual love is expressed. As the Son is to the Father, absolutely and eternally, so men have been given the capacity of becoming, relatively and contingently, and to this end moral probation exists. With this in mind, Jesus' prayer, as recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John, takes on added significance.

I pray that they all may be one; as thou, father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. . . I in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me. . . For thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world. . . And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it; that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them.⁴⁶

The Terms of Sonship. In order to make possible men's relationship to God after the analogy of the Son's relationship to the Father, Jesus "came to his own" - to those whose prototype He was, -and was made flesh, "and dwelt among us."⁴⁷ He took on Himself the seed of Abraham,⁴⁸ and came under the terms of human probation. In this He was made like unto his

⁴⁶ John 17:26.

⁴⁷ John 1:14.

⁴⁸ Hebrews 2:16-17.

brethren.⁴⁹ He was "tempted in all points like as we are, without sin.⁵⁰ He tasted death for every man,⁵¹ to deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.⁵² And it was in this capacity of uniting in Himself both God and man that his death and resurrection could make reconciliation for the sins of the people.⁵³ Within Himself, He provides the way back to God. "No man cometh unto the Father but by me."⁵⁴ Daniel Steele's insight was valuable here, though it is this investigator's opinion that more weight should have been given to the eternal purpose of God in the plan of redemption rather than permitting the suggestion that salvation was an afterthought to God, as Steele seems to do.

When sin had discrowned Adam and his sons it was determined in the Council of the Trinity that a new and superior order should be constructed out of a ruined race. A second Adam appears on earth as the first term of the glorious series, the new founder of the new order. He is the new norm or model by which the new creation will proceed. All these sons of fallen Adam who by faith yield to the transforming power assume the essential attributes of the second Adam, the Lord from heaven. . . . There is one word in the Greek Testament that exactly describes this relation of Jesus to the development of the sons of God. The term is ἀρχηγός . . . rendered best, file-leader. . . . The office

⁴⁹ Hebrews 2:17.

⁵⁰ Hebrews 4:15.

⁵¹ Hebrews 2:9.

⁵² Hebrews 2:15.

⁵³ Hebrews 2:17.

⁵⁴ John 14:6.

of Christ as the beginner of a glorious series is strikingly set forth in Hebrews 2:10: 'For it became Him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the file-leader perfect through suffering.'⁵⁵

Jesus, as Son of God, and by implication, our Brother, showed men the moral basis for sonship. He undercut any notion of the universal Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man by His stern demands. Sonship is reserved for those who love God supremely, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, mind, soul and strength, and thy neighbor as thyself.⁵⁶ To be privileged to sit with the Son in glory one must have shared in His ministry, "For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister."⁵⁷ Sonship involves the suffering of discipline, for "though he were a Son, yet he learned obedience by the things which he suffered,"⁵⁸ and "whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth."⁵⁹ And a son is obedient even unto death.⁶⁰ All of this is involved in the "adoption as sons" which is after the analogy of the Sonship of Christ to the Father.

⁵⁵ Daniel Steele, Mile-stone Papers (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1876), pp. 13-14.

⁵⁶ Mark 12:30.

⁵⁷ Mark 10:37-45.

⁵⁸ Hebrews 5:8.

⁵⁹ Hebrews 12:6.

⁶⁰ Philippians 2:8.

It is just at this point that the full significance of keeping the distinction clear between image and likeness appears. There is an important difference between image as constituent equipment which identifies man as man, the loss or serious derangement of any part of which would make him incapable of morally intelligent existence, and the disposition man makes of his powers. There is no better way to sharpen the discrimination than to label these two concepts, being and attribute. The "new man," the man "created in Christ Jesus" is not a man new in any metaphysical sense. Man did not lose anything of his metaphysical image in the fall. He is to have no new image, in that sense, in redemption. Even to parallel the idea of natural and moral by using the term image in both cases leads to the error of thinking of moral image in the same concrete way as natural image is conceived. This conception takes the moral element out of the redemption process by thinking of grace as making an artificial addition to man, either as irresistible, hence, a moral, or as the metaphysical addition of the supernatural, also a moral, both of which lead to practical antinomianism. Another danger is in the more mystical approach of Arminianism, which may also issue in as effective an antinomianism as the other systems. The error is in thinking of the union of God and man in too metaphysical a sense, one in which there is a "blending, a fusion," a "unique" union in which each may in some way lose their own identities,

and a "new species of humanity" is created.⁶¹ Unless this is carefully guarded there tends to develop a blurred distinction between man and God, bordering upon pantheistic identification, with the consequent loss of moral responsibility to objective standards of revealed truth. The distinctions made in this study eliminate these dangers, by the emphasis made upon the ethical. Men retain their natural image. They do not approach any metaphysical union with God. Their attributes are molded to the attributes of Christ, which is another idea all together. The union of God with men in the experience of the baptism of the Holy Spirit is ethical and religious which is a very different thing than that implied by a union of being. Redeemed man will always be man, with attributes holy by derivation from the Holy Spirit. He may possess the "mind" of Christ, be molded into His image but will never be metaphysically united with Him.

II. THE MANNER OF REDEMPTION

In tracing through the tenses used in the Greek text in connection with the gracious provisions of Christ for men, several most interesting and significant facts were discovered. With a few note worthy exceptions, all verbs having to do with faith for the new birth and any other phase of initial salvation

⁶¹ George Frame, "The Genius of Entire Sanctification," The Preacher's Magazine, January-February, 1951. pp. 26-28.

were in the progressive present tense, signifying a continuing act or condition.⁶² Similarly, those verbs having to do with any phase of cleansing, sanctification and holiness were, in nearly every case in the aorist tense, which denotes a punctiliar act.⁶³ A third fact was that all verbs describing renewing, transformation and conformation of men to the image of Christ were found in the progressive present tense.

Another trilogy of truths developed. The mood of all that is said relative to initial salvation was one of entreaty and invitation. Seldom is this pattern altered except to address men who have sinned against great light or who profess great self-righteousness.⁶⁴ A change of mood was observed when any phase of cleansing was under discussion. A thundering, commanding, imperative sound was almost in every case employed. But the mood again changed for the final group of verbs. Either a statement of fact was made about the renewal which God intended or an exhortation to constancy was made. It was not "come ye," or "be ye," but "let us."

A third truth became increasingly obvious early in this study and was one which spurred the interest of the investigator. All references in the New Testament to man's relationship

⁶² Dana and Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947), p. 181.

⁶³ Ibid., p. 193.

⁶⁴ Luke 13:3,5.

to a divine image were to an approximation of man to the image of Christ. The word approximation is used for the reason that in every case where this matter was under discussion, the molding process was emphasized by the progressive present tense. Finally, wherever the image of Christ was made a prototype, the process of man's approximation to it was described by one of three words, transformation, conformation or renewal, the latter of which had no thought in the Greek of a repetitive act in remolding but of an initial molding toward a prototype. Keeping these three groups of observations in mind a more detailed and properly defended study will follow.

