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Anthropology in the Pentateuch

1. Genesis 1:26-31: Then God said, "Let us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; and let them rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over the cattle and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth." And God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them. And God blessed them; and God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it; and rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky, and over every living thing that moves on the earth. Then God said, "Behold, I have given you every plant yielding seed that is on the surface of all the earth, and every tree which has fruit yielding seed; it shall be food for you and to every beast of the earth and to every bird of the sky and to everything that moves on the earth which has life, I have given every green plant for food"; and it was so. And God saw all that He had made, and behold, it was very good. And there was evening and there was morning, the sixth day.

a. "Let us make"

i. Note the difference with the rest of creation. Previously, God had said, "Let there be . . ." Here, He says, "Let Us make." The rest of creation is formed by God's command; man is brought into existence after God's counsel. This is a tribute to man's dignity (Calvin, Genesis, p. 91). H. D. McDonald relates:

The impression conveyed by the account is that when God came to the creation of man, he entered upon something different and distinctive. At the end of each stage in the world's creation God stopped and contemplated what he had wrought and pronounced the satisfying verdict that it was good (1:4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25). Then he set about creating a being worthy of all he had made. So God brought man into existence to have lordship over the world; man with whom he could walk and talk. (McDonald, Christian View, p. 32)

ii. Make ('asa) is commonly used in the OT. It is used with the verb create (bara') throughout the creation passages. It emphasizes the actual fashioning of the object being made, though it does not reflect any other particular nuances (McComiskey, TWOT, p. 701). "Make" is used in 1:7, 11, 12, 16, 25, 26, 31, 2:2, 3, and 4.

iii. The basic concept is that man is not the result of chance and circumstances. He did not spontaneously arise; he was purposely fashioned by his Creator to meet a divine intention. Thus, he has a purpose for his existence.

b. "Let Us make man." The word "man" ('adam) appears 562 times in the OT. The etymology of the word is no longer certain, though it may come from roots linked to the ruddy (reddish) complexion of the caucasian race (Coppes, TWOT, p. 10). It is closely linked to the word for tillable soil or ground ('adama) and may be seen in terms of man being a "cultivator of the soil" (Leupold, Genesis, 1:88). This may also explain the link between man's sin and the curse on the whole earth (for more on this, see the notes on Gen. 3).

c. "In Our image, according to Our likeness": man is patterned after His Maker (see also Gen. 5:1-3 and 9:6).

i. What do "image" and "likeness" mean?

(1) "Image" (selem, 16 times in the OT) refers to a representation or a likeness in a concrete sense (Hartley, TWOT, p. 767). Most often it refers to an idol (the root meant "to carve" or "to cut-off", Leupold, Genesis, p. 88). If it has any significance here, it would be because it refers to the physical aspect of man.

(2) "Likeness" (demut, 26 times in the OT) refers more to similarity in an ideal sense than to physical likeness (see Isa. 43:11, where the verb is used to show that no one is comparable to God in ability and function).

ii. How are they to be viewed in relation to each other? There are at least five options (Hamilton,TWOT, p. 192):
(1) "Image" refers to man's structural likeness, which survived the fall, and "likeness" refers to man's moral likeness, which was destroyed when man fell (the basic Roman Catholic position).

(2) "Image" is the more important of the two terms, and implies a precise copy. Because this word by itself is too strong, it is modified by "likeness", which is a more general term and reduces the strength of the term "image".

(3) "Image" is the more important, but "likeness" amplifies it rather than reducing it. Man is more than an image--he is a "likeness-image." He is the visible representative of God on earth, and not merely similar to God.

(4) "Likeness" is the more important of the two terms, and it is further refined by "image." In other religions present at the time, the term "likeness" alone could have been used as proof of the Mesopotamian doctrine that the gods make man from divine blood (Hebrew: likeness = demut, blood = dam). Thus, Moses is defining "likeness" by the use of "image" (selem) to show that blood was not involved.

(5) There is no distinction between the two terms, seen in the fact that only image is used in 1:27, when God actually makes man and in the fact that the LXX translates the term likeness in Gen. 5:1 by the Greek word usually used for "image". They are thus interchangeable, and we do not need to try to discern any significant difference between them. This is the view to be preferred.

iii. How are we to understand man as being in God's image? What does this refer to in man? There are three major categories of views (Erickson, Christian Theology, pp. 498-512) in which a total of eight major options may be listed (McDonald, Christian View, pp. 33-41).

(1) The image is something substantive in man ("The common element in the several varieties of this view is that the image is identified as some definite characteristic or quality within the makeup of the human"; Erickson, Christian Theology, p. 498):

(a) The image is man's bodily form, an idea allowable from the Hebrew words but in contrast to the concepts of God as Spirit and His omnipresence. The manifold use of anthropomorphisms in Scripture, however, shows that this understanding is not completely without merit.

(b) The image is man's spirit; only man is a spiritual being. A result of this is man's rationality, making him able to have fellowship with God. But does the OT show that there this strong of a dichotomy in man?

(c) The image is the whole man, both body and spirit. All that man is on the outside and the inside is of God. Calvin remarks (Genesis, p. 95): "The chief seat of the Divine image was in his mind and heart, where it was eminent; yet there was no part of him in which some scintillations of it did not shine forth. In the mind perfect intelligence flourished and reigned, . . . and all the senses were prepared and moulded for due obedience to reason; and in the body theree was a suitable correspondence with this internal order."

(d) The image is man's rationality, morality, personality, or some combination of these attributes. Note the discussion in McDonald (Christian View, pp. 37-39).

(2) The image is relational ("Man is said to be in the image or to display the image when he stands in a particular relationship. In fact, that relationship is the image"; Erickson, Christian Theology, p. 502):

(a) The image is man as male and female (taking v. 27b as a comment on v. 27a). Thus, man and woman are to live in equal harmony, as does the Trinity (see Jewett, Man as Male and Female and Atkins, Split Image).
(b) The image is man's sonship—he was created to be God's natural son, but broke that through sin. God therefore chose to adopt us again as His son through Christ. Because of his sonship, man was given dominion, rationality, morals, personality, etc. (see McDonald Christian View, p. 41).

(c) The image is man's relationship with God and other men. Man was the only creature created in an incomplete state. As we relate with God, and He perfects and molds us, our response is the "image of God" (see Erickson, Christian Theology, pp. 503-4).

(3) The image is functional ([T]he image consists in something man does. It is a function which man performs, the most frequently mentioned being the exercise of dominion over creation", Erickson, Christian Theology, p. 508):

The image is man's dominion over the rest of creation ("Let Us make man . . . and let them rule"). This appears to fit the use of the words in extra biblical sources, where a pagan king would put his image in a conquered land as a symbol of dominion (similar to pictures of a national leader found in many countries today). Man is God's visible representation, the keeper of His creation. Sin affected man's use of dominion, but that dominion was not removed from him (see also Gen. 9:3 and Ps. 8:4-6).

iv. It seems that many are trying to limit the image or substance under a single heading as a result of their cultural bias for categorization. Possibly all the views listed above are correct in one sense, but they only deal with part of the issue. Is it possible to combine all the views into a modified form of image as a whole man who exists in relationship with God and other men and who exercises dominion over the rest of creation—and that ALL of that is the "image"? As Erickson notes:

The image refers to the elements in the makeup of man which enable the fulfilment of his destiny. . . . The image itself is that set of qualities that are required for these relationships and this function to take place. They are those qualities of God which, if reflected in man, make worship, personal interaction, and work possible. . . . Man qua man has a nature that includes the whole of what constitutes personality or selfhood: intelligence, will, emotions. This is the image in which man was created, enabling him to have the divinely intended relationship to God and to fellow man, and to exercise dominion. (Erickson, Christian Theology, pp. 513-4)

d. "And let them have dominion over (the earth)"

i. The "him" now changes to "them". Adam and Eve and all who come from them are to have this dominion.

ii. "Have dominion" shows man's intended purpose: he was to rule over the earth and all of its creatures, and is thus separated from the rest of creation. All of creation, then, is to be utilized by man in meeting his needs. Before the fall, this would have been done sinlessly.

e. God created man as male and female. Verse 27 is a threefold parallel:

And God created man in His image
in the image of God He created him;
male and female He created them

i. Create here is bara', a term often used of bringing things into existence from nothing. Only God is ever said to bara'.

ii. The "Our image" of v. 26 is changed to "His image" here. God is three in one.

iii. Male and female—man is incomplete without woman. Both bear the image of God; both are integral to each other.

f. God blesses man and commands them to "Be fruitful, multiply, fill the earth, and subdue it."

i. All mankind can trace its ancestry back to this one pair. The bounds and one major purpose of
marriage (that of reproduction) are given here, but not fully laid out until 2:21-25.

ii. In order to subdue the earth, man must multiply and fill it (male') it. The same word is used spatially of God filling heaven and earth (Jer. 23:24) and metaphorically of completing a task or statement (1 Kings 2:27, El't's words were fulfilled). The form of the verb indicates that the spatial idea is in view here. Questions that we may ask centre on the concepts of how (or whether) we can know when the earth is filled and whether or not this command still applies to man (e.g., did the fall change things in some way?). The usage here of male' may indicate that the earth is filled when it can sustain no more people. Have we reached that stage? Obviously not, though greed prevents all the people currently on the earth from being able to eat enough to live. Does this verse have impact on the concept of family planning? If so, in what way? All of these are difficult to answer from this verse alone.

g. God gives them food to eat--but only plants. Apparently, Adam and Eve were vegetarians. Man does not receive a specific command to eat meat until Gen. 9:3, after the flood! Verse 30 indicates that the animal kingdom was vegetarian as well (see the discussion in Keil and Delitzsch, 1:65-67).

h. Everything that God had made was very good--no imperfections were found.

2. Genesis 2:7: Then the Lord God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living being.

a. "Formed" (yatsar means to form or fashion) is used in Jeremiah's illustration of the potter forming the pot (Jer. 18:2ff). God gave special care and attention to making man (Leupold, Genesis, 1:115), while the animals simply sprang up from the earth (Calvin, Genesis, p. 111).

b. Man was made of "dust" ('aphar) from the ground ('adama). Dust is simply loose, dry dirt. Man, though in God's image, was made from dirt! "Ground" is tillable soil. In Hebrew, man ('adam) and ground ('adama) are closely linked (see notes below on Gen. 3:1-24). Quite frankly, the wording leaves no room for man to be seen as an evolutionary product. Additionally, as dust is not eternal material, Adam was probably mortal in terms of his physical body. Before the fall, the original plan may have been for him to go directly to heaven without passing through physical death. The fall has changed that completely!

c. God breathed into man the breath of life--a personal act of God given to none of the animals (Leupold, Genesis, 1:116).

i. The "breath of life" belongs to all creatures (Gen. 7:22 has "breath of the spirit of life," the same basic expression), so the breath itself does not make man unique. The fact that God specifically gave it to man in a separate act, however, is man's unique heritage.

ii. Adam became a living soul. "Soul" (nephesh) occurs 755 times in the OT. The root has the concrete idea "to breathe". It can refer to the throat (Isa. 5:14), physical or spiritual appetite (Deut. 23:24), life (Prov. 19:18), soul (as the seat of spiritual experiences (Ps. 42:1-4), or the person himself (Lam. 1:16). The soul can desire or crave (Isa. 26:8-9), be hungry or thirsty (Ps. 107:9), long for or yearn (Ps. 130:5), love (Song of Sol. 1:7), hate (2 Sam. 5:8), have joy (Ps. 86:4), be bitter (Job 27:2), live (Gen. 12:13), be saved (Josh. 2:13) [Waltke, TWOT, pp. 587-91, and Wolff, Anthropology, pp. 10-25]. In general, it did not convey the concept of a separate "component" of man as much as we tend to place on it today. The same term used here (living soul) is used for the animals in Gen. 1:20, 21, 24, 9:10, 12, and 15, cannot be used to prove that man has a "soul" which is separate from the body. It simply means that man is alive (Stigers, Genesis, p. 66).

3. Gen. 2:15-17: Then the Lord God took the man and put him in the garden in Eden to cultivate it and keep it. And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, "From any tree of the garden you may eat freely, but from the tree of knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat from it you shall surely die."

a. Man was placed in the garden of Eden to perform a specific task: he was to cultivate and keep the garden there. Adam was not to live a life of lazy leisure, but of productive activity. This caretaking is part and parcel of man's dominion over the world.

b. God promised that Adam would die that day (or moment) that he ate of the fruit. God did not have to
explain the concept of death to Adam; how did Adam know of it? Was there already animal and plant death present in the garden? God pronounced this death in His judgments on Adam and Eve after the fall (3:19), but Adam's physical death did not happen the same day (or moment) that he sinned. For further discussion, see the notes on "death" (Gen. 3:1-24).

c. Why this one prohibition in the garden? What purpose did it serve? Options for understanding this include:

i. The prohibition was given because the fruit was physically poisonous to Adam in some way. This, however, does not make sense in light of Adam's long life after the fall (930 years total, of which 800 came after Seth was born, Gen. 5:3-4).

ii. The prohibition was a test of obedience, either to teach Adam that God was still in control of the universe, and man merely a steward, or to give Adam the chance to prove his faithfulness. [Love (or obedience) without any chance to prove itself cannot be called true (or freely given) love, so God had to give Adam that chance to disobey (see Leupold on the temptation, Genesis, 1:145-6).]

iii. The prohibition was a covenant of works. Before the fall, mankind could have earned his way to God's promise of life by perfect obedience. After the fall, however, that ability was gone forever.

4. Gen. 2:18-25: Then the Lord God said, "It is not good for the man to be alone; I will make a helper suitable for him." And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every bird of the sky, and brought them to the man to see what he would call them; and whatever the man called a living creature, that was its name. And the man gave names to all the cattle, and to the birds of the sky, and to every beast of the field, but for Adam there was not found a helper suitable for him. So the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and he slept; then He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh at that place. And the Lord God fashioned into a woman the rib which He had taken from the man, and brought her to the man. And the man said, "This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh. She shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man." For this cause a man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they shall become one flesh. And the man and his wife were both naked and were not ashamed.

a. "It is not good for man to be alone" refers not to a defect in Adam, but to an incompleteness. There are two aspects of this:

i. Man is a social creature—he exists in the context of relationships. He is different from the animals, and a relationship with them is not enough. This is seen when they all pass before Adam but none of them is suitable as his helper.

ii. Man is a creature of a special relationship: marriage. He and woman are uniquely fitted to each other both biologically and psychologically.

b. I will make him a helper suitable for him (worthy of him, Leupold, Genesis, p. 134).

i. Woman is a helper. She is to assist man in his dominion over the world.

ii. She is suitable for him ("as a counterpart," or "agreeing with him," or "which may be like him"). She is not above or below him, and is just the kind of helper that man needs. She is the female counterpart of the male (Stigers, Genesis, p. 72).

iii. Man needed woman for two reasons (Keil and Delitzsch, Commentary, 1:86-7):

(1) To cultivate and govern the earth (and fulfill God's command of 1:28).

(2) To propogate the race. Man's inability to do this by himself shows that God intended to make woman from the start.

iv. God proceeds to make the animals, and passes them before Adam, who names them.

(1) Stigers points out "The action of Adam by which he gave names to the creatures is a proper exercise of his powers of dominion as well as a demonstration of the perceptive ability of a thinking, reasoning personality. The action of naming the animals demonstrates the capacity
to rule, for it is indicative of the capacity to discriminate, to evaluate, and to make decisions on the basis of facts and their significance, and it included the intuitive process." (Stigers, *Genesis*, p. 72).

(2) Larkin maintains that this is the first exercise in building a culture (Larkin, *Culture and Biblical Hermeneutics*, p. 207) and shows man's creativity (Ibid., p. 204).

c. Eve is created out of Adam; both spring from the same source. Calvin states, "He (Adam) lost, therefore, one of his ribs; but instead of it, a far richer reward was granted him, since he obtained a faithful associate of life; for he now saw himself, who had before been imperfect, rendered complete in his wife" (*Genesis*, p. 133).
   
i. Eve therefore has the same dignity as Adam, since she is of the same substance as he is.
   
ii. She is not out of his head, to be above him as a boss. She is not out of his foot, to be below him as a slave. Rather, she is at his side, to be with him as a partner.
   
iii. Eve was built (*bana*), a word used of constructing a house, city, tower, etc. (Waltke, *TWOT*, p. 116). God has specially constructed woman to meet man's needs.

d. Adam reacts to God's special creation: a triple emphasis on "this" shows Adam's joy in what God has made for him.
   
i. She is bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh—man and woman are of the same substance. The phrase shows Adam's "joyous astonishment" at God's creation (Keil and Delitzsch, *Commentary*, p. 90).
   
ii. She is woman (*'ishah*) because she is taken from man (*'ish*). Calvin relates that it may be said, "She shall be called manness, because she was taken out of the man" (*Genesis*, p. 135, n. 2).

e. Adam names Eve "woman", indicative of his headship over her (see Hurley, *Man and Woman*, pp. 204-21).

f. God's decree on marriage (vv. 24-25; Jesus shows that God gave this statement [see Matt. 19:4-5], probably through the pen of Moses):
   
i. Man shall leave his father and mother. He begins a new family unit which takes priority over the old. His wife is to be more important to him than his parents—this bond of marriage is to be preferred over all others (Calvin, *Genesis*, p. 136).
   
ii. Man shall cleave to his wife, and they shall become one flesh. Leupold remarks, "'Becoming one flesh' involves the complete identification of one personality with the other in a commonality of interests and pursuits, a union consummated in intercourse" (*Genesis*, 1:137). Their unity is thus far more than the physical act of love, which is the external consummation of the spiritual and physical reality.
   
iii. Finally, they were naked and not ashamed. Shame came with the fall, and is not a normal part of God's created order.

5. Genesis 3:1-24: How did the fall affect man?

a. Their own relationship was disturbed. They now know they are naked and try to "cover up".

b. Paul appears to relate that this had affected the relationship of all men to all women (see 1 Tim. 2:11-15), and ties it to both the fall and the order of creation (man was created first, then woman). Sin, of course, has led to abuse of this idea in the form of female slavery, servitude, second class status, etc.

c. How was God's image in man affected?
   
i. In Gen. 9:5-6, we are told that murder is prohibited because man is in God's image (even after the
Thus, that image was not completely destroyed. The questions that remain are:

(1) Was God's image in man affected?

(2) If so, how much was it affected?

ii. Factors in determining our answer:

(1) Nowhere in the Bible does it explicitly teach that man lost the image of God in him.

(2) God continues to communicate directly with men after they are cast out of the garden of Eden (see 4:6ff).

(3) In the NT, it is emphasized that we are being remade into the image of Christ, the new man.

(4) Sin had a deep and ever present impact on every human being. Did it affect our "image of God" or some other "part" of man? We will continue to examine this in later passages.

(5) If our "image" is some combination of the ideas given above in the discussion on "image", then it was obviously affected. In fact, in our sinful state it is probably impossible to fully assess the extent of the damage. We will discuss this more in the NT section.

(6) Some evidence of the extent of the fall is found in 3:6. As many areas in which the fruit looked "good" to Eve, those were the minimum of the areas which were affected (the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the boastful pride of life, 1 Jn. 2:16). Calvin comments:

But Paul (Rom. iii.10) teaches that corruption does not reside in one part only, but pervades the whole soul, and each of its faculties. Whence it follows, that they childishly err who regard original sin as consisting only in lust, and in the inordinate notion of appetites, whereas it seizes upon the very seat or reason, and upon the whole heart. (Calvin, Genesis, p. 155)

d. Man dies; but what does this mean?

i. "Death" (μοι) most often refers to physical death. This death came to mankind as a result of our sin. Leon Morris points out:

Death seems to be necessary for bodies constituted as ours are. Physical decay and ultimate dissolution are inescapable. . . . Now the possession of eternal life does not cancel out physical death. It is opposed to a spiritual state, not to a physical event. The inference that we draw from all this is that that death which is the result of sin is more than bodily death. But with this we must take the other thought that the scriptural passages which connect sin and death do not qualify death. We would not understand from them that something other than the usual meaning attached to the word. Perhaps we should understand that mortality was the result of Adam's sin, and that the penalty includes both physical and spiritual aspects. But we do not know enough about Adam's pre-fallen condition to say anything about it. If his body was like ours, then he was mortal. If it was not, we have no means of knowing what it was like, and whether it was mortal or not. It seems better to understand death as something that involves the whole man. Man does not die as a body. He dies as a man, in the totality of his being. He dies as a spiritual and physical being. And the Bible does not put a sharp line of demarcation between the two aspects. Physical death, then, is a fit symbol of, and expression of, and unity with, the deeper death that sin inevitably brings. (Morris, "Death", NBD)

ii. How, then, did Adam die? The total picture (from Gen. 3:14-24) involves at least three aspects:

(1) He died in his relationship with God (spiritual death). God's holiness demanded a spiritual separation from Adam's sin.

(2) He died in his ability to obey God, but how total is this inability? We will discuss this in later passages and in soteriology.
(3) He died in relation to his physical body. Physical death was now to be a fact of his existence, though not experienced until later. It was the final result of Adam's disobedience.

(4) He dies in his relationship with Eve. They were naked and ashamed and began to cover their nakedness from each other as a result.

e. The soil is cursed—why is this so when it was man who sinned? Both appear to be intimately linked, seen in the Hebrew usage of the same root for both words. 'adam is man and 'adama is soil. Note the play on words and concepts (Coppes, TWOT, p. 11):

   i. Initially God made 'adam out of 'adama in order to till the 'adama.

   ii. The first 'adam was to be God's servant in caring for the 'adama, which would yield fruit for 'adam.

   iii. 'adam sinned, and the harmony between 'adam and God as well as 'adam and 'adama was disrupted. The consequences included:

      (1) 'adam would now return to 'adama as a result of sin (i.e., he would die).

      (2) 'adam was driven out of the paradise of 'adama and away from the tree of life. Intimate fellowship among God, man, and the soil was broken.

      (3) 'adama would no longer produce fruit for 'adam, but thorns and weeds.

      (4) As a token that God would send the Redeemer of 'adam, the 'adama would produce fruit for 'adam, but only through 'adam's sweat.

   iv. At the end times, God will create not only new resurrection bodies for men ('adam), but also a new heaven and new earth ('adama)—man will return to the harmony originally intended by God.

6. Genesis 5:1-3: This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day when God created man, He made him in the likeness of God. He created them male and female, and He blessed them and named them Man in the day when they were created. When Adam had lived one hundred and thirty years, he became father of a son in his own likeness, according to his image, and named him Seth.

   a. God made Adam in the "likeness of God." This is the same idea as expressed in 1:26-27. Here, Adam is made in God's likeness, in 1:26 it was after (NASB has "in") God's likeness. As the two Hebrew terms are often used interchangably, there is no significant difference in the wording.

   b. They were created male and female, another reminder that they are both "man," both part of God's plan, and that they need each other.

   c. Adam became the father of Seth.

      i. Why are Cain and Abel not mentioned? Probably because God's purpose (through Moses) in this section is to show man's ancestry to Abraham, who came from the line of Seth (see also 4:25-26; Cain's ancestry is traced in 4:16-24).

      ii. Seth is in Adam's likeness and image. The reversing of the order of the terms from that in 1:26 shows that the two terms are interchangable and with no significant difference between them. What is the meaning of this statement? Two major options are available:

         (1) Adam, in having children, passes on the image of God that was in him to them. The problem with this is that only Seth is named as Adam's likeness—neither Cain nor Abel are given this description.

         (2) OR Seth is in Adam's image—he takes after his father. Though a sinner, he is also a man of faith, as Adam was. In tracing man's ancestry to Abraham, we see that this is a godly line, and that is the emphasis of 5:3.
Elements of both may be in view. Adam passed on the image of God (distorted by the fall?) and his own image (a sinner, yet saved by faith) to Seth. In Abraham’s line we see that the man of faith is now a hybrid—he sins, yet has faith (see Keil and Delitzsch, Commentary, 1:124).

7. Genesis 6:5-12: Then the Lord saw that the wickedness of man was great on the earth, and that every intent of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And the Lord was sorry that He had made man on the earth, and He was grieved in His heart. And the Lord said, “I will blot out man whom I have created from the face of the land, from man to animals to creeping things and to birds of the sky; for I am sorry that I have made them.” But Noah found favor in the eyes of the Lord. These are the records of the generations of Noah. Noah was a righteous man, blameless in his time, Noah walked with God. And Noah became the father of three sons: Shem, Ham, and Japheth. Now the earth was corrupt in the sight of God, and the earth was filled with violence. And God looked on the earth, and behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted their way upon the earth.

a. Man’s wickedness (ra’a) was great. In moral or religious contexts, the word denotes activity contrary to God’s will. It is used to describe things that range from rejection of God (Isa. 1:4) to demanding immoral relations (Gen. 19:7) to efforts to kill (Jer. 38:9) (Livingston, TWOT, pp. 854-6).

b. Every intent (yatsar) of the thoughts of his heart (leb) was only on evil continually: the source of man’s sin was his heart—the very core of his person.

i. The intent or form (yatsar, the same word is used in God’s creation of man, Gen. 2:7) refers to plans or purposes (McComiskey, TWOT, p. 396).

ii. Man’s heart (leb, used 858 times in the OT) could only form evil thoughts. The heart became the richest OT symbol for man’s total inner nature. Virtually every inner function is ascribed to the heart (emotions [166 times], thought [204 times], or will [195 times]; see Banwell, "Heart," NBD). The OT idea encompasses both heart and mind as we think of them today. The heart feels emotions (Prov. 15:13), longs for things (Prov. 21:12), understands (Prov. 15:14), can be wise (Ps. 90:12) or foolish (Prov. 22:15), can be full of knowledge (Prov. 18:15), is the seat of the will (Jer. 17:12) and memory (Dan. 7:28). It can convict us (1 Sam. 24:6), plan our way (Prov. 16:19), and must be guarded (Prov. 4:23) [see Wolff, Anthropology, pp. 40-58]. In some passages, the heart is considered as separate from the rest of the person (Job 15:12, “Why does your heart carry you away?”), but generally is refers to the whole person’s character (inside and outside, Bowling, TWOT, pp. 466-7). It is the source of man’s actions and thoughts, but has been seen in this passage to be continually forming thoughts that are opposed to God’s will. We are in a dilemma—our deepest root is full of evil, and we are powerless to change it in our own strength (see Calvin’s excellent comments, Genesis, 247-8). The tone of opposites of vv. 5 and 6 should be noted:

Verse 5: man’s heart is bent only on evil
Verse 6: God’s heart is grieved that He made man.

Fortunately for man, God promises a new heart (Exek. 11:19-20) to replace our stony, evil one. We will again examine "heart" in the NT passages.

c. The result of man’s evil heart is that God repented that He had made man, and eventually sent the flood.

i. Repent (naham) means more to regret or be sorry. We are told that God does change His dealings with men according to man’s responses to His word. Here, the human race as a whole (v. 12, except for Noah and his immediate family, v. 9) were completely bent on evil, and God, deeply sorrowed at this, resolved to show judgment rather than mercy.

ii. Verse 11 indicates the form man’s corruption (shahat) took—violence (hamas).

(1) Shahat is uses 151 times in the OT (three times here in vv. 11-12) and is often translated as "to destroy" (Num. 32:15 related God’s warning Israel that, if they turned from Him, "He will once more abandon them in the wilderness; and you [Israel’s leaders] will destroy all these people.") The sense of corruption and its linking to destruction are seen in Jeremiah’s purchase and hiding of a waistband. When he dug it out, it "was ruined, it was totally worthless” (Jer. 13:7). Mankind, seen here in Gen. 6:11-12 (also Ps. 14:1) was ruined, and totally worthless before God.
Hamas and related forms appear 67 times, and is always linked to sinful violence of some form (Harris, TWOT, p. 297). It is a violation of the rights of others, and is done in a high-handed fashion (Leupold, Genesis, 1:267).

d. In contrast to the rest of the world stood Noah, who was righteous (sedek) and blameless (tamim). Leupold translates this, "Noah was a righteous-perfect man" (Genesis, 1:264).

i. Noah was righteous (sedek), the noun is used 274 times, and has the root idea of being straight; Stigers, TWOT, p. 753). Girdlestone remarks, "In its relative aspect, it implies conformity with the line or rule of God's law; in its absolute aspect, it is the exhibition of love to God and to one's neighbor . . ." (Girdlestone, Synonyms, p. 101) See also the Gen. 15:6 soteriology notes.

ii. Noah was blameless (tamim). Tamim essentially means complete (a complete day, Josh. 10:13), and, in the ethical/judicial arena, means moral completeness or soundness. It does not go as far as absolute perfection, but does refer to a man who is a finished product, one who is well rounded and balanced. Noah, Abraham, Job, David, and even Satan (Ezek. 28:13) are described by this word. None, obviously, was perfect in the absolute sense. The idea seen here is "whole hearted in commitment to the person and requirements of God" (Payne, TWOT, p. 974).

iii. Verse 12 indicates that the problem included all men: all flesh had also been corrupted. Flesh (basar, 273 times) refers most often to the muscle, but can also be extended to blood relations, living things, life itself, and created life (Oswalt, TWOT, p. 136). It commonly refers to the external form of a person, and is one of the components of a person (along with heart and soul, see notes above), though in the OT these components are not seen as separate entities. Psalm 84:2 joins them in parallelism, "My soul longed and even yearned for the courts of the Lord, my heart and my flesh sing for joy to the living God." As the outer physical part of man, the flesh is weak and can easily be destroyed (Ps. 78:38, Deut. 5:26), and in Gen. 6:12 we see that all flesh on the earth is corrupted (see also Wolff, Anthropology, pp. 26-31).

8. Genesis 9:1-7: And God blessed Noah and his sons and said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth. And the fear of you and the terror of you shall be on every beast of the earth and on every bird of the sky; with everything that creeps on the ground, and all the fish of the sea, into your hand they are given. Every moving thing that is alive shall be food for you; I give all to you, as I gave the green plant. Only you shall not eat flesh with its life, that is, its blood. And surely I will require your lifeblood; from every beast I will require it. And from every man, from every man's brother I will require the life of man. Whoever sheds man's blood, by man his blood shall be shed, for in the image of God He made man. And as for you, be fruitful and multiply; populate the earth abundantly and multiply on it."

a. God commands Noah to fill the earth.

i. He is to multiply himself and fill the earth abundantly (N.B. after the fall). Again, in today's world, we may ask how "full" this means (see discussion on 1:28). We see here God's mercy in gifting man ("be fruitful") and letting him start over.

ii. Noah is not told to subdue the earth as Adam was. Is this because he is no longer able to do so? Or is it because after the fall that task remained for Christ alone?

b. Instead of the animals voluntarily submitting to man, they will now fear him.

i. The new rule of fang, tooth, and claw replaced the old rule of peaceful submission (Stigers, Genesis, p. 118). Man still controls the animal world, but now through terror.

ii. In addition, man is now given permission to eat meat (v. 3), with no mention of clean and unclean, which were only temporary provisions.

iii. The major prohibition here is to not eat meat with the blood in it. This may be given to pave the way for the sacrificial system. On the identification of blood with life, see the soteriology notes on Lev. 17:11. The idea here is that the blood is to be drained before the meat of animals may be eaten. The reason is that man is to have respect for life as created by God, and thus respect God Himself.
c. Man’s life is not to be taken by blood (i.e., a violent death, or murder). If the blood of the animals was important, how much more was man’s (for he was made in the image of God)? This prohibition and demand of an account for murder applied to animals and men that killed. Any murderer, man or beast, was to be killed in turn.

i. "From every man’s brother’’ God will require life for life. While this phrase is difficult to translate, one indication it gives is that men are all brothers in the sense of accountability before God.

ii. Verse 6 gives the institution of government—“by man shall the murder of a man be avenged.” The inference drawn here is that if man is in charge of his own highest good (life), all lower goods (organizing society, enforcing laws, etc.) will also be subsumed under this (see Leupold, Genesis, p. 333). Thus, government is an institution given by God, and capital punishment is one of its primary functions. Capital punishment, as seen here, is not only a deterrent, but a moral and physical cleansing of the murderer from society (Stigers, Genesis, p. 116). This is not to be confused with “blood revenge,” which is simply an attempt to get even. It is a divine enactment for justice on earth. On the whole discussion, see Stigers, Genesis, pp. 115-117.

iii. Alternatively, some feel that this verse simply shows that the natural consequence of a murder is for the one who kills to suffer a violent death himself. This seems far less probable than 2C above because of the focus on man being in God’s image as the reason for the statement.

iv. The prohibition of murder is tied to man being in God’s image (v. 6). Murder is thus striking against the majesty of God. Stigers says, “It would appear that the murderer has assaulted the government of God and so lies beyond the protection of the divine will” (Stigers, Genesis, p. 116, emphasis his). The enactment of execution for murder is to prevent a people from promoting violence and bloodshed as a way of life (bear in mind that the world before the flood was “filled with violence”, Gen. 6:11-12).

v. Because the prohibition is based on man’s being in God’s image, we see that the image was not lost in the fall (Kidner, Genesis, p. 100).