The reason for the order in which these verbs are treated and the aspect of salvation which they are said to describe, developed as a result of observing them within their context. A chart⁶⁵ was set up listing all the references in the New Testament which spoke of believing for some aspect of salvation. The tense in each case was recorded against the actual reading of the passage. Besides the observations already given which were made from an analysis of this chart the following are significant. The exhortations to exercise the faculty of faith were addressed mainly to unbelievers, obviously, and hence, to those who were in sin. It was logical to conclude that these passages referred to the initial work of grace. This does not exclude faith from the other benefits of grace for

⁶⁵ See Chart I.

interestingly enough, the condition for them was merely given as, "by faith," which implied a continuing attitude of faith. The chart also pointed out the fact that all exhortations to cleansing, sanctifying, to "putting off" and "putting on" and purity of heart and mind were addressed to believers, to brethren, to the church and even to those who had become "ensamples" to all of Macedonia.⁶⁶ There was not much question but that this phase of redemption came chronologically subsequent to the prior one of believing. That it was so predominantly expressed in the aorist tense established it as an instantaneous work of grace. Though directed to the same audience as the work of cleansing, the work of renewal and transformation, was distinguished from it by the unchanging regularity of the progressive present tense. Besides this analysis of the chart, there was no attempt, in this study, to arbitrarily associate any work of grace with any certain passage of Scripture.

The Function of Faith. The most urgent demand in all the New Testament on men is the demand to believe God. The urgency of faith penetrates every fibre of the Word. It surrounds every promise and stands in the way of every step toward God and redemption. The very first step toward light and God is conditioned by faith. This faith is not a mere intellectual assent or life commitment alone, but seems to be

⁶⁶ I Thessalonians 1-4.

a living trust, a vital confidence in God as Lord. Assurance of this fact is pressed convincingly upon the mind of one who traces the usage of the word through the gospels and epistles. It is the unbelief of rebellion against the absolute authority of God that characterizes the carnal man. Faith, then, becomes a moral act, which surrenders self-will, and self reliance and in its exercise clears the clogged channels to God. Faith is, according to Thayer, the conviction of the truth of anything or a belief respecting man's relationship to God and divine things.⁶⁷ The writer to the Hebrews, in familiar words, has reminded his readers that "without faith it is impossible to be well-pleasing to God," and that he who comes to God must believe that He is and that He rewards those who seek Him.⁶⁸ John's gospel is full of exhortation regarding the importance of faith, and he said the cause for God's condemnation of the race is this: "He that believeth not hath been judged already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God."⁶⁹ This passage becomes a commentary on the moral implications of unbelief. "This is the judgement, that light came into the world and men loved darkness rather than light . . . everyone that doeth evil hateth the light, and cometh

⁶⁷ Joseph Henry Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (New York: American Book Company, 1899), p. 512.

⁶⁸ Hebrews 11:6.

⁶⁹ John 3:18.

not to the light."⁷⁰ When Jesus said, "Except ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins,"⁷¹ he reiterated the moral implications of unbelief. No wonder then that the terms for believing are used about ninety times in John's gospel alone--some of these in the strongest possible language. All that is included in salvation from sin and entrance into eternal life hinges absolutely upon faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God. Unbelief is not only condemned in itself, as it occurs in men's reaction to God but has already met God's judgment.

Unbelief is not failure in intellectual apprehension. It is disobedience in the presence of the clear commands of God.⁷²

If there were no future judgment, anyone who now refuses to believe, has been condemned by virtue of his deliberate personal involvement with this sin of the race. One more verse sharpens the issue so far as life and faith in God is concerned. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."⁷³

(Faith) rises up spontaneously in the soul when hindrances are removed. Unbelief has always a moral cause--unwillingness to do the will of God in some point. . .

⁷⁰ John 3:19-20.

⁷¹ John 8:24.

⁷² G. Campbell Morgan, God's Last Word to Man (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1934), p. 50.

⁷³ John 3:36.

Faith becomes as natural as breathing when we dethrone our idols.⁷⁴

Believing is the human response to God's grace without which there can be no salvation. This faith is in no sense human merit, but rather, the total absence of merit in that it is absolute dependence upon God. Faith, moreover, is a new life attitude, not merely the acceptance of some formal code or religious philosophy. The prevalence of the use of the Greek present tense supports this contention. It is in the attitude of believing that the benefits of redemption accrue. It is the "who are believing" ones (relative pronoun with present participle) who will not perish but have everlasting life.⁷⁵ The same words describe those who have life,⁷⁶ and, (another present participle), in "believing ye might have life."⁷⁷ Peter stressed this truth to Cornelius and his household, "Everyone that believeth on him (Jesus of Nazareth) shall have remission of sins."⁷⁸ In one of Paul's earliest recorded sermons he stressed the same truth, "everyone that believeth (is believing) is justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by Moses' law."⁷⁹ Throughout the book

⁷⁴ J. B. Chapman, The Terminology of Holiness (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1947), p. 75.

⁷⁵ John 3:16 (literal translation).

⁷⁶ John 3:36; 6:40.

⁷⁷ John 20:31.

⁷⁸ Acts 10:43.

⁷⁹ Acts 13:39.

of Romans, Paul related righteousness to the present attitude of believing.⁸⁰ John in his first letter said that the condition of being begotten of God depended upon the state of believing.⁸¹

Faith, then, is that single, slender line that alone permits communion between man and God. Unbelief, its antithesis, which is sin, with all that it involved severs that connection. Faith, with the conditions that permit its activity, operating as a permanent life attitude opens the door to all the benefits of grace. Its importance cannot be over emphasized nor even satisfactorily stressed. Eternal life is the fruit of faith.⁸² The new birth is by faith.⁸³ Righteousness is only by faith.⁸⁴ Remission of sins is by faith.⁸⁵ Believing in Jesus opens the door to the Spirit's infilling and empowering.⁸⁶ The Christian's "rest" is entered by faith.⁸⁷ The

⁸⁰ Romans 3:22; 4:5; 6:24; 10:4; 10:10.

⁸¹ I John 5:1.

⁸² John 3:36.

⁸³ I John 5:1.

⁸⁴ Romans 4:24, etc.

⁸⁵ Acts 10:43.

⁸⁶ John 7:38.

⁸⁷ Hebrews 4:3.

promise of the Spirit is through faith.⁸⁸ Hearts are purified by faith.⁸⁹ Men are sanctified by faith.⁹⁰ Christ dwells in the heart by faith.⁹¹ There is access with boldness to the presence of God, by faith.⁹² Christians are established in faith.⁹³ And Jesus is the author and finisher of the believer's faith.⁹⁴

There is yet to be considered those few occasions where believing is found in the aorist tense. In every case, so far as this investigator has discovered, where the term is found in the aorist tense, the Biblical writer sought to establish the fact that at a time prior to the action of the main verb certain people became believers, or to emphasize a condition in which they had, or would become, believers. A notable example is that in which John the Baptist was said to be a witness to the Light, that "all men through him might believe."⁹⁵ One of the strongest arguments for a "second work of grace" hangs

⁸⁸ Galatians 3:14.

⁸⁹ Acts 15:2.

⁹⁰ Acts 26:18.

⁹¹ Ephesians 3:17.

⁹² Ephesians 3:12.

⁹³ Colossians 1:23.

⁹⁴ Hebrews 12:2.

⁹⁵ John 1:7 (subjunctive aorist).

on this aorist tense and a Greek rule in grammar. The rule is that an aorist participle, when temporal, usually denotes a preceding state or act, to that of the main verb.

This use of the Aorist Participle is one of the most common idioms in the New Testament, and may be continually represented in translation by two verbs--the action of the one (the participle) immediately preceding that of the other.⁹⁶

"Antecedent action relative to the main verb is ordinarily expressed by the aorist or perfect participle."⁹⁷ This usage, so common in Greek, has been pressed into valuable service in expressing the truth under consideration. Four clear examples will illustrate the fact that the special operating of the Spirit upon the hearts of men is subsequent to a definite state of believing. The aorist participle indicates the sequence of events.

He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, from within him shall flow rivers of living water, But this spoke he of the Spirit, which they that believed on him were to receive.⁹⁸ (Aorist participle).

Did ye receive the Holy Spirit when ye believed?⁹⁹ (The King James expresses the tense more accurately when it says, "since ye believed." (Aorist participle).

⁹⁶ Samuel G. Green, Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament (London: The Religious Tract Society, n.d.), p. 333.

⁹⁷ H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1947), p. 230.

⁹⁸ John 7:38-39.

⁹⁹ Acts 19:2.

We who have believed do enter into that rest.¹⁰⁰
(Aorist participle)

(Christ). . . in whom, having also believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is an earnest of our inheritance, unto the redemption of God's own possession.¹⁰¹ (Aorist participle)

Faith begins with an act and continues as an attitude.

There is Biblical evidence, also, that this aorist and perfect use of the verb to believe establishes the position that, though believing is a continuing attitude, it is not temporally indefinite. Peter must have referred to such a definite occasion when he said to Jesus, "We have believed and know that thou art the holy one of God."¹⁰² Paul must have meant for the Roman jailor to take a clear cut step when he said to him, "Believe on the Lord Jesus and thou shall be saved."¹⁰³ The jailor must have been through some crisis experience, when a few minutes later he was said to "rejoice greatly. . . having believed in God."¹⁰⁴ By the same token it may be concluded that justification is not a gradual accomplishment, though it is, as above demonstrated, maintained by faith, "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law,

¹⁰⁰ Hebrews 4:3.

¹⁰¹ Ephesians 1:13-14.

¹⁰² John 6:69.

¹⁰³ Acts 16:31.

¹⁰⁴ Acts 16:34.

but through faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Jesus Christ."¹⁰⁵ All the above tenses are aorists or perfects. An aorist subjunctive remains, suggesting the contingency of believing as a definite act, "If thou shalt. . . believe in thy heart. . . thou shalt be saved."¹⁰⁶

With all this it may be concluded that faith is the condition of any saving contact with God, that it is a continuing condition of believing that it perpetuates the benefits of grace and that there is another "work of grace" receivable only by those who have previously become believers. All of this constitutes the first step toward conformity to the image of Christ. It is involved in the initial step in redemption.

The Function of Cleansing. The second step follows naturally from the preceding observations. In fact it is required by the very anticipations which were aroused by the Scriptures quoted. Subsequent to becoming a believer in Christ, there is another act of divine grace termed variously, cleansing, purifying, and sanctification. To this experience strong urgency is expressed in such phrases, as, "put off" and "put on," "cleanse yourselves," "put to death," "purify yourselves," "present" and many more. The striking fact that practically

¹⁰⁵ Galatians 2:16.

¹⁰⁶ Romans 10:9.

all these references are in the aorist tense, make obvious the relationship between them in the plan of redemption. All of them have to do with a renovation of the inner man.

Sanctification seems to center about a reestablishment of a proper relationship to truth, which relationship was violated in the fall of man. All righteousness is sustained by truth. Sanctification is renewal in truth. It was pointed out in Chapter IV that enmity and rebellion in the human heart is centered in the *φρόνημα*, or that area of mind out of which the "general bent of thought and motive"¹⁰⁷ arise. Every area of mind was actively co-operative in the wilful departure from truth. Holiness must be a complete reversal of every area of mind to comply with God's truth. And so it develops.

Jesus' entire ministry was in the interest of this truth. He not only came to bear witness to truth¹⁰⁸ but He was truth.¹⁰⁹ The Comforter whom Jesus would send in His place was the Spirit of Truth¹¹⁰ and when "He is come" He would guide into all truth.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁷ Moulton and Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1949), p. 676.

¹⁰⁸ John 5:33.

¹⁰⁹ John 14:6.

¹¹⁰ John 14:17.

¹¹¹ John 16:13.

Jesus prayed that believers would be sanctified through truth.¹¹² His preoccupation with truth is the profoundest fact of all redemption. It was the ultimate in redemption, for it attacked "the Lie" which is the essence of carnality and sin. There is a moral element in man's relationship to truth and only those morally willing to receive it can do so.

Christ could make blind eyes see, but He could not make a blind soul perceive while persisting in a course of sin . . . Truth is conformity to fact or reality. Eternal happiness is in building on the granite of reality and laying every hewn stone by a plum line of truth.¹¹³

In all the epistles the reference to truth and holiness and the gospel is strong and frequent. The "new man" which is to be put on is said to be created in the "holiness of truth"¹¹⁴ and the loins are to be "girt with truth."¹¹⁵ "The lie" is to be put away.¹¹⁶ Every solemn warning is made against lying of all kinds and against any association in word or spirit with those who turn from the truth. It is the opinion of this investigator that this element of the redemptive economy is absolutely central. All of moral recovery is anchored to truth. It lies at the heart of every Scriptural analogy regarding the

¹¹² John 17:17.

¹¹³ Daniel Steele, The Gospel of the Comforter (Apollo, Pa.: The West Publishing Co., n.d.), p. 14.

¹¹⁴ Ephesians 4:24.

¹¹⁵ Ephesians 6:14.

¹¹⁶ Ephesians 4:25.

various aspects of the work of grace. It is itself, no analogy, but stark, raw fact. It is to this recovery of man to the relationship of truth that the analogies are addressed and in that light receive their forcefulness.

The terms sanctify and cleanse and purify, all in the aorist tense, have been adequately treated by Daniel Steele in his book, Mile-Stone Papers, and so will not be repeated here. But one more observation is necessary to the progress of this argument. It was noted that the first step to moral rightness was faith and the second step cleansing. The radical nature of what occurs in cleansing is demonstrated by the Greek imperatives, "put off," and "put on," and, in this, something of the essential nature of the image of God in man is revealed. It would be difficult to conceive of a greater shock to human personality than that implied in these commands. To "put off the old man"¹¹⁷ and "put on the new man"¹¹⁸ involves a voluntary tearing up of the very roots of personality, out of the muck of self-love and a transplanting of them into the will of God. It is the most violent revolution which the human mind can support. It is the human preamble to the divine cleansing wrought by the baptism of the Holy Spirit. It is not a life long anguish, a gradual putting to death. It is an act as

¹¹⁷ Colossians 3:9.