9. Genesis 11:1-9: Men try to build a city which will reach heaven, and God scatters them by giving them different languages.

a. Up to this point in time, mankind had one language (lit. "one lip") and one vocabulary (lit. "single words"), and everyone could understand everyone else.

b. Out of their insecurity and pride, and possibly their desire to control others, men seek to build a tower ("and especially a tower"; Leupold, Genesis, 1:384) and make a name for themselves (to create a strong, centralised power-base?; Stigers, Genesis, p. 129).

c. "Nothing which they purpose to do will be impossible for them". God had made man with incredible abilities which can be used for good or bad. Here His concern appears to be with the latter—building such a tower in their pride, there is nothing (including the deepest sin) which will be impossible for them. His concern is not to frustrate man’s technological capability, but to prevent his skills from being used to the maximum for sinful purposes ("better division than collective apostasy"; Kidner, Genesis, p. 110).

d. God frustrates their efforts. Two major factors might be involved (Stigers, Genesis, p. 129):

i. A "unified" sinful man would wreak more havoc (through centralised power and control) than a "nationalised" divided man (which distributes power). Thus, "nationalism" actually reduces sin in the world! "It may then be said tin general, nationalism is best for the world in its present state of sin and that to destroy those national boundaries is contrary to God's present will" (Stigers, Genesis, p. 129).

ii. A "unified" world would have more easily resulted in the untimely destruction of Israel, God's chosen people.
e. Derek Kidner summarises the attitude seen in the narrative:

The primeval history reaches its fruitless climax as man, conscious of new abilities, prepares to
glorify and fortify himself by collective effort. The elements of the story are timelessly characteristic of the
spirit of the world. The project is typically grandiose; men describe it excitedly to one another as if it were
the ultimate achievement—very much as modern man glories in his space projects. At the same time they
betray their insecurity as the crowd together to preserve their identity and control their fortunes (4b).

The narrative captures the simultaneous absurdity and gravity of it. Even the materials are
makeshift, as verse 3 remarks, yet the builders are weaker still. There is irony in God's echo of their
bustling "Go to . . . Go to . . ." with His own "Go to, let us go down . . ."; and the end is anticlimax; "they
left off . . ." The half-built city is all too apt a monument to this aspect of man. (Kidner, Genesis
TOTC, pp. 110-1)

10. Exodus 21:22-5: regulation concerning harm unintentionally done to a pregnant woman

a. The exact nature of the injury is not clear from the text. It may be a miscarriage (see NASB) or only a
premature delivery (indicating that the baby lives; see NIV):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NASB</th>
<th>NIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And if men struggle with each other and strike</td>
<td>If men who are fighting hit a pregnant woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a woman with child so that she has a</td>
<td>and she gives birth prematurely but there is no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miscarriage, yet there is no further injury,</td>
<td>serious injury,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. The first issue is the correct translation of the injury to the woman and unborn child. Is this injury a miscarriage (with the child born dead; Childs, Cole, Waltke, NASB) or a premature birth (with the child born alive; Bush, Calvin, Cassuto, Hannah, Keil and Delitzsch, NIV, KJV)?

i. Is this premature birth?

(1) Arguments in favour of this "premature birth" include (from Erickson, Christian Theology, pp. 555-6; which is a summary of Cottrell, "Abortion and the Mosaic Law", Christianity Today 16 March 1973, pp. 6-9):

(a) The term used for fruit (yeled; KJV, "so that her fruit depart from her") is typically used for child or offspring.

(b) The verb translated as "miscarriage" (yatsa', NASB) is usually used for normal birth, not for miscarriage (Gen. 25:25-6, 38:28-9, Job 1:21, 3:11, Eccl. 5:15, and Jer. 1:5, 20:18). There is a specific Hebrew word used for miscarriage (shakol) which is not used here.

(2) Note Hannah's explanation if this is the correct translation:

If . . . a pregnant woman delivered her child prematurely as a result of a blow, but both were otherwise uninjured, the guilty party was to pay compensation . . . However, if there was injury to the expectant mother or her child, then the assailant was to be penalized in proportion to the nature of severity of the injury. While unintentional life-taking was usually not a capital offense (cf. vv. 12-13), here it certainly was. Also the fetus is viewed in this passage as just as much a human being as its mother; the abortion of a fetus was considered murder. (Hannah, "Exodus", BKC, p. 141)

ii. If, however, the NASB translation is correct, and this applies to the premature delivery of a dead child, what can we learn from the passage?

(1) The fact that only a fine must be paid does not prove that the aborted child was in any way not yet fully human. Note v. 21, for the case in which a slave who was beaten survives a day or two, the owner will not be fined—even if the slave later dies. Applying the logic used by pro-abortionists, we would have to conclude that the slave is not a human (see Brown, Death Before Birth, p. 125).
(2) Note that the injury was accidental, and not premeditated. The only case in OT law in which no ransom (or payment) was accepted was intentional, premeditated murder. The fact that a fine is levied here has no bearing on the humanity or lack of humanity of the unborn child (Ibid.)

Anthropology in the Poetic Books

1. Job 10:8-12: "Thy hands fashioned and made me altogether, and wouldst Thou destroy me? Remember now, that Thou hast made me as clay; and wouldst Thou turn me into dust again? Didst Thou not pour me out like milk, and curdle me like cheese; clothe me with skin and flesh, and knit me together with bones and sinews? Thou hast granted me life and lovingkindness, and Thy care has preserved my spirit.

a. Job describes his formation in his mother's womb by using several descriptive terms which reveal God's intimate concern with man from the time of conception. The first area of concern is Job's physical side:

i. God's hands fashioned and made Job. Fashion ('atsab) is used only twice in the OT. It means to shape or fashion, and in the only other occurrence (Jer. 44:19), it carries the sense of fashioning an idol. Made is 'asa, as discussed in Gen. 1:26-31.

ii. Job was made ('asa) as clay (homer, the same word is used of men in Job 4:19 and 13:12; it was simply the reddish clay found in Palestine) and Job feared that he would return to dust ('aphar, see notes on Gen. 2:7).

iii. God poured him out like milk. Could this be a reference to the semen of the male? Bear in mind man's limited medical understanding of reproduction at the time of Job (see Wolff, Anthropology, p. 97).

iv. God then curdled Job like cheese curdling from milk. Again, Job may have thought that the man's semen solidified into a person. If so, we must note that this is not taught here; it only shows Job's ideas. The basic thought is that God is in complete control of the formation of the man in the womb.

v. God clothed Job with skin and flesh, and knit him together with bones and sinews. No wonder the Psalmist (139) writes, "I am fearfully and wonderfully made!"

b. Finally, beyond the physical, God has granted Job life, lovingkindness, and preservation of his spirit–these deal with his spiritual side.

i. Life (hayyim) in Hebrew is seen in experiential rather than abstract terms. To live involves the ability to utilize one's powers to their fullest extent, and death is the lack of any ability to do so (Smick, TWOT, p. 279). This ability (or animation) is a gift granted by God.

ii. Lovingkindness (hesed) can also be translated as kindness, mercy, pity, favour, or goodness (in the KJV). See Harris, TWOT, pp. 305-7, for discussion on the meaning of hesed. Job was the recipient of God's mercy or favour, as are all of the redeemed. It is an attitude founded in love that results in actions of love offered to the recipient.

iii. God's care had preserved Job's spirit (ruah). The root meaning of ruah is air in motion, or wind. In regard to man, however, ruah is used to refer to the whole non-material part (Payne, TWOT, p. 836). Osterhaven concisely summarizes the usage of the word in relation to man: "It is used of rationality (Ma. 2:15; Deut. 34:9), determination (Jer. 51:1; Hag. 1:14), attitude in general (Num. 14:24), courage (Josh. 2:11; 5:1), religious understanding (Job 20:3), emotions (Zech. 12:10; Psal. 77:3; 143:4), pride (Ps. 76:12), jealousy (Num. 5:14, 30), and various other inner dispositions" (Osterhaven, EDT, "Spirit"). Compare the idea here in Job with Zech. 12:1, "God . . . forms the spirit of man within him." (See also Wolff, Anthropology, pp. 32-39.)

2. Job 14:13-17: "Oh that Thou wouldst hide me in Sheol, that Thou wouldst conceal me until Thy wrath returns to Thee, that Thou wouldst set a limit for me and remember me! If a man dies, will he live again? All the days of my struggle I will wait, until my change comes. Thou wilt call, and I will answer Thee; Thou wilt long for the work of Thy hands. For now Thou dost number my steps, Thou dost now observe my sin. My transgression is sealed up in a bag, and Thou dost wrap up my iniquity."

a. Job contemplates death and whether anything comes after it in the midst of his expressing a desire to be hidden from God's wrath.
b. In v. 13, he related that he would like to be hidden in Sheol where he would no longer feel the effects of God's anger. Sheol (šōl, 65 times; discussion here adapted from Harris, TWOT pp. 892-3; see also Van Gemeran, EDT, "Sheol"; Innes, NBD, "Sheol", and Bietenhard, NIDNTT, "Hell") has been a greatly debated term. The etymology of the word is uncertain. It may be related to a word for "hollow", meaning a hollow or deep place (i.e., a grave), or it may be tied to the verb "to ask", and signify the place where oracles could be gotten (the place of the dead, who know the answers to our questions). The way people define it depends greatly on their understanding of the OT teaching on death and future life. It seems best to understand that the OT does affirm life after death (see below on 19:23-27, Dan. 12:2, 13, and soteriology notes on 1 Sam. 28), but does not give details about that life. There are three major ways to understand Sheol:

i. It has two different meanings (the one being meant must be determined by the context):

1. Grave, to which all the dead (good and evil) go. This may have been the original meaning.

2. Hell, to which only the wicked go. This more technical meaning may have arisen later.

ii. It is a name for the underworld, common in mythologies contemporary with the time of Job. The major problem with this is that it contradicts the NT teachings.

iii. It may simply refer to the place where the body goes (the grave), making no reference to the soul. The parallels between Sheol and other terms for grave (Isa. 14:11-20 and Ezek. 31 and 32) may indicate that this is the best understanding (see Harris, TWOT, p. 892).

c. In v. 14, Job asks the question of whether man lives after death. He affirms that he awaits his "change" (NIV, "renewal"). Change (halāp) has a special significance here. In 14:7 Job used it to refer to the second growth of a tree: "For there is hope for a tree, when it is cut down, it will sprout again, and its shoots will not cease." In light of that, v. 14 affirms Job's hope of a "second growth" (i.e., life) after death (see Harris, TWOT, pp. 291-2).

3. Job 19:25-27: As for me, I know that my Redeemer lives, and at the last He will take His stand on the earth. Even after my skin is destroyed, yet from my flesh I shall see God; whom I myself shall behold, and whom my eyes shall see and not another. My heart faints within me.

a. Job places all his hope in God--his Redeemer. At the end of all things, He will take His stand on the earth (lit. "dust") and Job would finally be judged (hopefully vindicated!) by Him.

b. Job will see Him, even though his skin has been destroyed. What does it mean that Job would see Him "from the flesh"? "From" (min) can have two senses:

i. In (or from the vantage point), meaning that Job is talking about a resurrection body. This is the usual meaning of min when used with the verb "to see."

ii. Apart from, meaning that Job would see God while in spirit (not body) before he received a resurrection body. This seems more likely in the context (v. 26a refers to death [not in the state of a resurrected body], and 26b, in parallel, should refer to the same thing).

c. The emphatic construction of v. 27 ("I myself") shows Job's certainty at this prospect. There is no doubt in his mind that after death he would stand before God and be vindicated. He is so excited at the thought that his kidneys (see notes on Ps. 139:13-16) waste away within him.

4. Job 31:13-15: If I have despised the claim of my male or female slaves when they filed a complaint against me, what then could I do when God arises, and when He calls me to account, what will I answer Him? Did not He who made me in the womb fashion Job, and Job's servants. As such, Job is accountable to God when his servants bring a valid complaint of their treatment.

a. Background: Job is responding to his friends' attacks on his righteousness. In this passage, he shows that he has treated his servants properly.

b. The reason Job treated them fairly was his basic theological foundation: they were equal to him as human beings. The justification for his foundation is simple, yet profound: the same God who fashioned Job in the womb also fashioned Job's servants. As such, Job is accountable to God when his servants bring a valid complaint of their treatment.
5. Psalm 8:3-8: When I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and stars, which Thou hast ordained; what is man, that Thou dost take thought of him? And the son of man, that Thou dost care for him? Yet thou hast made him a little lower than God, and dost crown him with glory and majesty! Thou dost make him to rule over the works of Thy hands; Thou hast put all things under his feet, all sheep and oxen, and also the beasts of the field, the birds of the heavens and the fish of the sea, whatever passes through the paths of the seas.

a. This is a great passage of David's (guided by the Holy Spirit) reflection on man's place in the universe. Hebrews 2 picks it up and shows how it applies to Christ as a man, but the psalm itself centres only on sinful man. The thrust of the psalm as a whole is to show how God's glory is revealed in man's status (Leupold, Psalms, p. 100).

b. Verse 4 questions how man is to compare with the works of God's hands—the heavens, the moon, and the stars. Modern astronomers were not the first to consider the vastness of the universe and wonder about the significance of man! We see here that size and visible glory are not the final considerations in man's stature in the created order.

c. Leupold (Psalms, p. 103) points out that vv. 5-8 develop this theme: "God invested man with a dignity that is second only to His own and made him ruler over the world which He had just created." Commentators differ on whether this reflects man in his pre-fallen state, man after the fall, or man in a restored state (in heaven?). Perowne (Psalms, p. 152) explains the proper view: "David is manifestly speaking of the present. He sees the heavens witnessing for God; he sees man placed by God as ruler upon earth; he feels how high an honor has been put upon man; he marvels at God's grace and condescension. Man is king, however his authority may be questioned or defied."

i. Man was made "a little lower than God." The Septuagint renders "God" as "angels", a remote possibility (see 1 Sam. 28:13?). Hebrews 2:8, basing its quotes of the OT on the LXX, follows that rendering. The Hebrew text, however, shows that man, in God's image, "lacked but little of God" (BDB).

ii. That man is crowned with glory and honour shows man's role as king among God's creation.

iii. As king, man rules over the rest of the world. This is a direct application of Gen. 1:26. "All things" (David applies is primarily to the visible world; Paul extends it [in Christ, Eph. 1:22] to the spiritual realm as well) are put under man's feet, showing that he has complete control, a fact that can be used properly or abused.

6. Psalm 49:15: But God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol; for He will receive me.

God will receive David—the poor man who trusts Him. This is contrasted with God's response to the rich, who cannot redeem themselves, no matter how great their wealth is (see Soteriology notes on Ps. 49:5-9). "Receive" is the same word used of God taking Enoch (Gen. 5:4), so this verse does not refer to a premature death, but to God bringing us out of the grave. It is used again in Ps. 73:42, "With Thy counsel Thou wilt guide men, and afterward receive me to glory."