¹¹⁸ Ephesians 4:24; Romans 13:4; Colossians 3:10.

deliberate as that which characterized our first parents' sin, and it is as clean cut and positive as that which the Greek aorist pictures. "Let all bitterness be put away."¹¹⁹ "Putting away lying."¹²⁰ "Put off all things."¹²¹ "Mortify your members"¹²² "Renounce hidden things of dishonesty."¹²³ "Put on the Lord Jesus Christ."¹²⁴ "Put on the new man."¹²⁵ In this act, all of "the lie" is abolished, and all of "the truth" is received. The very deepest nature is altered, first by a man's voluntary act and then, in answer to all the promises of God, an act of the Spirit of God, divinely accomplished. The Greek word for "putting off" and "putting on" is used also for putting clothing on and off¹²⁶ and is a happy choice in this spiritual connection, for it not only points to the unessential nature of sin to human finiteness but the human ability to voluntarily part with it, at least so far as intention goes.

¹¹⁹ Ephesians 4:31.

¹²⁰ Ephesians 4:25.

¹²¹ Colossians 3:8.

¹²² Colossians 3:5.

¹²³ II Corinthians 4:2.

¹²⁴ Romans 13:14.

¹²⁵ Ephesians 4:24.

¹²⁶ Thayer, op. cit., p. 214.

There are a number of observations pertinent to this study which should be made regarding the words under discussion. Sanctification, or cleansing, is required, by Biblical injunction.¹²⁷ The cleansing is to be from, unrighteousness,¹²⁸ bitterness,¹²⁹ filthiness of flesh and spirit,¹³⁰ double-mindedness,¹³¹ lying,¹³² fornication and such like.¹³³ All these seem to be in the realm of attitude and spirit. At least fifteen times the work of becoming separated from and separated to, is said to be on the initiative of the human agent. About fifteen or sixteen times a divine agency is indicated, as being the source of the new cleansed life. Of striking interest are the number of passages in which the work of Christ is said to be for the purpose of this act. Jesus, in order to sanctify the people with his blood suffered outside the gate.¹³⁴ Jesus Christ gave himself to redeem and purify a people.¹³⁵ The blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin.¹³⁶

¹²⁷ See Chart II.

¹²⁸ I John 1:9.

¹²⁹ Ephesians 4:31.

¹³⁰ II Corinthians 7:1.

¹³¹ John 4:8.

¹³² Ephesians 4:25.

¹³³ I Thessalonians 4:3.

¹³⁴ Hebrews 13:12.

¹³⁵ Titus 2:14.

¹³⁶ I John 1:7.

These, with others, are all in the aorist tense. It becomes obvious that this act of grace, participated in by both man and God, at a time subsequent to the new birth, is designed to establish a new relationship between God and man. Man's preoccupation with self and the world, expressed in enmity and bitterness and uncleanness is to be directed toward God and thereby the new issues of life will be correspondingly changed.

As with the general tenor of the use of the word, to believe in the present tense with the significant exceptions, so with the words relating to holiness in the aorist tense. A few are in the present progressive tense, and are so, significantly. It testifies to the fact that while there is an act of sanctification, there is also a process in the sanctified relationship. The writer to the Hebrews uses this present tense twice among the few occasions of it in the New Testament. Jesus is the sanctifier of those who are being sanctified,¹³⁷ and by His one offering He has perfected forever those who are being sanctified.¹³⁸ John records two such verses. "If we walk in the light, . . . the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth (continues to cleanse) us from all sin."¹³⁹ Again, "He that hath this hope of seeing Jesus in him, purified himself, even as he is pure."¹⁴⁰ These two passages seem to

¹³⁷ Hebrews 2:11.

¹³⁸ Hebrews 10:14.

¹³⁹ I John 1:7.

¹⁴⁰ I John 3:3.

teach the contingency of this grace. Thomas Cook stated it well.

Holiness. . . is a condition of soul which requires for its maintainance the continual observance of the condition by which we enter into it.

When He the Holy Spirit fills the heart with the light of His own indwelling presence all sin is excluded, but that condition is only maintained so long as the Holy Spirit continues fully to possess the heart.¹⁴¹
 . . . We teach, therefore, not a state of purity, but a maintained condition of purity.¹⁴²

Paul twice uses the present tense in this manner. In contrasting the life lived after the flesh and after the Spirit, he summarizes,

If ye live after the flesh, ye must die; but if by the Spirit, ye put to death keep putting to death the deeds of the body, ye shall live.¹⁴³

This is not contrary to his exhortation in Colossians, "Put to death your members,"¹⁴⁴ which is in the aorist tense, when it is noted that the itemized members of sin are specifically enumerated in the last passage while a continuing spiritual emphasis over the bodily emphasis, with no sins considered, is in the first, the subject under discussion. There is suggested by this verse, the important consideration that the Spirit-

¹⁴¹ Thomas Cook, New Testament Holiness (London: The Epworth Press, 1950), p. 42.

¹⁴² Ibid., p. 43.

¹⁴³ Romans 8:13.

¹⁴⁴ Colossians 3:5.

filled life is to be nurtured and guarded. The other Pauline statement so far as a study of terms is concerned, is in the Corinthian letter. "Let us cleanse ourselves (aorist) from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting (present) holiness in the fear of the Lord."¹⁴⁵ It is obvious from these passages that holiness is both a gift and a process. It is therefore both instantaneous and gradual.

Holiness is both a crisis and a process. As Bishop Moule would say, 'It is a crisis with a view to a process.'¹⁴⁶

In the light of the preponderance of evidence in the use of the aorist tense, to the instantaneous nature of the cleansing experience, a sharp distinction must always be made between that and progressive holiness.

There can be no increase of purity, but there may be an eternal increase of love, and in the fruits of the Spirit. After cleansing, our ceaseless prayerful effort must be to gain more knowledge, robust virtue, deeper sanctity and every other form of spiritual excellence.¹⁴⁷

Both believing and sanctification, according to Greek usage, begin with an act and continue as an attitude.¹⁴⁸ Faith is nine times referred to as an act, three of these being aorist participles and indicating a state of grace prior to the

¹⁴⁵ II Corinthians 7:1.

¹⁴⁶ Cook, op. cit., p. 43.

¹⁴⁷ Cook, op. cit., p. 36.

¹⁴⁸ See Chart III.

Spirit's infilling. Every other occasion for the use of the word believing, (about thirty-five) times, is in the present tense, and emphasizes the attitude of a Christian. Sanctification, cleansing, crucifixion, put off and on, etc., is thirty-five or six times found in the aorist or perfect tenses and six times in the present tense. This clearly testifies to the completeness of the moral renovation of the act but points to the truth that only by means of an established attitude in harmony with the will of God and in the closest communion with the source of holiness, the Holy Spirit, can this renovation be retained and developed. It is this last observation that leads to the final consideration of this study, namely, an examination of the attitude which must, by New Testament declaration, characterize a Christian.