7. Psalm 139:13-16: For Thou didst form my inward parts; Thou didst weave me in my mother's womb. I will give thanks to Thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; wonderful are Thy works, and my soul knows it very well. My frame was not hidden from Thee, when I was made in secret, and skillfully wrought in the depths of the earth.

a. The psalmist seeks to show that God has searched him out completely. As proof that man can hide nothing from God, he relates God's role in the creation of every person.

b. God has controlled both the deepest and the earliest parts of our lives.

i. He forms our inward parts (lit. "kidneys").

(1) "Forms" (qana) has two major meanings. The first is to possess or acquire, especially in a business transaction. The second, which is certainly the use here, is to create (see also Gen. 4:1, Deut. 32:6, and Ps. 74:2).

(2) "Kidneys" (kilya, 31 times) refers literally to the organs and figuratively to the deepest parts of our being (Oswalt, TWOT, p. 440). They are the seat of conscience (Ps. 16:7, Jer. 12:2). God tests both the heart and the kidneys (see also Ps. 7:9, 26:2, Jer. 11:20) (Wolff, Anthropology, p. 65).

ii. God weaves the person in his mother's womb, the frame in particular (v. 15). He not only creates the deepest part of our being, He weaves the outer frame around it. He knows us from the inside out, and is intimately
involved with us from conception. Does this have any relevance in the question of abortion? See also Jer. 1:5: "Before I formed you in the womb I knew you, and before you were born I consecrated you; I have appointed you a prophet to the nations."

8. Ecclesiastes 3:17-21: The Preacher relates that God tests man, and shows him that man and beasts are alike.
   a. Man is like the beasts:
      i. Both come from the dust
      ii. Both will die ("return to the dust").
      iii. They have the "same breath" (i.e., the breath of life.
   b. The Preacher then asks a question, of which there are two possible translations:
      i. "Who knows whether man's spirit is different from the beasts?" (v. 21; Kidner, A Time to Mourn, p. 43; and most modern translations)
         If this is the correct translation, the question is simply expressing the common understanding of man at the time--he did not know what happened after death, and there was no human way of gaining the information needed to understand it.
      ii. "Who knows the spirit of man which goes upward and the spirit of the beast which goes downward?" (Eaton, Ecclesiastes, pp. 87-9; KJV). The implications of this translation are:
         (1) There is a difference between man and beast which follows death. The spirit of the beast appears to be rendered completely ineffective, while man's spirit is dealt with by his Maker.
         (2) Most men do not appreciate this difference and live as if there were none at all (they live as beasts, not at responsible men).

9. Ecclesiastes 12:5-7: . . . For man goes to his eternal home while mourners go about in the street. . . . the dust will return to the earth as it was, and the spirit will return to God who gave it.
   a. The whole passage is a reminder of the frailty of man, who eventually weakens, becoming afraid of high places, having his hair turn white ("the almond tree blossoms"; Eaton, Ecclesiastes, p. 149), his walk turning to a limping drag, and his physical appetites being greatly reduced. Eventually he dies, and the mourners lament his passing on to his eternal home (with no implications of the location of that home being given).
   b. In v. 7, we see that at death the spirit separates from the body and returns to God who gave it, an idea which is not further explained. It either hints at the continued existence of the spirit after death (Eaton, Ecclesiastes, p. 151), or simply notes the return of the "breath of life" to its Creator with no individual immortality being required (Kidner, A Time to Mourn, p. 104).

**Anthropology in the Prophetic Writings**

1. Isaiah 8:19: And when they say to you, "Consult the mediums and the spiritists who whisper and mutter," should not a people consult their God? Should they consult the dead on behalf of the living?

   What is our relationship with the dead? We are not to seek them out for answers, advice, or wisdom. God alone supplies that to us, and we are to consult Him on matters beyond us (see also Deut. 18:10-12).

2. Isaiah 25:8: He will swallow up death for all time, and the Lord God will wipe tears away from all faces, and He will remove the reproach of His people from all the earth.

   God is eventually going to swallow up death and all the sorrowing and pain that are linked to it. We may not realize the full effects of this until after our deaths (Alexander, Isaiah, p. 416), but in the end God will eternally banish death and all its consequent results.
3. Isaiah 26:19: Your dead will live; their corpses will rise. You who lie in the dust, awake and shout for joy, for your dew is as the dew of the dawn, and the earth will give birth to the departed spirits.

4. Isaiah 43:7: Everyone who is called by My name, and whom I have created for My glory, whom I have formed, even whom I have made.
   a. Background: Isaiah is exhorting Israel not to fear when in captivity (vv. 1-7) because of their relationship with God. She has been separated by God from the rest of the nations, and is given three reasons not to fear (Martin, "Isaiah", BKC, pp. 1096-7):
      i. God had created, formed, and redeemed her (vv. 1-2).
      ii. God loves her (vv. 3-4).
      iii. The God who was with them had promised to bring them out of captivity and gather them together (vv. 5-7).
   b. The second half of v. 7 gives two important statements:
      i. God created (bara), formed (yatsar), and made (asa) His people. These are the same words used in the Genesis creation account. The distinctions among them may be that God created His people out of nothing (bara), formed what He had created (yatsar), and then perfected or completed the work (asa). Young points out, "As God once created, formed, and made the world, so now He will create, form, and make His new creation, the redeemed" (Young, Isaiah, 3:146).
      ii. God created them for a purpose: for His glory. The placement of the word in Hebrew is for emphasis: He brought them into existence FOR HIS GLORY. Thus, the redeemed of the Lord have a reason for their existence, which is to glorify God.

5. Ezekiel 37:12-14
   Some have felt that this teaches the resurrection from the dead. Taylor, with most modern commentators, argues strongly against it:
   This passage does not therefore teach a doctrine of resurrection from the dead, either general, national, or individual. Nor does it even imply a belief in resurrection on the part of Ezekiel or his hearers. All that can be said of it is that Ezekiel uses the language of resurrection to illustrate the promise of Israel's return to a new life in her own land from the deathlike existence of the Babylonian exile. (Taylor, Ezekiel, TOTC, p. 236)

6. Daniel 12:2-3, 13: And many of those who sleep in the dust of the ground will awake, these to everlasting life, but the others to disgrace and everlasting contempt. And those who have insight will shine brightly like the brightness of the expanse of heaven, and those who lead the many to righteousness, like the stars forever and ever. . . . But as for you, go your way to the end; then you will enter into rest and rise again for your alloted portion at the end of the age.
   a. After much prophecy about the end times, Daniel is told by an angel that those who are dead will rise from the dead to face judgment. Man's short stay on earth is not the complete story--he will go in the end to meet his Maker and face his final destiny (other possible OT resurrection passages, in addition to those we have included in these notes, are Ps. 16:10 and Hosea 13:14).
      i. They rise from the dusty ground, a play on the Genesis "dust to dust".
      ii. Some rise to "everlasting life" (the OT equivalent of eternal life).
      iii. Others rise to everlasting disgrace and contempt. Disgrace (herpa) is blame or scorn; contempt (dera'on) is aversion or abhorrence.
      iv. On the debate on the meaning of "many will be raised," see the commentaries.
   b. Daniel himself is told that he will die, and be raised at the end for his alloted portion (i.e., an inheritance) in the judgment at the end of the age.
c. In v. 3, we get the first OT glimpse of the reward for those who follow the Lord and lead others to Him. They will shine like stars in the night sky, but they will shine eternally. God will put those who follow Him and lead others to do the same on display for the rest of the universe to see.
Anthropology in the New Testament
A. Scott Moreau, D. Miss.

Anthropology in the Historical Books

1. Matthew 10:28 And do not fear those who kill the body, but are unable to kill the soul; but rather fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell (compare to Luke 12:4-5).

   a. We see here a definite demarcation between body and soul (contra Schweizer, TDNT Abridged, p. 1349). Men can kill only the former; God can destroy both in hell. R. H. Gundry relates that the Jews as well as the Greeks "regarded death as separation of the soul from the body", (Matthew, p. 197; he lists numerous references to substantiate his point), so this is not a new idea to Jesus' audience (seen in the fact that He did not have to explain His statement).

   b. Body (soma, 140 times) refers primarily to the physical part of man. Many feel that Paul uses it in a specialized sense of the whole man (see comments on Rom. 6:12). For a concise summary on the debate as to the meaning, see Hoehner, EDT, "Body, Biblical View"; for extended discussion, see Gundry, Soma). We note Gundry's conclusion:

   . . . apart from its use for a corpse, soma refers to the physical body in its proper and intended union with the soul/spirit. The body and its counterpart are portrayed as united but distinct--and separable, though unnaturally and unwantedly separated. The soma may represent the whole person simply because the soma lives in union with the soul/spirit. But soma does not mean 'whole person', because its use is designed to call attention to the physical object which is the body of the person rather than to the whole personality. Where used of whole people, soma directs attention to their bodies, not to the wholeness of their being. (Gundry, Soma, pp. 79-80)

   c. Soul (psuche, 101 times) can refer to life, to the whole person, or to the inner part of man. It parallels the OT nephesh (see notes on Gen. 2:7), but by NT times (seen especially in this verse) could be viewed as a distinct part of a person.

   i. McNeile points out three uses of the word (Matthew, p. 145):

      (1) The life principle common to men and animals.

      (2) The seat of thoughts and feelings (or personality, Harder, NIDNTT 3:683).

      (3) Something higher than either of these two, comprising all that makes up the real self (which can be saved or lost).

   ii. For a brief comparison with spirit (pneuma), see Schweizer, TDNT Abridged, pp. 1350-1; or Hendriksen, Matthew, p. 471, n. 453).

   iii. In terms of the separate existence of the soul, there is much debate today. Harder states:

      That would be a misunderstanding. This kind of thinking, . . . deduces the immortality and permanence of the soul from its own particular quality. This is just what the NT does not teach. The soul is simply that area in which decisions are made concerning life and death, salvation and destruction. (Harder, NIDNTT, 3:686)

      Osterhaven, the other hand, states: "In general terms then it can be said that soul in Scripture is conceived to be an immaterial principle created by God, which is usually united to a body and gives it life; however, the soul continues to exist after death in human beings" (Osterhaven, "Soul", EDT).

d. What is hell (gehenna)? Gehenna is the Hebrew term for the Valley of Hinnom, a valley outside of Jerusalem that became a dumping ground for refuse and corpses of criminals. By the first century, it was possibly still a rubbish pit, complete with smouldering fires. As a result, it was used to symbolize the place of final judgement (see Carson, "Matthew", EBC, 8:149). The real hell, however, is a place of eternal fire (Mark 9:43). The punishment of those in hell is the exact opposite of the reward of those who receive eternal life. All of mankind faces one destiny or the other, there is no third option given in the Bible.

   e. In light of this, Jesus points out that we are not to fear those who can kill only the body, which is going to
die in any event. Our greater concern will be to please God, the One who alone can destroy (apoluo, who can also mean send away or dismiss [Mt.15:23]) our souls and bodies in hell.

2. Matthew 19:3-12 (Jesus teaches on divorce, see also Mark 10:2-12). Note that we focus on divorce and marriage here, not the testing of Jesus by the Pharisees.

a. The question asked ("Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife for any and every reason?") reflects a debate within mainstream Judaism at the time. The two main schools both held that a man could divorce his wife (but not vice-versa) on the grounds of something indecent (Deut. 24:1), but they could not agree on how to define indecency. One side (the school of Hillel) was lenient (an improperly cooked meal was allowable ground), the other (the school of Shammai) more strict. Jesus' teaching here follows neither group (see Carson, "Matthew", EBC, p. 411). It should be noted that the Pharisees had such a high frequency of divorce that it was an open scandal (Hill, Matthew, p. 280). Unfortunately, today's commentators are still divided on the whole issue, making a definite conclusion on this whole passage hard to reach (see Tasker, Matthew, p. 179). The answer that Jesus gives carries the indication that for a certain cause (e.g., adultery) the possibility of divorce exists, but it is not allowable for every cause.

b. The foundation for Jesus' answer (see also Matt. 5:31-32) is in the creation account (Malachi 2:14-16 uses similar reasoning to show that God hates divorce [v.16]). Jesus' use of "from the beginning" shows that his arguments had more weight than the Pharisees who appealed to Moses (an exegetical method that "earlier is weightier", upheld by the Pharisees themselves, Carson, "Matthew", EBC, 8:412).

i. God made them male and female (Gen. 1:27), implying that the two sexes should be joined together.

ii. God made them male and female for this reason (Gen. 2:24): that their joining be in the bond of marriage. Every marriage, as Carson points out, "Is a reenactment of and testimony to the very structure of humanity as God created it" ("Matthew", EBC, 8:412).

iii. The husband and wife are one not by their own work, but by God's creative establishment in their relationship. Marriage is thus a fundamental fact not just of a covenant between God and man (or man and woman), but of the created order itself.

iv. Thus Moses made a concession to the sin of man in permitting divorce (he did not command it, he only allowed it). Divorce, then, is not part of the created design, but an allowance brought about as a result of the fall of man. It is always evidence of sin and is thus not a morally neutral thing (see Carson, "Matthew", EBC, p. 413; contra Tasker, Matthew, pp. 181-2).

c. Jesus does not permit divorce except for "immorality" (which broke the oneness of the relationship anyway). In the context of the times, the Jews would have understood Jesus to be revoking Moses' divorce regulations (see 4C below for the result) and essentially declaring all divorce as evidence of sin.

i. On the various explanations for Matthew being the only gospel account to include the exception clause and the various interpretations of the meaning of that clause, see Carson, "Matthew", EBC, pp. 414-8.

ii. The range of meanings for porneia (NASB: "immorality"); NIV: "marital unfaithfulness"; KJV: "fornication") is wide. It could mean (see also Hendriksen for a good summary, Matthew, p. 716 n. 684):

(1) Incest (but no Jew would have permitted an incestuous marriage).

(2) Premarital sex (i.e., if a man finds out that his bride was not a virgin, then he may divorce her).

(3) Adultery (which was punishable by stoning, not just divorce).

(4) Spiritual harlotry (i.e., the spouse is not a Christian).

iii. *Porneia* can have all of these meanings (except possibly the fourth). It generally refers to sin of a
sexual nature; the exact connotation can only be determined by the context. Here it seems best to leave it in the general sense, and see Jesus' exception as applying to sexual sin of any sort (Carson, "Matthew", EBC, p. 417), but only to sexual sin.

iv. One aspect of this is that the termination of marriages for sexual sin is no longer effected by death (enacted by the stoning of the guilty parties), but divorce (Hurley, *Man and Woman*, p. 104).

d. Mark's account adds, "If she herself divorces her husband and marries another man, she is committing adultery", showing that women have the same rights and responsibilities as men in regard to divorce.