Transformation of character. There seems to be two phases of post-sanctification procedure. It may contribute to clarity to say there are two lines running toward a common goal. One line is drawn from the redeemed, but sin-marred man, outward toward full redemption of both man and his tortured earth, "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. . .waiting for. . .redemption. . . ."149 It is a healing of the wounds which sin inflicted. The other line is drawn from a man made holy by the blood of Christ, up toward

149 Romans 8:22.

the fulness of the stature of Christ. It is the molding process ordained before worlds, which Adam could have and should have enjoyed.

Christian Ethics. The first line will be touched but briefly. Every exhortation to consistent, Christian behavior points to the depths of moral depravity into which the race has plunged itself. Romans 12-16 need not have been written to Adam and Eve. It was needed even to sanctified believers whose minds and manners had been corrupted as the first chapter of Romans would indicate. The exhortation could not have been heeded by a carnal Christian with fleshly lust in his heart, but it was advice, desperately needed even by the Spirit-filled, heathen convert. Hear the call; think not too highly of yourselves, but exercise your gifts fully;¹⁵⁰ have nothing but sincerity, in love and service in unpleasant relationships;¹⁵¹ be of the same mind one to another and be as much at peace as possible;¹⁵² be in subjection to higher powers;¹⁵³ let the strong bear the infirmities of the weak.¹⁵⁴ Ephesians is full of such instruction and the letters to the Thessalonians

¹⁵⁰ Romans 12:3-8.

¹⁵¹ Romans 12:9-13.

¹⁵² Romans 12:14-18.

¹⁵³ Romans 13:1-8.

¹⁵⁴ Romans 15.

abounds in it, particularly I Thessalonians 5:12-22. There is to be a refining of the whole man physically, socially, mentally, from the most crude, coarse, vulgar convert ever to come to Christ, to the cultured Paul, who was taught by the risen Lord. Dirt becomes abhorrent, manners tend to improve and the mind awakens under the influence of the indwelling Prince of life. Christian annals abound in confirmatory evidence of those dull, thick-witted individuals who under the illumination of the Spirit have found quickened intellects.¹⁵⁵ Even physical loveliness has supplanted the ugly ravages of sin. This aspect of redemption is important and we believe Biblically sound but is, in measure, incidental to the central theme of God's purpose for man. It is incidental in the sense that it supplements, merely, the grand, creative design which the Trinity proposed when it was decreed, "Let us make man in our image and after our likeness."

Christian Character. It is a self-evident truth that character is the result of a carefully controlled process and is never the result of any one act. It is just this truth that becomes significant at this point in the study under consideration. Adam was placed under probation for the purpose of moral testing to validate character. He failed. God's grace provided

¹⁵⁵ Harold Begbie, Twice Born Men (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1909).

not only redemption but extended the term of probation to cover the possibilities originally intended by God for man. Now, three passages of New Testament truth, laid together, seem to provide a pattern.

God chose you from the beginning unto salvation in sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth.¹⁵⁶

He God chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blemish before him in love; having foreordained us unto adoption as sons, . . .¹⁵⁷

Whom he foreknew, he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son.¹⁵⁸

Here are the three eternal goals for man, sanctification, sonship by adoption and conformation to the image of the Son. The first is what Adam had in his grasp but forfeited by choosing to believe "the Lie." The whole redemptive scheme is centered about the task of raising men to this level again in order that the original purpose could be realized. The second passage dovetails into the first relating holiness to adoption as sons, as the basis for further eternal advancement.

Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called children of God; and such we are. . . Beloved, now are we children of God, and it is not yet manifest what we shall be. We know that, if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him; for we shall see him even as he is. And every one that hath this hope

¹⁵⁶ II Thessalonians 2:13.

¹⁵⁷ Ephesians 1:4-5.

¹⁵⁸ Romans 8:29.

set on him^m purifieth himself, even as he is pure.¹⁵⁹

The third passage opens up the whole goal of God's creative purpose. All that is involved in the first, or sanctification, is but the lowest level of spiritual existence which is tolerable to God. The second is the relationship that God hoped men would choose by deliberate and loving decision. "Sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord."¹⁶⁰ And the third is the beginning of the endless possibilities of men, created in the image of God, to be molded to the image of Christ.

But we all, with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory.¹⁶¹

It is this last aspect of the possibility of one made in the image of God, and involving likeness to him^m, which demands final consideration.

There are three terms relative to character growth, all of which always appear in the present tense, conform^m, transform^m, renew. None of them, as will be seen, look backward to the image of God, but forward to the image of Christ. The first word, to conform^m (συνμορφίζω), has in it the subjective fashioning of a thing to a prototype. It has to do with the nature rather than surface appearance.¹⁶² It is that

¹⁵⁹ I John 3:1-3.

¹⁶⁰ I Peter 3:15.

¹⁶¹ II Corinthians 3:18.

¹⁶² Trench, op. cit., pp. 161-162.

which is intrinsic and essential in contrast to that which is outward and accidental.¹⁶³ Once only is it used as a verb in the New Testament, "that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his suffering, becoming conformed unto his death."¹⁶⁴ The present tense suggests a growing likeness to the Lord, not in any sense a gradual moral evolution, a thought which is denied in verse 9 by these words, "not having my own righteousness. . .but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith," but a character development due to a proper response to the sufferings incident to his ministry. Twice the word is used as a substantive, the occasion in Romans 8:29, already having been noted, and again in Philippians 3:21, the "body of our humiliation. . .conformed to the body of his glory." There is here suggested in both passages a molding of the very form and substance of the body and spirit into a likeness to Him who is the believer's Elder Brother, for *συνμορφῶς* "denotes inward and thorough and not merely superficial likeness."¹⁶⁵

The second word is transformation (*μεταμορφάω*), another compound with *μορφή*. It is used three times in the

¹⁶³ Thayer, op. cit., pp. 161-162.

¹⁶⁴ Philippians 3:10.

¹⁶⁵ Sanday and Headlam, *Epistle to the Romans* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950), p. 218.

New Testament; once to describe the change in Jesus at the Transfiguration;¹⁶⁶ again when Paul exhorted the Roman Christians to be transformed by the renewing of their minds;¹⁶⁷ and once more in Paul's description of that which would occur in those who "with unveiled face, beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory."¹⁶⁸ In all cases the progressive present tense is employed. It is an experience of metamorphosis of spirit and body accomplished as the attention is riveted on the glorified Lord. In none of these passages could the most feeble argument be found for any gradual destruction of sin, or daily death to evil. They are all accomplished in a spiritually rarified atmosphere free from the contamination of the carnal mind. In fact, the distraction which the carnal mind produces in drawing the full attention away from the Spirit of God, prevents the concentration necessary to the change of which Paul speaks. Transformation, or metamorphosis, is a geological term, which describes the change that heat and pressure exercises upon rocks, so altering the atomic pattern as to forever stamp a new character upon the substance. This type of change is, in the Roman passage, contrasted with a

¹⁶⁶ Matthew 17:2.

¹⁶⁷ Romans 12:2.

¹⁶⁸ II Corinthians 3:18.

cheap and superficial fashioning after this age, σχηµα . Trench says that it is possible for Satan to change (µετασχηµατίζειν) himself into an angel of light (II Corinthians 9:14); or he could take the whole outward resemblance of such; but to any such change the word (µεταμορφοῦσθε), could never apply, for it implies an internal transformation of character impossible to the devil.¹⁶⁹ The change Paul is describing takes time as the present tense indicates.

One more word is used in connection with the progress of development in a Christian, namely, renewal (to use the English translation). Nothing of the depth of meaning inhering in this term can be undertaken here, but only a suggestion of what is involved. Of the five times it is used in relation to the progression in grace, twice the Greek word ἀνακαίνω is translated, renew. "Though our outward man is decaying, yet our inward man is renewed day by day."¹⁷⁰ Ye have "put on the new man, that is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him."¹⁷¹ The noun form of this same word is found twice. "Be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind."¹⁷² According to his mercy he saved us, through the

¹⁶⁹ Trench, op. cit., pp. 263-264.

¹⁷⁰ II Corinthians 4:16.

¹⁷¹ Colossians 3:10.

¹⁷² Romans 12:2.

washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit."¹⁷³
 This word, Thayer says, is peculiar to the Apostle Paul, and means to cause to grow up, or to make new.¹⁷⁴ Once, *αναθεώμα* is found, "Be renewed in the spirit of your mind."¹⁷⁵ It is an exhortation to take on a new mind,¹⁷⁶ or, as Trench suggests, "This is that gradual conforming of the man more and more to that new spiritual world into which he has been introduced."¹⁷⁷ He adds that this word implies an active participation in the personal change rather than the passivity of other expressions.

It will be seen that these three words are important to an understanding of the purpose of God for men. Another study should investigate into the full implications of these words to the eternal development of man toward the image of Christ. In summary, they have been seen to constitute an intrinsic and essential alteration in character. They indicate a deep and abiding change toward the very glory of the Lord, and that there is a personal responsibility in the growing up unto Him. The mind, or whole personality, is the area which is changed, and Christ is the Pattern. Character, knowledge, glory, these are the goals of God for men.

¹⁷³ Titus 3:5.

¹⁷⁴ Thayer, op. cit., p. 38.

¹⁷⁵ Ephesians 4:23.

¹⁷⁶ Thayer, op. cit., p. 40.

¹⁷⁷ Trench, op. cit., p. 65.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this research was an inductive Biblical study of the image of God in man. Every effort was sincerely put forth to discover the Scriptural ground which must underlie a truly Christian position. The study has not been a philosophy but an attempt to present the proper Biblical foundation for a valid, satisfying, Christian philosophy. It is the conviction of this investigator that such a philosophy would be compelled to face into a Biblical study such as this, and be circumscribed by its limits and guided by its directive.

The historical positions were presented, and little of the spirit of them was found defective. In the definitions and use of terms, however, there is some divergence from Scriptural usage and this, in turn, has made the soteriological conclusions less than defensible, Biblically and philosophically. Catholic theology recognized the distinction between image and likeness, but, without Biblical warrant, conceived of human nature as a dualism, natural and supernatural, thereby separating between the secular and religious. Each of these realms, to them, has a moral code of its own, Christian perfection being the goals of the secular and religious perfection obligated by the "higher" code of the evangelical councils

of poverty, chastity and obedience.¹ & ² These conclusions are rejected as being un-Biblical.

The Protestant theologians, in rejecting the Catholic dualistic distinction between image and likeness, were compelled in their monism, to separate arbitrarily between the natural and the moral image of God in man. In this way they preserved man from so great a loss in the fall as to constitute him less than human and hence, unredeemable. The philosophical error inherent in this view is simply that a practical dualism remains, the being of the moral man having been equated with the being of the natural man. The two ideas are not parallel.

Actually, the Biblical terminology and usage, carefully examined, preserves all the truth in both these systems and avoids the errors. It presents man, as Gestalt, or an organized whole,³ in relationship to God. . . He was created in the image of God. He is to be conformed to the image of God's Son. Within these two statements lie the distinction and difference between image and likeness and the basic moral emphasis of the very purpose of man's creation.

¹ Hugh Pope, "Holiness," Catholic Encyclopedia, Special edition, VII, p. 386.

² Arthur Devine, "Perfection," op. cit., Special edition, XI, p. 666.

³ Dagobert Runes, ed., A Dictionary of Philosophy (New York: Philosophical Library, 1942), p. 117.

It was seen that, so far as Biblical statements were concerned, that the imago Dei consisted in the three fold nature of personality; $\nu\omicron\delta\varsigma$, as the intellective faculty, $\phi\rho\omicron\nu\mu\alpha$, as the inclination or "set" of the mind, or will, and $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$, as the feeling, desiring, or affectional aspect of the personality, all operating as total man. In the state of original righteousness, these aspects of personality responded to God in trust, affirmative choice and devoted love. The first sin involved these three areas as unbelief, rejection of God's authority, the substitution of self as the object of affection. The curse of sin was death, or alienation from the life of God. It affected the total man thus, his understanding was darkened, his will chose the lie and love became lust or moral perversion. Redemption is primarily the restoration of life, or contact with God as the source of moral life. To thus contact God, faith must supplant the unbelief which first separated man from God, Sanctification must restore the relationship of rightness or truth between God and man, and by the deposition of self as god and the sanctifying in the heart of Christ as Lord. This whole new relationship, so far as man is concerned must be secured by the passion of $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\eta$, which orients the total man about his God. Now, the same three fold nature of man may realize the original purpose of God, to be renewed (or to "grow up," as has been shown) in the knowledge of God, to be conformed to the character of God's son and to be transformed

into the image of the Lord, from glory to glory.

God's minimal line for man, must not be forgotten, namely that he should be holy and without blemish before Him in love. From that line man fell and to that line again all redemption is directed. But this moral relationship is but the beginning, not the end, of man's existence. From this line upward to the measure of the fulness of the stature of Christ, is the purpose for which man was made. Calvinistic theology is one with conservative thought in recognizing this minimal line, but it denies the possibility of reaching it in this life. Holiness theology is apt to stop at that line as being the goal of human existence. The Scriptures teach that holiness is the beginning, not the end, and that from holiness extends the fullest measure of molding toward the image of God's Son.