3. Matthew 26:41: "Keep watching and praying, that you may not enter into temptation; the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak" (also Mark 14:38). Our focus is "The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak".

a. Spirit (*pneuma*) is the other major word used for an internal component of man (soul, *psuche*, was discussed in the notes on Matt. 10:28). It denotes, "man in so far as he belongs to the spiritual realm and interacts with the spiritual realm (Dunn, NIDNTT, 3:693), and is used some 40 times in this sense. It is the part of man most immediately open to God and sensitive to spiritual concerns. As with soul, there is debate over whether the spirit is a separate part of man. Further, is spirit to be distinguished from soul (see notes on 1 Thess. 5:23 and Job 10:8-12)?

b. Flesh (*sarx*, 147 times) usually denotes the meaty part of the body, though it can refer to the whole person or to the earthly part of man (Rom. 8:5-13); it can "denote the whole personality of man as organized in the wrong direction, as directed to earthly pursuits rather than the service to God" (Morris, NBD, "Flesh", see also notes on Rom. 8:5-25); or it can express mans' "creatureliness and frailty"; or, finally, it may refer to purely "human, external or natural considerations" (Thiselton, NIDNTT 1:678). The meaning must be determined in context.

c. On the meaning here, Hill relates, "the distinction is between man's physical weakness and the noble desires of his will" (Hill, *Matthew*, p. 342). Foulkes summarizes the contrast as seen generally in the Bible:

This significance of "spirit" leads appropriately to the consideration of the contrast between flesh and spirit found both in OT and NT. Body and spirit, or flesh and spirit, can be said to make up the whole man. Both body and spirit can be defiled (2 Cor. 7:1); both can be holy (1 Cor. 7:34). Spirit is the life principle, the real person, the inner self, and the body is the outward personality. The body without the spirit is dead (James 2:26). The flesh can be destroyed and the spirit saved (1 Cor 5:5). A person can be absent in body but present in spirit (Col 2:5). In such passages as John 3:5-8; Romans 8:3-14; and Galatians 4:21-5:26 the distinction between flesh and spirit is between the will and power of man apart from God doing what he chooses, and the life and will and power given by the Spirit of God enabling man to do what chooses. (Foulkes, ZPEB, "Spirit", 5:504)

4. Mark 7:14-23 (Things on the inside, not the outside, are what defile man).

a. The focus of the Pharisees in regard to uncleanness was in the external observances of the Law (which included specific regulations concerning washing before eating, personal hygiene, etc.). Jesus states that this focus is improper, for the heart is the seat of impurity in man. William Lane notes:

The new element in Jesus' interpretation is the specific reference to "the heart". In Semitic expression the heart is the center of human personality which determines man's entire action and inaction. This key to the statement in verse 15 was already available in the citation of Isa. 29:13: 'This people honors me with their lips, but their heart is far from me.' Jesus now makes this explicit when he traces the source of defilement to the heart, and shows that in an ultimate sense 'food' and 'the heart' have nothing to do with each other. The relevance of this explanation to the question posed in verse 5 is apparent: fulfilling the dictates of the oral law on cultic purity does not alter the heart of man with its warring impulses: the minutiae of the tradition are powerless to remove the pollution from the heart, the source of defilement in the actions of men. Jesus has no intention of denying that the purity laws occupy a significant place in the Mosaic code (Lev. 11:1-47; Deut. 14:1-20) or of detracting from the dignity of men who suffered death rather than violate the Law of God governing unclean foods (1 Macc. 1:62f.). Rather he presses home the recognition that the ultimate seat of purity or defilement before God is the heart. (Lane, *Mark*, p. 255)
b. Verse 19b is Mark’s comment on Jesus’ teaching. The significant one for us is the declaration that all foods are clean for man, reversing the eating prohibitions given in the Pentateuch.

c. As to the list of twelve things that defile a man, Hendriksen (Mark, pp. 282-9) briefly explains each (note that there are two lists; the first contains six plural items, the second, six singular ones, a structure that would suit early church catechisms):

i. Sexual sins or immoral acts. In its widest sense the term here used indicates sexual sin in general, illicit sexual behavior of any description, whether within or outside of marriage bond, often but not always the latter.

ii. Theft. Though, . . . in the New Testament this term occurs but seldom, the sin itself is referred to rather frequently.

iii. Murders. Just why it is that murders are mentioned here in connection with the two preceding items we do not know. There may be a reason for this. Are not murders often committed at the very scene where the immoral act or the theft is occurring?

iv. Adulteries. This is the violation of the marriage bond: a married man's voluntary sexual intercourse with someone other than his wife; or a married woman's voluntary sexual intercourse with someone other than her husband. It should be made clear, however, that Jesus sharpened the edge of every commandment. He taught that hatred is murder (Matt. 5:21, 22), and that a married man's lustful look at another woman is adultery (Matt. 5:28).

v. Covetings. Though we do not know the reason for the sequence adulteries . . . covetings, yet if there is intended to be a connection we might think first of all of the ravenous self-assertion in matters of sex, at the expense of others: "You shall not covet your neighbour's . . . wife." But Exod. 20:17 and Mark 7:22 are broad enough to include every form of avarice.

vi. Malicious acts. This could well be a summing up . . . of all manifestations of wickedness, both those already mentioned and all others besides.

vii. Deceit. This is the first of the sinful qualities or drives that are here mentioned. With such wicked propensities of the human nature the deeds that have already been enumerated are closely connected.

viii. Lewdness. Other ways of designating the same sinful drive: lasciviousness, licentiousness . . . The term stresses the lack of self-control that characterizes the person who gives free play to his perverse impulses.

ix. Envy. Whenever jealousy and envy can be distinguished, jealousy is the fear of losing what one has, envy is the displeasure of seeing someone else have something. One of the most soul-destroying vices is envy. Is it not "the eldest born of hell"? "Rottenness of the bone"? (Prov. 14:30). Our English word envy comes from the Latin in-video, meaning "to look against", that is, to look with ill-will at another person because of what he is or has. It is interesting to note that the Greek original which is found here in Mark 7:22 expresses this idea literally, for its basic meaning is a "a sinister eye", an eye that views another person with fierce and grudging displeasure.

x. Abusive speech or slander. The word used in the original is blasphemy. . . . In the present connection, since the term occurs here in Mark 7:22 between "envy" and "arrogance", it probably has reference to defamation of character, railing, slander, scornful and insolent language directed against another person, whether it be addressed to him directly or spoken behind his back.

xi. Arrogance. The evil tendency of fancying oneself better, abler, or greater than someone else is a universal trait of the human heart as it is by nature.

xii. Folly is the term that probably sums up the preceding five drives and words, just as "malicious acts" summed up the deeds.

d. What is the heart (kardia) in NT thought?
i. Behm points out that "heart" is used to express the following (Behm, TDNT Abridged, p. 416):

1. The seat of feelings, desires, and passions (e.g. joy, pain, love, desire, and lust, see John 16:6, Acts 2:26, Rom. 1:24, 10:1, and 2 Cor. 7:3).

2. The seat of thought and understanding (see Matt. 7:21, John 12:40, Acts 8:22, and Rom. 1:21).


4. The root of religious life, which determines man's moral conduct (see Luke 16:15, Rom. 5:5, 8:27, Eph. 3:17, 2 Pet. 1:19) and where God reveals Himself to men.

ii. The basic condition of the human heart is evil. Sorg points out (Sorg, NIDNTT, 2:182-3):

1. Evil thoughts come from the heart (Mark 7:21).

2. Shameful desires dwell in it (Rom. 1:24).

3. It is disobedient and impertinent (Rom. 2:5), hard and faithless (Heb. 3:12), and dull and darkened (Eph. 4:18).

4. Note that God reveals what is hidden in it (1 Cor. 4:3), examines it (Rom. 8:27), and tests it (1 Thess. 2:4).

iii. Because it is the centre of corruption, it is also the seat of faith and renewal (Rom. 10:6-10), something accomplished not by man (1 Cor. 2:9) but by God alone (Acts 16:14 and 2 Cor. 4:6) through being cleansed by Christ (Heb. 10:22), who dwells in hearts thus cleansed (Eph. 3:17).

5. Mark 8:36-37: For what does it profit a man to gain the whole world, and forfeit his soul? For what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? (see also Matthew 16:24-26 and Luke 9:23-25)

Nothing in the whole world is as valuable as a single person's soul. God places the value of man above the whole rest of this world, and man is unable even to purchase himself!

6. Mark 12:29-31: Jesus answered, "The foremost is, 'Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord; And you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength.' " The second is this, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' There is no other commandment greater than these."

a. Above all, man is to love God with all his heart (see discussion on Mark 7:14-23), soul (see discussion on Matt. 10:28), mind (the seat of intellect, dispositions, and attitudes; Hendriksen, Mark, p. 493), and strength. This is not intended to show a demarcation among them, but to emphasize that our love for God is to be complete and to involve everything we have and are (also seen in the four fold use of "all").

b. The second command also involves love, but in a horizontal direction. We are to love our neighbour as ourself.

i. This assumes that we love ourself already. No where in the Bible to do we see a command to love ourselves, because all men already do that. Is this "self-love" good or bad? Here we are told to extend it, implying that it may not be all bad. Other passages, however, remind us to deny ourselves and focus on Christ (Matt. 16:24).

ii. We are to extend the natural love we have for ourselves to others around us. In the Luke account Jesus tells the story of the good Samaritan to show who our neighbour is--it is anyone we have contact with (Luke 10:29-37).

7. Luke 1:41-44: And it came about that when Elizabeth heard Mary's greeting, the baby leaped in her womb; and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit. And she cried out with a loud voice, and said, "Blessed among women
are you, and blessed is the fruit of your womb! And how has it happened to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me? For behold, when the sound of your greeting reached my ears, the baby leaped in my womb for joy."

Is John's "leaping for joy" in his mother's womb any indication of the status of the unborn? It appears to weigh in favour of considering them as fully human (Brown, Death before Birth, p. 127), but we do not know with certainty how to understand the whole event, especially Elizabeth's report (see Erickson, Christian Theology, p. 554).

8. Luke 9:28-31: And some eight days after these sayings, it came about that He took along Peter and John and James, and went up to the mountain to pray. And while He was praying, the appearance of His face became different, and His clothing became white and gleaming. And behold, two men were talking with Him; and they were Moses and Elijah, who, appearing in glory, were speaking of His departure which He was about to accomplish at Jerusalem.

a. Why are Moses and Elijah here? There are some significant things to note in both of their lives (see Carson, "Matthew", 8:384):

i. Both "died" under unusual circumstances. Moses was buried by God (Deut. 34:6), and Elijah was taken up to heaven (2 Kings 2:11).

ii. Both were men of God in times of transition. Moses introduced a covenant, Elijah worked for renewed adherence to it.

iii. Both were eschatological figures. Moses was a model in the coming Prophet (Deut. 18:18), and Elijah was his forerunner (Mal. 4:5-6, Matt. 17:9-13).

iv. Both experienced God's glory. Moses did so on Mt. Sinai (Exod. 31:8), Elijah at Mt. Horeb (1 Kings 19:8).

v. Both suffered the rejection of their own people (Moses Acts 7:35, 37; Elijah 1 Kings 19:1-19, Matt. 17:12).

b. Walter Liefeld's comments are worth noting:

Scholars debate the significance of Moses' and Elijah's presence. The old view that they represent the Law and the Prophets respectively does not do justice to the rich associations each name has in Jewish thought. Moses had a mountaintop experience at Sinai; his face shone (Exod. 34:30; 2 Cor. 3:7); he was not only a lawgiver but also a prophet--indeed the prototype of Jesus (Deut. 18:18). Elijah was not only a prophet but was also related to the law of Moses as symbolizing the one who would one day turn people's hearts back to the covenant (Mal. 4:4-6). In Jewish thought, Elijah was an eschatological figure, that is, one associated with the end times. So one may say that in the transfiguration scene Moses in a typological figure who reminds us of the past (the Exodus), Moses being a predecessor of the Messiah, while Elijah is an eschatological figure pointing to the future as a precursor of the Messiah. (Liefeld, "Luke", EBC, 8:926)

c. How do we respond to the charge that Christ is here "consulting the dead"? There are several things to note:

i. Christ Himself is transformed here--He sheds some of His earthly aspects and begins to reflect this true glory (i.e., His deity is explicitly seen). This is not a mere man seeking to consult the dead!

ii. Moses and Elijah stand as a solid, supernatural testimony that Christ is who He claims to be. They are granted by God this unique experience as a proof to the disciples of the validity of Christ.

iii. Christ goes through no medium and utters no spells. Moses and Elijah are not "conjured up", but God does allow them to come and talk to Christ about His coming death (lit. "departure").

iv. Though Moses and Elijah appear, Christ's transfiguration shows that He is superior to them and shows that he transcends both the realm of the living and the realm of the dead.

      
      i. Apparent blessings in this life are no guarantee of blessings in the next. Indeed, the next life may well be a complete reversal of this one.
      
      ii. If the law and the prophets are not enough to turn someone from their sins, then even the miracle of someone returning from the dead will not suffice to change them.

   b. In anthropological terms, we receive several hints worth noting (with the recognition of the dangers of trying to find doctrinal truths in circumstantial details of any parable):
      
      i. There is immediate life after death, and a conscious, intermediate state is what we can expect (Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 636-7). Notice that the rich man wanted Lazarus to be sent back to contact his living relatives, indicating that the final judgment had not yet come.
      
      ii. Communication between the living and the dead for the purpose of communicating the need for the living to repent is prohibited as useless.
      
      iii. There is an unbridgeable separation between the wicked dead and righteous dead (v. 26). The language indicated that this barrier has the purpose of preventing those on either side from crossing to the other (Morris, *Luke*, p. 254), but does not appear to shut off verbal or visual communication (though notice that nowhere do we see that Lazarus hears the rich man, for Abraham is the one who communicates with him. No indication is given that the barrier is not permanent, thus implying that there will be no "second chance").
      
      iv. There will be conscious torment ("agony", v. 25) of wicked dead in Hades (vv. 23-4), who will long for relief (indications being that dire thirst will comprise part of the punishment). Especially interesting is the fact that the rich man's thinking had not changed--twice he appeals to Abraham to "send Lazarus" to serve him in some way. Even in his torment he still thinks of Lazarus as nothing more than a servant (Marshall, *Luke*, p. 637), and implies that if he had received enough information while living he would have repented (thus blaming Abraham for unfair treatment; Morris, *Luke*, p. 254)!
      
      v. There will be conscious blessing of righteous dead, and angels appear to be involved in the transport of the righteous dead to their heavenly dwelling place (v. 22). The basic picture seems to indicate their participation in a great feast, reclining in Abraham's bosom as a place of honour (see Morris, *Luke*, p. 253).

10. Luke 20:34-38: And Jesus said to them, "The sons of this age marry and are given in marriage, but those who are considered worthy to attain to that age and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage; for neither can they die any more, for they are like angels, and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection. But that the dead are raised, even Moses showed, in the passage about the burning bush, where he calls the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. Now He is not the God of the dead but of the living; for all live to Him."

   a. The Pharisees did not believe in the resurrection, and wanted to trap Jesus with their question. Jesus responded by showing that they did not believe the Scriptures (about God being a God of the living) or the power of God (in being able to raise people from the dead)—our resurrection is real and will take place!

   b. Jesus further defines some characteristics of those who are raised from the dead:
      
      i. They are considered worthy to attain that age ("a unique phrase for 'the age to come'", Marshall, *Luke*, p. 741). The basis of their worthiness is not mentioned here.
      
      ii. They do not marry. There are two major ways to understand this idea:
(1) All our former earthly relationships are cast aside as part of the "old age," even our marriages.

(2) Marriage as a means of reproduction is no longer necessary, even though the mutual recognition and love developed in earthly marriages will continue.

iii. They cannot die any longer!

iv. They are like angels (in respect to death; Matthew 22:30 states that this is also in respect to marriage).

v. They are sons of God, since they are sons of the resurrection. Our full understanding of this has not yet come (Rom. 8:18-25).

11. Luke 23:39-43: And one of the criminals who were hanged there was hurling abuse at Him, saying, "Are You not the Christ? Save Yourself and us!" But the other answered, and rebuking him said, "Do you not even fear God, since you are under the same sentence of condemnation? "And we indeed justly, for we are receiving what we deserve for our deeds; but this man has done nothing wrong." And he was saying, "Jesus, remember me when You come in Your kingdom!" And He said to him, "Truly I say to you, today, you shall be with Me in Paradise."

One of these being executed requests that Jesus remember him when He comes into His kingdom (a future expectation). Jesus promises him, however, that today he would be with Him in paradise (a Persian word, borrowed by Greeks, for "garden"; it is used of Eden in LXX [Gen. 2:8]). We do not need to wait for the judgment before we begin to experience paradise--it comes immediately after death for those who repent. This passage may also indicate that Jesus did not descend into Hell (or it may show His omnipresence was immediately assumed after His death).

12. John 5:25, 28-29: "Truly, truly, I say to you, an hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and those who hear shall live... Do not marvel at this; for an hour is coming, in which all who are in the tombs shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; those who did the good deeds, to a resurrection of life, those who committed the evil deeds to a resurrection of judgment."

a. A time is coming when all the dead shall be raised by the sound of Jesus' voice.

b. Some will rise to (eternal) life, and others to (eternal) judgment. Marcus Dods notes about the latter:

The fact that some shall rise to condemnation discloses that even those who have not the Spirit of God in them have some kind of continuous life which maintains them in existence with their personal identity intact from the time of death to the time of resurrection. Also, that the long period spent by some between these two points has not been utilised for bringing them into fellowship with Christ is apparent. In what state they rise or to what condition they go, we are not here told. (Dods, "St. John", EGT, 1:742)

13. John 10:34: Jesus answered them, "Has it not been written in your Law, 'I said, YOU ARE GODS'? "If he called them gods, to whom the word of God came (and the Scripture cannot be broken), do you say of Him, whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world, 'You are blaspheming,' because I said, 'I am the Son of God'?

a. "You are gods" (Ps. 82:6) was possibly written of the unjust judges of Israel, and, as Morris points out, "Is applied to them in the exercise of their high and God--given office" (Morris, John, p. 525). If this is the case, then it does not refer to an ontological issue, but a functional one (i.e. the judges acted as God's representatives in giving judgement).

b. Alternatively, some feel that the Psalm refers to angelic beings. If this is the case, then Jesus' point is not that humans are called gods, but that if God refers to "them" (whoever they are) as gods, does Jesus deserve the death penalty for calling Himself the Son of God (see Bruce, John, pp. 234-5; Morris, John, p. 525 n. 92; also Homcy, "'You Are Gods?'", pp. 489-91)?