A number of questions were aroused by the research necessary for this study, which need further clarification and would contribute to a better understanding of this matter. The whole field of adoption and sonship in relation to soteriology should be reviewed with the possibility in mind of a more clear statement in full harmony with the Biblical distinctions which were pointed out in this study. The references to renewal in knowledge, which were touched but not developed, need to be thoroughly investigated. Another term which is so freely used is glory. It is doubtful that its full implications are known. From the reference in Romans to the fact that

all men have come short of the glory of God, to the one in Corinthians concerning the development from glory to glory, in men, who with open face behold the Lord, an inductive study could profitably be made. In relation to this, the measure of the fulness of the stature of Christ as the goal of God's creative forethought for men, ought to receive the attention due it. All of these areas of thought are related to the likeness of Christ, to which men are to be molded.

In conclusion, there seems to be enough evidence to say that the image of God in man was not lost or forfeited in the fall. Life, or the source of holiness, was lost, by alienation from God. Christ died, not to restore the capacity for sonship in man, but the right and opportunity to exercise that capacity. All of moral probation is involved, then, in the distinction between image and likeness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Arminius, James, The Works of James Arminius. Translated by James Nichols. 3 vols.; London: Longman, Rees, Orne, Brown and Green, 1828.
- Barnes, Albert, Notes, Explanatory and Practical on the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Romans. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1866.
- Begbie, Harold, Twice Born Men. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1909. 280 pp.
- Benson, Joseph, The Holy Bible, with Critical, Explanatory and Practical Notes. New York: Carlton and Phillips, 1854.
- Berkhof, Louis, Systematic Theology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949. 784 pp.
- Brown, Charles Ewing, Meaning of Sanctification. Anderson: Warner Press, 1945. 229 pp.
- Calvin, John, Institutes of Christian Religion. 2 vols.; Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1932.
- Chambers, Oswald, Biblical Psychology. Cincinnati: God's Revivalist Office, 1914. 273 pp.
- Chapman, J. B., The Terminology of Holiness. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1947. 112 pp.
- Clark, Adam, The Holy Bible with a Commentary and Critical Notes. 6 vols.; Cincinnati: Applegate Company, 1859.
- Conner, W. T., Christian Doctrine. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1945. 349 pp.
- Cook, Thomas, New Testament Holiness. London: The Epworth Press, 1950. 158 pp.
- Godbey, W. B., Commentary on the New Testament. Vol. V, Acts-Romans; Cincinnati: Revivalist Office, 1899. 209 pp.

- Haney, M. L., Inheritance Restored. Chicago: The Christian Witness Co., 1897. 301 pp.
- Henry, Matthew, A Commentary on the Holy Bible. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., n.d.
- Hodge, A. A., Outlines of Theology. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1880. 663 pp.
- Jessop, Harry E., Foundations of Doctrine. Chicago: The Chicago Evangelistic Institute, 1938. 252 pp.
- Kerr, Hugh Thompson, ed., A Compend of Luther's Theology. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1948. 249 pp.
- Lindstrom, Harald, Wesley and Sanctification. London: The Epworth Press, 1946. 228 pp.
- Machen, J. G., A Christian View of Man. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1947. 302 pp.
- Mac Pherson, John, Christian Dogmatics. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898.
- Martensen, H., Christian Dogmatics. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1866. 501 pp.
- Miley, John, Systematic Theology. 2 vols.; New York: Eaton and Mains, 1892.
- Morgan, G. Campbell, The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1909. 244 pp.
- Morgan, G. Campbell, God's Last Word to Man. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1934. 160 pp.
- Morgan, G. Campbell, Living Messages of the Books of the Bible. Vol. 2; New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1912. 226 pp.
- Morgan, G. Campbell, The Teaching of Christ. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1913. 333 pp.
- Moule, H. C. G., Outlines of Christian Doctrine. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1889. 267 pp.
- "On the Trinity," (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Scribner's 1908, First Series, Vol. III).
- Pope, Wm. Burton, A Compendium of Christian Theology. 3 vols.; New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1875.

- Pope, Wm. Burton, The Person of Christ. London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 1875. 302 pp.
- Ramsey, Paul, Basic Christian Ethics. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950. 404 pp.
- Raymond, Minor, Systematic Theology. 3 vols.; Cincinnati: Cranston and Stowe, 1877.
- Runes, Dagobert, ed., A Dictionary of Philosophy. New York: Philosophical Library, 1942.
- Sanday, William and Arthur Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950. 450 pp.
- Shedd, Wm. G. T., A History of Christian Doctrine. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1865.
- Smith, George D., ed., Teaching of the Catholic Church. 2 vols.; New York: Macmillan Company, 1950.
- Steele, Daniel, The Gospel of the Comforter. Apollo, Pa.: The West Publishing Company, n.d.
- Steele, Daniel, Milestone Papers. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1876. 297 pp.
- Strong, Augustus Hopkins, Systematic Theology. Rochester: Press of E. R. Andrews, 1886. 758 pp.
- Turner, George Allen, "Is Entire Sanctification Scriptural?" Unpublished doctrinal thesis for Harvard University, 1946.
- Watson, G. D., Our Own God. Cincinnati: Revivalist Office, 1904. 271 pp.
- Watson, Richard, Theological Institutes. Vol. I.; New York: Waugh and T. Mason, 1834. 642 pp.
- Welch, Herbert, ed., Selections from the Writings of the Rev. John Wesley, M. A. New York: Abingdon Cokesbury Press, 1918. 543 pp.
- Wiley, H. Orton, Christian Theology. 3 vols.; Kansas City: King's Highway Press, 1941.
- Wiley, H. Orton, Psychology of Holiness. An unpublished manuscript of lectures.

The Works of John Fletcher. Vols. I and II; New York: T. Mason and G. Lane, 1836.

The Works of the Rev. John Wesley, A. M. Vol. I; New York: Hunt and Eaton, n.d.

B. BIBLES

The Bible. American Revised Edition, 1901.

The Bible. King James Version.

Kittel, Rud., editor, Biblia Hebraica. Genevae: Pro Societatum Biblicarum Confoederation, 1949.

Nestle's, New Testament Greek Text.

Vetus Testamentum Graece. Lipsiae: Sumptibus Ernesti Bredtii, 1868.

C. CONCORDANCES

Moulton, W. F. and Geden, A. S., A Concordance to the Greek New Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950.

Young, Robert, An Analytical Concordance to the Bible. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1905. 1108 pp.

D. ENCYCLOPEDIA ARTICLES

Devine, Arthur, "Perfection," The Catholic Encyclopedia, Special edition, XI, p. 666.

Pope, Hugh, "Holiness," The Catholic Encyclopedia, Special edition, VII, p. 386.

Rees, T., "Adoption," International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, 1947 edition, I, 58-60.

E. GREEK WORKS

Chamberlain, William Douglas, An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941. 233 pp.

- Dana, H. E. and Julius R. Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947. 356 pp.
- Green, Samuel G., Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament. London: The Religious Tract Society n.d.
- Moulton, James Hope and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1949.
- Nicoll, W. Robertson, Expositor's Greek New Testament. 5 vols.; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company n.d.
- Thayer, Joseph Henry, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. New York: American Book Co., 1889.
- Trench, Richard Chenevix, Synonyms of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949. 405 pp.