14. John 14:2-3: In my Father's house are many dwelling places; if it were not so, I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you to Myself; that where I am, there you may be also.
a. "My Father's house" is heaven—we should not confuse it with a mere building. Is there any aspect of the new Jerusalem in this?

b. There are many dwelling places. Some versions read "mansions" (from the Latin translation), but the Greek word does not have the connotations that the English one does (Morris, John, p. 638 n. 6). They are permanent residences, best thought of as rooms in God's house. In what way they are being prepared by Jesus we do not know, but we do know that there will be sufficient room for all.

15. Acts 7:59: And they went on st oning Stephen as he called upon the Lord and said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!"

a. Stephen, using the same words as Jesus on the cross (Luke 23:46; see also Matt. 27:50 and Mark 15:37), shows that he expected his spirit to return to his Lord. This may either imply a belief in continued existence in a spirit state, or it may be a reflection of the spirit given by God to every person simply returning to its source. The former seems the more likely interpretation (Gundry, Soma, p. 114).

b. We should also note Stephen's response to impending death—he is victorious over it because it has lost its sting—"death was no longer an active enemy, but a conquered enemy who now serves not to condemn and destroy, but to free us from the dreadful conditions which sin has introduced" (Erickson, Christian Theology, p. 1172).

16. Acts 17:26-28: And He made from one, every nation of mankind to live on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed times, and the boundaries of their habitation, that they should seek God, if perhaps they might grope for Him and find Him, though He is not far from each one of us; for in Him we live and move and exist, as even some of your own poets have said, "For we also are His offspring."

a. This is part of Paul's sermon on Mars Hill to pagan Greeks. He is seeking to convince them that the "unknown god" is now being made known, and that He has been in charge of men's affairs all along.

b. Paul points out that all men came from one, a blow to the Athenians, who believed themselves to have sprung from the soil of Attica (Bruce, Acts, p. 357).

c. He determined for every nation:

i. Their appointed times (either the seasons of the years or the specific times of national existence, see Dan. 2:36-45).

ii. The boundaries of their habitation (either their specific geographic locations or the general habitable zones of the whole earth; see Bruce, Acts, p. 358).

iii. He did these things for the express purpose of causing man to seek God (compare this to Rom. 1:20).

d. In God all mankind lives and exists, a fact that Paul says was recognized by pagan poets. As creatures, we all depend on God for our continued existence (whether we know it or not). We are all children of God in the sense of creation, but this does not show that we are all spiritual children (see John 8:42-47).

**Anthropology in the Pauline Epistles**

1. Romans 1:18-32 (the basic state of man)

a. God's wrath is upon all men, for they have ignored (and even suppressed) the evidence of God that was planted in them (or in their midst, Cranfield, Romans, p. 104). They are without excuse.

b. Paul describes the results of our unbelief in extremely vivid terms:

i. They became futile in their speculations (v. 21). "Paul no doubt means to indicate the futility which is the inevitable result of loss of touch with reality" (Cranfield, Romans, p. 117).

ii. Their hearts were darkened (v. 21, compare Eph. 4:18) "The darkening to which this sentence testifies means that, even at its best, the thinking of fallen man is never perfectly objective"

iii. Professing to be wise, they became fools (v. 22)—what a contrast between human claims and divine reality!

iv. They exchanged the glory of God for images of men and beasts (v. 23) bring to mind the idolatry of the OT. Today's chase for money may be seen as an equivalent.

v. They exchanged the truth of God for a lie, worshipping and serving creatures instead of the Creator (v. 25), repeats the sense of v. 23. Here it is exchanging truth for lie, in v. 23 it is Creator for creature.

vi. They exchanged natural sexual relations for unnatural (here, homosexual) ones (vv. 26-27).

vii. They did not see fit to acknowledge God any longer, He gave them over an evil mind, which results in the evil deeds listed in vv. 29-31 (notes from Hendrickson, *Romans*, pp. 80-82):

1. **Unrighteousness** is lack of reverence for God's law.

2. **Wickedness** describes those people who take delight in doing what is wrong.

3. **Greed** is covetousness, over-reaching, the craving for more and more and still more possessions, no matter how they are obtained. At times, as in Eph. 5:3, the word applies to ravenous self-assertion in matters of sex, at the expense of others.

4. **Depravity** is badness in general. It is hard to distinguish it from wickedness.

5. **Envy** is the keen displeasure aroused by seeing someone having something which you begrudge him.

6. **Murder**. Envy often leads to murder. This was true in the case of Cain who murdered Abel (Gen. 4:1-8; 1 John 3:12). It was true also with respect to those who demanded Christ's crucifixion (Matt. 27:18; Mark 15:10). And was it not envy that caused the brothers of Joseph to pum his death? See Gen. 37:4, 18.

7. **Strife** refers to a quarrelsome disposition and its consequences.

8. **Deceit** is cunning, treachery.

9. **Malice** indicates malignity, spite, the desire to harm people.

10. **Gossips**. The "whispering" slanderers are meant. They do not--perhaps do not dare to--come out in the open with their vilifying chatter, but whisper it into someone's ear.

11. **Slanderers**. What the gossips do secretly, the slanderers do openly.

12. **Haters of God**. The word used in the original more often refers to those who are hated by God. However, the word is also used at times, as it is here, to indicate those who hate God.

13. **Insolent** (see also 1 Tim. 1:13). This marks' overweening individuals. They treat others with contempt, as if they (these insolent ones) and they alone, amounted to anything, and all others amounted to nothing.

14. **Arrogant**. These fellows consider themselves "supermen".

15. **Boastful**. Such people are constantly bragging about themselves.

16. **Inventors of (novel forms of) evil**. The reference is to those who take special delight in inventing "original" methods of destroying their fellowmen.
(17) **Disobedient to (their) parents** means exactly what it says, contrary to the command to honour our parents.

(18) **Senseless.** These are the people that are "void of understanding." But this is not merely a mental weakness; it is also a moral blemish. They are stupid because they have all along been unwilling to listen to God!

(19) **Faithless.** They are "not true to the covenant", hence are perfidious, not to be trusted.

(20) **Loveless.** The meaning is without natural affection. It was not at all unusual for pagans to drown or in some other way to destroy unwanted offspring. In this connection think of present-day abortion, for which all kinds of excuses are being invented.

(21) **Pitiless.** The reference is to people without mercy, cruel persons, ruthless ones. Think not only of the robbers in the parable of The Samaritan Who Cared (Luke 10), but also of the priest and the Levite, the two who "passed by on the other side".

### Romans 6:12-14: Therefore do not let sin reign in your mortal bodies that you should obey its lusts, and do not go on presenting the members of your body to sin as instruments of unrighteousness; but present yourselves to God as those alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness to God. For sin shall not be master over you, for you are not under law, but under grace.

**a.** Paul exhorts us not to let sin reign in our bodies. Why does Paul say this, when just before this he says that we are "dead to sin" (vv. 3, 6-7; see the soteriology notes on the senses of "dead to sin")? C. K. Barrett explains:

"In Christ" men are dead to sin and alive to God. This is sacramentally and eschatologically true; but neither the efficacy of the sacrament, nor the anticipation of the eschatological future, alters the fact that men in this world have mortal bodies, conditioned by the present age, not the Age to Come; and in these bodies sin is ever at hand. Hence the form of Paul's exhortation; sin must not be allowed to reign; the desires which are naturally engendered in a personality belonging to this age must not be obeyed (cf.xii. 1 f.). (Barrett, Romans, pp. 127-8)

**b.** What does Paul mean by "our bodies"? Is this just the physical part of man (Murray, Romans, p. 227; Gundry, Soma, pp. 29-31), or is it the whole man in all his fallenness (Cranfield, Romans, p. 317, Hendricksen, Romans, p. 201, n. 171)?

**i.** On one side we have Gundry's conclusion:

We have no need to enlarge the meaning of soma here. Paul writes quite straightforwardly about the Christian's responsibility to put his physical body into the service of righteousness. Of course, incorporeal features of man's constitution belong in the larger picture of Christian sanctification, but soma does not indicate them. (Gundry, Soma, p. 31)

**ii.** On the other, Hodges explains:

Paul does not teach that the body is the source of sin, nor its exclusive or principal seat; but it is the organ of its manifestation. It is that through which the dominion of sin is outwardly revealed. The body is under the power of sin, and that power the apostle would have us resist; and on the other hand, the sensual appetites of the body tend to enslave the soul. Body and soul are so united in a common life, that to say, 'Let not sin reign in your mortal body,' and to say, 'Let not sin reign in you,' amount to the same thing. When we speak of sin as dwelling in the soul, we do not deny its relation to the body; so neither does the apostle, when he speaks of sin dwelling in the body, mean to deny its relation to the soul. (Hodges, Romans, p. 204)

**c.** As men, we have two options (v. 13):

**i.** Place the parts of our bodies (i.e. any natural capacity we have—Cranfield, Romans, p. 317) as weapons (or instruments) of sin. In this sense, sin is a "general" that uses our natural capacities as weapons in the battle it fights. Paul exhorts us to stop placing ourselves at sin's disposal in this
ii. Offer ourselves to God and our "members as weapons in the service of righteousness" (Barrett, Romans, p. 128). The "war" vocabulary is a reminder that this is a genuine battle that we face.

d. What does Paul mean when he says "For sin shall not be master over you"? The suggested options include (Cranfield, Romans, p. 319):

i. We never again yield to sin (does this agree with the rest of Paul's teaching?).

ii. This is an imperative (Do not let sin reign . . .); but that would make v. 14 a redundant repeat of v. 12.

iii. "Sin" refers only to attempts to use the law to establish our righteousness; but the context does not support this limited view of sin.

iv. Sin will no longer be our lord—we never again need be helpless in its power, though it still has some type of hold on us.

e. What sense are believers not under the law? Law here should not be seen in the sense of the Mosaic code per se, but the law as condemning sinners. The meaning is thus "we are not under God's condemnation but under His divine favour" (see Cranfield, Romans, pp. 319-20, Murray, Romans, pp. 228-9).

3. Romans 7:14-25 (the reality of the Christian's struggle)

a. Who is Paul writing about? Is this a Christian or a non-Christian?

i. Cranfield lists the seven major options available in understanding this passage (Romans, p. 344; see also Hendriksen, Romans, pp. 225-30):

(1) It is autobiographical, the reference being to Paul's present experience as a Christian;

(2) It is autobiographical, the reference being to his past experience (before his conversion) as seen by him at the time referred to;

(3) It is autobiographical, the reference being to his pre-conversion past but as seen by him now in the light of his Christian faith;

(4) It presents the experience of the non-Christian Jew, as seen by himself;

(5) It presents the experience of the non-Christian Jew, as seen through Christian eyes;

(6) It presents the experience of the Christian who is living at a level of the Christian life which can be left behind, who is still trying to fight the battle in his own strength;

(7) It presents the experience of Christians generally, including the very best and most mature.

ii. We agree with Cranfield, Murray, Hodge, and Hendriksen (for a more complete list, see Hendriksen, Romans, pp. 229-30) that Paul's central idea is that this passage refers to mature Christians (views 1D or 7D above). The decisive factors are:

(1) Nowhere else does Paul refer to a non-Christian as "delighting in the law" (v. 22) and "serving the law in his mind" (v. 25).

(2) Throughout Paul uses "I", not "he".

(3) The present tense indicates that this is not a past struggle, but a continuing one.

(4) After Paul remarks on Christ setting him free (v. 25a), he says that he serves two laws (v.
b. If this refers to a Christian, what does it mean? We must bear in mind the context. Verses 7-13 seek to deal with the question of whether or not the law is evil. Paul concludes that it is not (v. 12), but that sin utilized the law to work its evil in man (v. 8). Indeed, that is why the Law was given--to show sin for what it is (vv. 7,13).

i. The Law given by God is good (see v. 12; here "spiritual", it came from God). We, on the other hand, are fleshly. Cranfield remarks, "We take it then that Paul is here describing the Christian as carnal and implying that even in him there remains, . . . that which is radically opposed to God" (Cranfield, Romans, p. 357). In that sense, we are of the opposite framework as the law, which is holy, righteous, and good (v. 12). "Flesh" is used here in a completely negative sense, as it is closely linked to sin residing in Paul (vv. 18, 25). It refers to the tendency to sin which affects all men (Barrett, Romans, p. 146).

ii. Even as Christians, we are "sold into bondage to sin". Paul is not saying that he sold himself (as did Ahab, 1 Kings 21:20, 25), but that he was sold by someone else--a situation that he agonizes over (compare this to Psalm 51:5). The full meaning of being "sold into bondage to sin" is explained in vv. 15-23.

iii. The believer exists in tension--he is a saint who still wrestles with sin. Hendriksen remarks:

For the present, the Christian is living in an era in which two ages, the old and the new, overlap. There was a time when Paul was exclusively a sinner. There will be a time when he will be exclusively a saint. Right now, as he is dictating this letter, he is a sinner-saint. A "saint", to be sure; but also still a "sinner"; hence the tension, the inner conflict. It is a struggle which every true believer experiences. (Hendriksen, Romans, p. 232)

He does not "condone" (or acknowledge) what is happening in him (v. 15, see Cranfield, Romans, pp. 358-9 for a justification of this translation), and it is a very real struggle.

(1) In the "inner man" Paul joyfully wants to do what the Law requires (v. 22). The "inner man" may be seen as the deepest and inmost part of Paul which has been regenerated by the Holy Spirit. It is essentially the same as the "mind" in vv. 23, 25.

(2) In the members of his body, however, he sees a different set of operations; which was against the desires of his inner man. The power sin has over us is Satan's perverted imitation of the type of control God's law should have over us.

iv. We need to be set free from this struggle embodied in "the body of this death." Paul's cry expresses deepest anguish, but not total despair (as he gives the answer to his question in the next verse). The body of this death might refer to his physical body (Murray, Romans, p. 268; a natural interpretation) or to "the speaker's human nature in its condition of occupation by that 'other law' which is the usurping authority of sin" (Cranfield, Romans, p. 366). The time of being set free is at the end of things, not when we receive Christ.

v. Finally, we serve two laws simultaneously (as we await our final being "set free"). We serve:

(1) The law of God with our mind

(2) The law of sin with our flesh.

Paul thus acknowledges the painful fact that, even as a Christian, he remains a slave in some sense to sin (see Cranfield, Romans, p. 370). It must be noted that Paul does not say that the mind serves the Law of God and the flesh the law of sin, but rather "I (myself) serve . . . with the mind . . . with the flesh" (Murray, Romans, p. 271). Paul thus takes full responsibility for his obedience to sin.

vi. In closing, it should be seen that Rom. 7:14-25 relate the Christian's very real struggle with sin and chapter 8:1-39 relates the positive side of the Christian experience in the person of the Holy Spirit
and His role in the life of the believer (the word "Spirit" occurs 21 times in Romans 8, and only 13 in the whole rest of the epistle, Cranfield, Romans, p. 371).

4. Romans 8:1-39 (the Christian life as characterized by the indwelling Holy Spirit).
   a. We will not try to extensively cover all the issues of this chapter. Instead, we will pick up on selected topics of special interest for anthropology.
   b. In spite of the Christian's struggle between "inner man" and "body of flesh", he has the joy of standing before God without any condemnation at all (v. 1). This privilege comes to him only because he stands "in Christ".
   c. Verse 10 shows that, even though we have Christ, in our bodies reside the consequence of sin, which is death. The second half of the verse has two options:
      i. Our spirits are alive because we have been justified (NASB, NIV, Sanday and Headlam, Hodge), showing further the demarcation between our body and our spirit, OR
      ii. The Holy Spirit "is at work giving life because you are righteous before God" (Barrett, Romans, p. 154, see also Cranfield, Murray, and Hendriksen), showing that the H.S. inside us is a pledge of our future resurrection (or life, see Cranfield, Romans, p. 390). See v. 11 and the various commentaries as to why this understanding is to be preferred.
   d. Verse 11 gives us an indication of the coming resurrection of the dead. Just as the God raised Christ through the Holy Spirit, so will He "give life to your mortal bodies through His Spirit who indwells you".
   e. We have received the Spirit of adoption--we are God's sons and can call Him "Daddy".
      i. Adoption (huiothesia) occurs only five times in the NT. It was not a Jewish legal act; Paul is probably thinking of the Greek or Roman custom. Here Paul shows that we are now God's adopted sons (because we can say, "Abba"); in other places (e.g. 8:23) we see that the complete fulfillment of that adoption still lies in the future (Cranfield, Romans, p. 398). It should be seen that the very use of this term implies that our sonship is not natural, an indicator of the extent of God's mercy. (Schweizer, TDNT Abridged, p. 1215).
      ii. We call God, "Abba", a term of endearment or familiarity that would be foreign to a pious Jew. "It denotes child-like intimacy and trust, not disrespect" (Kittel, TDNT Abridged, p. 2), an intimacy we have only because Jesus invited us to share it with Him (see Cranfield, Romans, pp. 399-400).
      iii. If we are God's children, then we are heirs with Christ. Cranfield relates of this picture:

        The imagery, of course, breaks down; for, since the eternal God does not die (the thought which is present in Heb. 9:15-17 is not present here), there is no question of God's heirs' succeeding Him. But it points extraordinarily effectively to the facts that Christians are men who have great expectations, that their expectations are based upon their being sons of God, that these expectations are of sharing not just in various blessings God is able to bestow but in that which is peculiarly His own, the perfect and imperishable glory of His own life, and that the determination of the time when their expectations will be realized is outside their control. (Cranfield, Romans, p. 407)

      iv. Our final destiny as now firmly linked to Christ's--we shall be glorified with Him (just as we now suffer with Him).
   f. What we will be has yet to be revealed (vv. 18-25). There are several considerations in this regard:
      i. The glory that is to be revealed in us far surpasses the suffering we presently endure.
         (1) This glory is to be revealed. This glory may be something not yet existing (and therefore brand new) or something that already exists but is currently hidden (or only seen in the glorified Christ).
(2) This glory will be revealed in us (contra NASB "to us"). We are not spectators of this glory, but participators in it.

ii. The creation itself is anxiously awaiting the revealing of our glory, for it was subjected to futility (as a result of man's sin) in hope that it will be set free as man will be (vv. 11-22).

(1) "Anxiously awaiting" (apokaradokia) is a word that carries the sense of stretching the neck out to see what is going to happen (Cranfield, Romans, p. 410).

(2) "Creation" includes the sum total of the sub-human (or non-rational, see Murray, Romans, pp. 302-2) created order, living and non-living. For discussion on how various commentators have understood this, see Cranfield, Romans, pp. 411-412.

(3) Creation itself was subjected to futility (v. 20). There have been many attempts to explain what this means, but the most likely is

. . . to understand Paul's meaning to be that the sub-human creation has been subjected to the frustration of not being able properly to fulfil the purpose of its existence, God having appointed that without man it should not be made perfect. We may think of the whole magnificent theatre of the universe together with all its splendid properties and all the chorus of sub-human life, created to glorify God but unable to do so fully, so long as man the chief actor in the drama of God's praise fails to contribute his rational part. (Cranfield, Romans, pp. 413-4; see Gen. 3:17-19)

This futility is not in vain, but in hope that it will be one day set free, just as man will.

iii. Creation will be set free (v. 21). This will not be in the same sense as man, but it will be set free to serve its original intention of fulfilling God's purpose for it in being subject to man.

iv. Currently all creation groans, waiting its redemption (v. 22). Its groaning is not worthless, for it groans in anticipation of the birth about to come.

v. Our adoption as sons has yet to be consummated (v. 23). We already are His sons, but that has not yet been fully manifested (Cranfield, Romans, p. 419). That manifestation will involve the redemption of our bodies--our resurrection and complete renewal.

---

5. Romans 12:1-2: I urge you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living and holy sacrifice, acceptable to God, which is your spiritual service of worship. And do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind, that you may prove what the will of God is, that which is good and acceptable and perfect.

a. Paul exhorts us to present ourselves to God. The language implies a technical sense of a sacrificial offering. We are to offer "our bodies", which here refers to our entire self, not just the physical (Cranfield, Romans, pp. 598-9; contra Murray, Romans, 2:110-111). We are no longer our own--we belong solely and completely to God. The aorist tense here does not force us to consider this a "one-time" sacrifice--we are to continually surrender ourselves to God.

b. In the original, the placement indicates three aspects of the sacrifice we are to offer (see Cranfield, Romans, pp. 600-1):

i. It is to be living--not just physically, but in the "newness of life" that comes from a relationship with Christ.

ii. It is to be holy--includes both "set aside for God's exclusive use" and ethically pure.

iii. It is to be well-pleasing to God--a true and proper sacrifice.

We are also exhorted to be "transformed by the renewing of our mind." The verb tense indicates that this process is already going on and we are to let it continue. We are to resist the process of being moulded
according to the world around us and participate in the process of being moulded by the Holy Spirit (we should not see any significant difference in the two words "conformed" and "transformed"). As discussed in Rom. 6, Christians have the power to make that choice, non-Christians do not. Cranfield recapitulates the idea:

Instead of going contentedly and complacently allowing himself to be stamped afresh and moulded by the fashion of this world, he is now to yield himself to a different pressure, to the direction of the Spirit of God. He is to allow himself to be transformed continually, remoulded, remade, so that his life here and now may more and more clearly exhibit signs and tokens of the coming order of God, that order which has already come—in Christ. (Cranfield, Romans, p. 608)

6. Romans 13:1-7: Let every person be in subjection to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those which exist are established by God. Therefore he who resists authority has opposed the ordinance of God; and they who have opposed will receive condemnation upon themselves. For rulers are not a cause of fear for good behavior, but for evil. Do you want to have no fear of authority? Do what is good, and you will have praise from the same; for it is a minister of God to you for good. But if you do what is evil, be afraid; for it does not bear the sword for nothing; for it is a minister of God, an avenger who brings wrath upon the one who practices evil. Wherefore it is necessary to be in subjection, not only because of wrath, but also for conscience sake. For because of this you also pay taxes, for rulers are servants of God, devoting themselves to this very thing. Render to all what is due them: tax to whom tax is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor.

a. Here Paul lays out the obligations of a Christian to the ruling authorities over him.

i. On the question as to whether "authorities" might also refer to the spiritual realm, see Cranfield's summary (Romans, pp. 656-9).

ii. What is meant by "be subject" (see Cranfield, Romans, pp. 660-3 for a more extended discussion)?

   (1) In an authoritarian state, it is "limited to respecting them, obeying them so far as such obedience does not conflict with God's laws, and seriously and responsibly disobeying them when it does, paying them direct and indirect taxes willingly, . . . and . . . praying for them. In such a state he is bound to do what he can for its maintenance as a just state; but there is no question of the ordinary citizen's having a responsible share in governing." (Cranfield, Romans, p. 662).

   (2) In a democracy, on the other hand, the outworking of "be subject" is more than just a maintenance role. In addition to the concepts of respect and limited obedience given above, the Christian's submission will include

   ... voting in ... elections responsibly, in the fear of Christ and in love to his neighbour, and, since such responsible voting is only possible on the basis of adequate knowledge, making sure that he is a fully and reliably informed as possible about political issues, and striving tirelessly in the ways constitutionally open to him to support just policies and to oppose unjust. (Cranfield, Romans, p. 663)

Murray points out that Paul does not give us answers to question concerning revolution—the government of his times was so old and strong that such a question was not a very practical one (Romans, p. 150, see also n. 10).

b. The person who resists the government authorities rebels against God and will receive judgment (in this case, probably referring to God's) upon themselves.

c. Verses 3-4 seem to ignore the possibility of an unjust government (i.e., a government that punishes those who do good and praises those who do evil). The implication is that "consciously or unconsciously, willingly or unwillingly, in one way or another, the power will praise the good work and punish the evil. The promise of v. 3 is absolute:

The Christian, in so far as he is obeying the gospel, may be sure that the power will honour him. It may indeed intend to punish him, but its intended punishment will then turn out to be praise. It may take his
life, but in so doing it will but confer a crown of glory. On the other hand, if he does evil, it must needs punish him—though it may be by shameful honours or a false security" (Cranfield, Romans, p. 665).

d. The Christian should submit to government for two reasons (v. 5):
   i. The wrath (of God) that he faces if he does not submit.
   ii. His conscience—or knowledge that God is at work "behind the scenes" controlling all things (Cranfield, p. 668).

e. The expressions of submission include (vv. 6-7):
   i. Pay taxes
   ii. Pay customs duties (Murray, Romans, 2:156)
   iii. Give fear (veneration and respect). This may refer to God (see Cranfield, Romans, pp. 671-2) or to the civil rulers (Murray, Romans, 2:156).

7. 1 Corinthians 2:11. For who among men knows the thoughts of a man except the spirit of the man, which is in him? Even so the thoughts of God no one knows except the Spirit of God.

   a. The basic idea that Paul is relating is that no one can know a man's inner thoughts except for the man himself. Others see the outside and guess, but he knows from the inside. This is the same for God—only His Spirit knows His thoughts (Morris, 1 Corinthians, p. 58).

   b. The idea of concern to us is the concept of the spirit of the man being "in him". Man's spirit is a distinct natural part of his make-up (Robertson and Plummer, 1 Corinthians, p. 44). It is the part that knows (or holds?) all the inner things (thoughts, personal memories, reflections, motives, etc.; Ibid.), though, as Fee points out, "Thus, while Paul would undoubtedly understand the human 'spirit' as a distinguishable constituent of the human personality, this sentence is not trying to make a definitive anthropological statement, nor is it suggesting that the analogy of the Trinity fits the human personality" (Fee, 1 Corinthians, pp. 111-2).

8. 1 Corinthians 2:14-3:3: But a natural man does not accept the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness to him, and he cannot understand them, because they are spiritually appraised. But he who is spiritual appraises all things, yet he himself is appraised by no man. For who has known the mind of the Lord, that he should instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ. And I brethren, could not speak to you as to spiritual men, but as to men of flesh, as to babes in Christ. I gave you milk to drink, not solid food; for you were not yet able to receive it. Indeed, even now you are not yet able, for you are still fleshly. For since there is jealousy and strife among you, are you not fleshly, and are you not walking like mere men?

   a. The natural (psychikos) man has no ability to discern things spiritually. Psychikos refers to an organic focus—this is a man whose "horizon is bounded by the things of this life" (Morris, 1 Corinthians, p. 60). He may be wise in things of the world, but he has no understanding (indeed, it is impossible for him to understand) the things of God, which are only discerned by the spirit. He is unregenerate (Bruce, 1 and 2 Corinthians, p. 41), but this term does not necessarily carry the connotation of sinfulness—it simply refers to the extent of his concerns as the natural world around him. He is not necessarily bad, foolish, or irreligious (Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 77). Spiritual truths are not purely a matter of the intellect—they require the Spirit of God to be comprehended.

   b. The spiritual (pneumatikos) man, on the other hand, through his union with God's Spirit, can discern or appraise all things. "He himself is appraised by no man" does not mean that he is above criticism. It either refers to the judgment of a non-spiritual man (Robertson and Plummer, 1 Corinthians, p. 50; Morris, 1 Corinthians, p. 61, or to the idea that God alone is his judge [see 1 Cor. 4:3-4; Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 78].

   c. The man of flesh (sarkinoi) is a babe in Christ. Is this a third category (Bruce, 1 Corinthians, p. 41; Morris,
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1 Corinthians, p. 62; Fee, 1 Corinthians, pp. 123-4) or a different way of referring to the "natural man" (Robertson and Plummer, 1 Corinthians, p. 49)? The answer is found in the fact that they are "in Christ", which is not true of the natural man. Thus, this is a third category—a category of those who are immature in their faith and still need to take milk in order to grow. The particular ending (inos) implies "made of (flesh)". It may refer to a young, immature one who is not yet to be held to blame for his immaturity, or to a believer who is still wrapped up in flesh and unable to discern spiritual things because his focus is in the wrong direction ("I could not speak to you as spiritual").

d. Is the "fleshly" (sarkikos) man of v. 3 to be considered as a fourth type of man, or as the same man in v. 1? The form of the Greek here means "characterized by (flesh)", v. 1 meant "made of (flesh)". Morris relates (1 Corinthians, p. 63): "Sarkos [v. 1] is a more thorough going word, but there is no blame attaching it as applied to those who are young in faith. But sarkikos, [v. 3] 'characterized by flesh', when used of those who have been Christians for years, is blameworthy", while Bruce (1 Corinthians, pp. 41-2) and Barrett (1 Corinthians, pp. 79-81) do not distinguish the words as applying to two types of people. The parallel here to "fleshly" is "walking as mere men". Is this different from being called "babes in Christ" (the parallel to "men of flesh" in v. 1)? Verse 1 seems to relate to the condition in which Paul first found them—immature Christians who needed milk. Verse 3 seems to relate to their present condition (see v. 2 "even now you are not able"). Had they passed from immature Christians to carnal ones? The use of "still" (eti) in v. 3 seems to imply that their condition had not changed, and thus the man in v. 1 is probably the same as in v. 3.

9. 1 Corinthians 6:12-20

a. Background: In these verses, Paul is dealing with the subject of sexual immorality in the Corinthian church, and using that to teach about true Christian freedom. It is possible that the "libertines" at Corinth were saying that freedom with food and freedom with sex were the same thing. Paul shows that they are not. This may have been based on some men going to prostitutes and arguing for the right to continue in their actions (Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 250). What is Paul's basic concern? Two possibilities are more likely than any others:

i. "Although in the divine economy the stomach and food are meant for each other, one's body and prostitutes are not meant for each other" (Gundry, Soma, p. 59) -OR-

ii. "Both food and the stomach belong to the present age, and 'God will do away with them both in the end' (NAB). What he will not let them do is take that slogan, which has to do with the irrelevancy of food restrictions, and apply it to illicit sexual relations." (Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 255)

b. The Christian has freedom, but such freedom can be abused to such an extent that we become slaves of following our own carnal desires. Paul's warning is to avoid mistaking "true freedom" and "enslaving 'freedom'". His basic concern is that we are slaves to Christ, and must not submit ourselves to be slaves of anyone or anything else (vv. 12-14).

c. Paul notes that God will destroy both food and the stomach. Gundry explains:

The destruction of the stomach and its food need only mean that God 'will (as the Parousia) cause such a change to take place in the bodily constitution of man and in the world of sense generally, that neither the organs of digestion as such, nor the meats as such, will then be existent [Meyer, Corinthians, p. 139] . . . . In other words, Paul simply teaches that the physical constitution of the resurrected body will be different from that of the mortal body. Consequently, temporary physical appetites—whether for food or for sexual gratification—of the present body ought not to govern the Christian. He should rather govern them according to the Holy Spirit (cf. vv. 17-20). (Gundry, Soma, p. 54)

d. Paul applies the principle "we are to serve Christ" to the area of sexual liberty and states two important truths:

i. Our bodies are members of Christ (v. 15). "Members" is the word used for ordinary parts of the body. When we join ourselves to a harlot, we are taking away what properly belongs to Christ and joining it to a harlot. How dare we repudiate our Lord in this way? The chiastic flow of the argument can be seen as follows (Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 257):
A: Their bodies are members of Christ's body;  
B: therefore, they may not be members of a prostitute's.  
B': Joined to a prostitute they become one body with her;  
A': joined to Christ they become one spirit with him.

ii. The sexual act makes us "one body" (vv. 16-19).