F. HEBREW WORKS

- Davidson, B., The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons Limited, 1794.
- Gesenius, William, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Company, 1893.
- Girdlestone, Robert Baker, Synonyms of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1948. 346 pp.
- Green, Samuel G., Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament. London: The Religious Tract Society, n.d.

G. PERIODICAL ARTICLE

- Frame, George, "The Genius of Entire Sanctification," Preacher's Magazine, Jan.-Feb., 1951.

APPENDIX

CHART I

<u>πιστεύω (believe)</u>	<u>Tense</u>
John 1:12- power to believe.	Present
John 3:15- believed in hi ^m	Present
John 3:16- believeth in hi ^m	Present
John 3:18- believeth is not conde ^m ned.	Present
John 3:36- believeth on the Son hath life.	Present
John 5:24- believeth hath life everlasting	Present
John 6:29- believeth on hi ^m who ^m he hath sent.	Present
John 6:35- believeth on ^m e shall never thirst.	Present
John 6:40, 47- believeth on Son hath everlasting life.	Present
John 7:38- believe on hi ^m --rivers of living waters	Present
John 8:24- not believe shall die in your sins.	Present
John 11:25- believeth on ^m e-though dead-shall live	Present
John 16:9- convict of sin because they are not bel-.	Present
John 17:20- pray for the ^m which shall believe.	Future
John 17:21- in order that the world ^m ight believe.	Present
John 19:35- that ye ^m ight believe.	Present
John 20:31- in believing ye ^m ight have life.	Present
Acts 10:45- he who believeth-receive re ^m ission	Present
Acts 13:39- all that believe are justified	Present
Ro ^m ans 1:16- power to every one believing	Present
Ro ^m ans 3:22- righteousness. . .to all that believe	Present

Romans 4:5- to him that believeth-faith as right . . . Present
 Romans 4:24- right.-imputed, if we believe . . . Present
 Romans 9:33- believeth shall not be ashamed . . . Present
 Romans 10:4- right.-to every one who believeth . . . Present
 Romans 10:10- with heart man believeth-unto right. . . Present
 I Corinthians 1:21- by preaching-save them that

believe . . . Present

Galatians 3:22- promise given to them that believe . . Present
 Ephesians 1:19- his power to usward who believe. . . Present
 I Thessalonians 2:13- truth worketh in you which

believe . . . Present

I Peter 2:7- to him who believeth he is precious . . . Present
 I John 5:1- who believes in Jesus is born of God . . . Present

Mark 16:16- one who believed shall be saved. . . Aorist Part.

John 1:7- that all men might believe . . . Aorist Subj.

John 3:18- because he hath not believed. . . Perfect

John 6:69- we have believed and art sure . . . Perfect

Acts 16:31- believe-and thou shalt be saved. . . Aorist

Acts 16:34- having believed with his house . . . Perfect

Acts 19:2- have ye received the Holy Spirit since

ye bel- . . . Aorist

Romans 10:9- if we believe-with heart-shall be

saved . . . Aorist

Galatians 2:16- we have believed in Jesus Christ Aorist

Ephesians 1:13- having believed-sealed with H.S. (both) Aorist

II Ti^mothy 2:12- I know who^m I have believed Perfect

Hebrews 4:3- which have believed do enter into rest Aorist Part.

Hebrews 11:6- who co^meth to God ^must believe Aorist

CHART II

<u>ἀγιάζω</u> (sanctify)	<u>Tense</u>
Acts 20:32- inheritance	
Acts 26:18- among them who are sanctified.	Aorist
Romans 15:16- Sanctified by the Holy Spirit.	
I Corinthians 1:2- Sanctified in Christ Jesus.	
I Corinthians 6:11- ye are washed, ye are sanctified	
II Timothy 2:21- vessel-sanctified and meet for.	
Hebrews 10:10- by which will we are sanctified	
John 17:19- sanctify through thy truth	
John 17:17- sanctify by truth.	
Ephesians 5:26- Christ loved church-sanctify it.	
I Thessalonians 5:25- God- sanctify you wholly	
Hebrews 13:12- sanctify the people with his-blood.	
I Peter 3:15- sanctify in your hearts, Christ.	
Hebrews 2:11- he who sanct.-they who are sanct.	Present
Hebrews 10:14- perfected (perf.)-them who are sanct.	Present
<u>ἀγρίζω</u> (make clean)	
James 4:8- purify your hearts, ye double minded.	Aorist
I Peter 1:22- seeing ye have purified your souls	Perfect
I John 3:3- hath this hope, purifieth himself.	Present
<u>καθαίρω</u> (cleanse)	
II Corinthians 7:1- let us cleanse ourselves	Aorist
Ephesians 5:26- Christ loved church-cleanse it	
James 4:8- cleanse your hands ye sinners	

I John 1:9- He is faithful to cleanse from unright. . .

Acts 15:9- put no difference-purifying hearts by . . .

Titus 2:14- purifying unto himself a peculiar p . . .

I John 1:7- Blood cleanses from all sin Present

καθαίρω (cleanse)

II Peter 1:9- having forgotten the cleansing from s. . Aorist

John 15:2- every branch-he purgeth Present

Put to death

Colossians 3:5- Put to death your members. Aorist

Romans 8:13- put to death the deeds of the body. . . Present

Put off, Put on

Ephesians 4:31- let all bitterness be put off. Aorist

Ephesians 4:25- having put away lying (or "the Lie") .

Colossians 3:8- put off all these-anger, wrath, malice

Colossians 3:9- put off old man.

Romans 13:14- put on the Lord Jesus Christ

Galatians 3:27- as many as have put on Christ.

Ephesians 4:24- put on new man

Colossians 3:10- put on-new man.

Crucified

Romans 6:6- old man crucified with Christ. Aorist

Romans 6:6- body of sin destroyed.

Galatians 2:20- I am crucified with Christ Perfect

Galatians 5:24- they that are Christ's have crucified. Aorist

Galatians 6:14- the world crucified unto me. Perfect

Renewed

II Corinthians 4:16- inward man renewed day by day . Present

Colossians 3:10- renewed in knowledge

Ephesians 4:23- be renewed in spirit of mind

CHART III

I. BELIEVING

A. An Act

1. Unto salvation
 - a. Mark 16:16
 - b. John 1:7
 - c. Acts 16:31, 34
 - d. Romans 10:9
 - e. Galatians 2:16
 - f. Hebrews 11:6
2. Prior to the Spirit's coming
 - a. John 7:39
 - b. Ephesians 1:13
 - c. Hebrews 4:3

B. An Attitude- All the rest of the passages- about 33

II. CLEANSING, SANCTIFICATION

A. An Act- 30 or more times

B. An Attitude

1. Man's continual attitude
 - a. I John 3:3
 - b. Romans 8:13
2. God's continued response
 - a. Hebrews 10:14
 - b. I John 1:7
3. Progress in grace
 - a. II Corinthians 4:16
 - b. Colossians 3:10
 - c. Ephesians 4:23
 - d. Romans 12:2