(1) Many feel that Paul here implies that sexual union is more than merely physical—it is the very bond of marriage (this does not mean that you become married to a harlot, but that you violently abuse the oneness of sex which God created). By its very nature, sex "engages and expresses the whole personality" (Bailey, The Man-Woman Relation, p. 10, cited by Bruce, 1 Corinthians, p. 64). This sin alone strikes at who a man is in his relationship with Christ—our only hope is to flee from it.

(2) Gundry, (and Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 259) however, argues forcefully for maintaining the purely physical picture:

We may question whether Paul means that a man and a harlot make up one physical body. But why not, at the time of sexual union? Prima facie, that seems to offer the most obvious meaning. To understand that a man and a prostitute become one person by means of a physical union (therefore the use of soma) overloads a simple expression with too much conceptual freight. It is more difficult to understand how for Paul an illicit and passing sexual union forms a unified person out of two individuals than to understand Paul in terms of solely physical union of two bodies in coitus. (Gundry, Soma, p. 64).

What, then is Paul saying? Gundry explains:

Corinthians would say, effects a oneness of physical relationship which contradicts the Lord's claim over the body and creates a disparity between the body (now given over to a harlot) and the spirit (still united to the Lord).  
. . . Hence, contrary to Corinthian belief, the body cannot sin with impunity apart from the spirit. (Gundry, Soma, p. 69)

e. What does Paul mean by, "All [other] sins a man commits are outside his body, but he who sins sexually sins against his own body" (v. 18; for options, see Gundry, Soma, pp. 70-5)?

i. Least likely is the explanation that it is used comparatively in reference to the sins listed in vv. 9-10. If so, Paul is possibly saying that only immorality so directly and severely alienated the body from Christ (see Barrett, 1 Corinthians, pp. 150-1; Robertson and Plummer, First Corinthians, pp. 127-8).

ii. Gundry feels that Alford has the best interpretation:

The assertion [that every sin is outside the body], which has surprised many of the Commentators, is nevertheless strictly true. Drunkenness and gluttony, e.g., are sins done in and by the body, and are sins by abuse of the body, . . . introduced from without, sinful not in their act, but in their effect, which effect it is each man's duty to foresee and avoid. But fornication is the alienating that body which is the Lord's, and making it a harlot's body—it is sin against a man's own body, in its very nature,—against the verity and nature of his body; not an effect on the body from participation of things without, but a contradiction of the truth of the body, wrought within itself. (Alford, The Greek Testament, 2:158; cited in Gundry, Soma, p. 72)

Fee summarises this concept: "Even though the body is 'one's own,' it is more properly God's since it is a temple of the Spirit and has been purchased through redemption. Thus the unique nature of sexual sin is not so much that one sins against one's own self, but against one's own body as viewed in terms of its place in redemptive history." (Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 263)

iii. A third viable option is explained by Fee. This sees the first phrase ("All sin is outside the body") as another of the Corinthian slogans, which Paul refutes by noting that sexual sin is against one's own body (Fee, 1 Corinthians, pp. 261-2).
f. Our bodies are the temple of the Holy Spirit (vv. 19-20). The word for temple is for the sanctuary, not for the entire temple (Morris, 1 Corinthians, p. 103). The Spirit resides in us--how dare we violate that temple by allowing entry of a harlot? Our bodies are really not our own--God has bought them, and we are to reflect this by glorifying God with our bodies. "The imagery is pure and simple, in which the significance of the body for the present is being affirmed; it is not intended to be a statement of Christian anthropology, as though the body were the mere external casing of the spirit or Spirit." (Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 264)


a. It will be helpful to first present the basic segments of the discussion (from Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 268):

i. 1-7: to the married: stay married with full conjugal rights

ii. 8-9: to the unmarried and widows: it is good to remain unmarried

iii. 10-11: to the married (with both partners believers): remain married

iv. 12-16: to those with an unbelieving spouse: remain married

v. 17-24: to all: remain in the place you were at the time of your call

vi. 25-38: to "virgins": it is good to remain unmarried

vii. 39-40: to married women (and widows): the married are bound to the marriage; when widowed it is good to remain that way

b. Fee summarises on this passage:

The net result is a section of considerable importance for the ongoing church, for marriage-related questions are addressed here as nowhere else in the NT. Yet apart from the command in v. 10, the whole is filled with what is acknowledged by the apostle as his personal opinion. That does not mean that it lacks authority or may be disregarded. But much of it functions more at the level of biblical guidelines than biblical mandate, and in using these texts one needs to keep that distinction in view. (Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 270)

c. What about the sexual relation within marriage (vv. 1-7)?

i. First, we note that v. 1 ("It is good for a man not to touch [have sexual relations with] a woman") is possibly Paul's quotation of a statement by the Corinthians. If this is the case, they were teaching that sexual relations were evil, and those who were married were being pressured to either abstain from sex or to get a divorce. Paul is answering their quote to show that sexual relations within marriage are good and proper (see Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 269). Fee conjectures:

One wonders further whether we do not have here the first evidence of the so-called "eschatological women" in Corinth, who think of themselves as having already realized the "resurrection from the dead" by being in spirit and thus already as angels (cf. 11:2-16; 13:1), neither marrying nor giving in marriage (cf. Luke 20:35; . . .). (Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 269)

ii. In any event, Paul's thrust is clear: there should be no unilaterally declared sexual abstinence in marriage. Even a mutually agreed upon abstinence should only be for a set period of time (especially in view of the immorality addressed in 6:12-20). Taken with the previous paragraph, this passage may indicate that the wives were denying sexual relations to the husbands, who, in turn, were going to prostitutes for their sexual desires).

iii. In substantiating his position, Paul notes the mutuality of marriage in three parallel clauses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Each man should have (sexually) his own wife</th>
<th>and</th>
<th>Each woman should have (sexually) her own husband</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The husband should give to the wife her (sexual) due</td>
<td>likewise</td>
<td>The wife (should give) to her husband his (sexual) due</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anthropology in the New Testament

The wife does not have authority over her own body, but her husband does

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The husband does not have authority over his own body, but his wife does</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

iv. The main thrust in each "having authority over the other's body" is NOT to teach that we must "claim our rights", but rather to teach that we must not deprive the other of their rights so that Satan will not be able to tempt them to immorality (Fee, 1 Corinthians, pp. 280-2)

v. Fee concisely points out three lessons on abusing sex within marriage from this section (Fee, 1 Corinthians, pp. 285-6):

1. "The affirmation of sexual relations within marriage as such is a much needed correction to some who still follow Augustine and treat sexuality as part of the Fall. God made us sexual creatures; and because God made us so, sex is good."

2. "The mutuality of sexual relations, and of marriage itself, also needs to be heard. Too many still treat sex as though it were the privilege of the husband and the duty of the wife. But not so. It is the privilege and duty of both together. Each belongs mutually to the other."

3. Verse 5 "not only prohibits the 'defrauding' of each other in this matter, but also, by the very fact of the mutuality argued for in vv. 3-4, prohibits the holding back of sexual relations as a means of manipulation within the marriage relationship. That both abuses sex and destroys mutual love and respect."

d. Is marriage necessary (vv. 8-9)?

i. Remaining in a single state is good--in fact, it is a gift of God (just as marriage is). How is this to be applied in the traditional African concept of marriage?

ii. For those who are not able to endure life as a single, however, it is better that they get married.

1. "Do not have self-control" implies either a long and painful struggle (Robertson and Plummer, 1 Corinthians, p. 139) or that they have not been successful (they "are not practicing continence"; Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 289).

2. What does Paul mean by "it is better to marry than to burn"? Again, two options are available:

   a. Burn with passion and desire (Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 289), or

   b. Burn in Hell for not being able to control the sexual appetite.

e. Is divorce for believing partners permitted (vv. 10-11)?

i. Paul has a specific command for believers married to believers: do not separate. Recognizing that they may do so anyway ("if she does leave"), he further commands the woman not to be married to anyone else but her original husband. How are we to understand this? The considerations include:

1. Paul is responding to specific questions of the Corinthians, not trying to lay out the total teaching on divorce and remarriage.

2. The context indicates that the separations he has in mind are not for sexual immorality, but for ascetecism (see Hurley, Man and Woman, pp. 130-3). The scenario is possibly of a believing couple with a wife who feels that the sexual relation pulls her away from Christ. Paul responds that this is not a legitimate excuse for separation (the word means separation, not just divorce).

3. If she does disobey the Lord and separates, then she is to marry no other person than her original husband. Did Paul have in mind a divorce caused by ascetecism, by immorality, or
any divorce? This is a difficult question to answer!

ii. No matter what else we might think about the passage, Paul gives only two options here: permanent separation or reconciliation.

d. Are marriages of mixed faith (one believer, one unbeliever) binding (vv. 12-16)?

i. The basic rule of maintaining the marriage still applies. The believing partner is not to seek divorce (vv. 12-14).

ii. If the unbelieving partner insists, then the believing partner is not bound, but is to allow the unbelieving partner to have his/her way (vv. 15-16). To what command is the believer no longer bound? Is it:

1. Only to the command against divorce (Fee, 1 Corinthians, pp. 302-3) or

2. Both to the command against divorce and to the command against remarriage (the official position in the Roman Catholic Church)?

iii. This does not actually mention the possibility of remarriage (see discussion in Laney, "Paul and the Permanence", pp. 286-8).

iv. The reason the believing spouse is not to seek divorce is that the believer "sanctifies" ("sets apart") the unbeliever and the children (who are "holy" as a result of their relationship with the believing partner). Morris states in relation to the spouse, "It is not possible to give a precise definition of what this signifies" (Morris, 1 Corinthians, p. 110). It seems to be an extension of Exod. 29:37 "Whatever touches the altar shall become holy", (Bruce, 1 Corinthians, p. 69). It may refer to the purity of the marriage rather than of the state of the partner's salvation (Robertson and Plummer, 1 Corinthians, p. 142), or to the idea that the partner is "set apart in a special way that hopefully will lead to their salvation" (Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 301).

g. Is a change in the marital status advisable (vv. 17-24)? Paul's basic teaching (which applies to the divorce questions in vv. 10-16 as well) is to be content with your present status. This does not exclude a change, but emphasises that our focus is to be on Christ, not ourselves.

h. Is a virgin allowed to get married (vv. 25-38)? Laney summarizes the teaching here:

According to Paul, the single life is the best course to follow in light of (1) the burdens of family life in an unfriendly world, 7:26-28; (2) the transitory nature of things in view of the Lord's imminent return, 7:29-31; and (3) the greater freedom and opportunity afforded a single person in serving Christ, 7:32-35. Paul views the single life as not morally better but as providing greater opportunity to be useful for Christ. However, Paul assures his readers that for a virgin to marry is not to commit sin but to incur greater responsibility and potential trouble in life (7:28). Therefore, he says, it is best to be content in the marital state you find yourself in. (Laney, "Paul and the Permanence", p. 290)

i. Is a widow permitted to remarry (vv. 39-40)? Paul gives his one explicit exception to the "remarriage" rule: once the partner dies, the survivor is free to do as he/she chooses (but "in the Lord").

11. 1 Corinthians 11:3-16 (Christian order in worship). Paul makes several important statements concerning the order of relationships among Christians in worship. Here we seek to deal with those that specifically relate to anthropology.

a. God is the head of Christ, Christ is the head of every man, and the man is head of a woman (vv. 3).

i. One major problem with the passage is the meaning of "head". There are two main schools of thought (see the concise listing of the literature and some of the major arguments in Fee's reference notes, 1 Corinthians, pp. 502-3, n. 42-6 and Grudem, "The Meaning: A Response to Recent Studies" Trinity Journal 11 (1990):3-72):

1. "Head" refers to a relationship of superior authority (see Wayne Grudem "Does Kephale

ii. "Head" is not used with the same nuance in every case in this passage (e.g., God's headship over Christ is not the same as the husband's headship over his wife; see Fee, 1 Corinthians, pp. 493-4 for a pictorial illustration of the outline of the material and the shifting uses for "head");. Within the two options for head given above, the various parallels can be described (Hurley, Man and Woman, p. 167 for "head" as authority; Fee, 1 Corinthians, pp. 504-5 for head as source):

(1) Christ/man.

(a) SOURCE: Either Christ is the source of all men as their Creator, or Christ is the source of every Christian man in the new creation.

(b) AUTHORITY: In the home, Christ is head over all husbands. They are to model their behaviour after his. In the religious sphere, Christ is the head over all elders and teachers.

(2) Man/woman.

(a) SOURCE: the basic sense is that the man (e.g., ADAM) is the "source of life" of the woman (e.g., EVE) in the sense that he was made first, and the woman was created from him (vv. 8-9). Thus, as Fee notes, Paul's concern is not hierarchical (who has authority over whom) but relational (the unique relationships that are predicated on one's being the source of the other's existence). Indeed, he says nothing about man's authority; his concern is with the woman's being man's glory, the one without whom he is not complete (vv. 7c-9). To blur that relationship is to bring shame on her "head." (Fee, 1 Corinthians, pp. 503-4).

(b) AUTHORITY: In the home, the husband is the head over his wife. In the church, the religious sphere, certain men act as heads by being elders, teachers and leaders of the worship (assuming that women elders, and teachers are prohibited by 1 Timothy 2-3, which will be discussed later).

(3) God/Christ.

(a) SOURCE: God is the "source" of Christ in the sense of the incarnation, not in any ontological sense of God being prior to the pre-existent Christ.

(b) AUTHORITY: God the Son became man and acted on behalf of Adam's race. As 'second Adam' (cf. 1 Cor. 15:45) he was obedient to God's authority (headship), even to the point of death (Phil. 2:8). In his capacity as the second Adam, the head of a new mankind, Christ will acknowledge God as 'head over' mankind by handing over 'the kingdom to God after he has destroyed all [other] dominion, authority and power' (1 Cor. 15:24).

b. An argument from culture: men are not to "hang down the head", and women not be "covered as to the head" while praying and prophesying (vv. 4-6).

i. The men are not to "hang down the head" ("with his head covered", NIV)—what is this? Most likely it refers to some external physical covering, but the exact meaning and scope of the prohibition is no longer known to us (Fee, 1 Corinthians, pp. 507-8).

ii. Women are not to "uncover the head".

(1) First, what is the general sense? Again, it depends on our interpretation of "head".
(a) On the "source" side, Fee maintains:

Although this could mean that she thereby disgraces her husband, more likely, in light of v. 3 and the ensuing analogy in vv. 5-6, as well as the argument of vv. 7-9, this probably refers to bringing shame on "the man" in terms of male/female relationships. That is, their action disregards this relationship by breaking down distinctions. (Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 508; emphasis mine)

(b) On the "authority" side, Hurley points out:

While it is not likely that the Corinthian men were in fact putting coverings on, it would seem quite likely that the Corinthian women had concluded that, having been raised with Christ (1 Cor. 4:8-10), their new position in Christ and their resultant freedom to participate in the worship by prayer and prophecy was incompatible with wearing a sign of submission to their husbands! Paul defends their right to pray and to prophesy, but does not see it as doing away with the marital relation. The already realized aspect of the kingdom leads to women's participation; it does not do away with marital submission, but rather should restore it to its proper form. Only at the resurrection will marital patterns be done away completely (Mt. 22:30). The Corinthians had not grasped the both/and of the present stage of the kingdom. (Hurley, Man and Woman, p. 170)

(2) What was the particular action involved in this? "Veil" is only mentioned in v. 15. What then does Paul mean by "covering"?

(a) Three basic options have been proposed (Hurley, Man and Woman, pp. 167-171; Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 496):

(i) A actual external veil to cover the entire head (the "traditional" view; Bruce, 1 Corinthians, p. 104; Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 510; and is favoured by being the opposite of the action of the men).

(ii) The long hair itself is the veil (argued from v. 15; see the alternate marginal translation in the NIV; we would then have to consider the men's prohibition to refer to long hair for them)

(iii) The hair grown long and worn in a certain style, the style being the veil or covering (Hurley, Man and Woman, p. 169; who feels that the prohibition is against letting that the hair down, or "loosing" it).

1) The punishment for a woman caught in adultery during the NT period was cutting off the hair (stoning was no longer allowed).

2) The actual word used for "uncovered" is of the same word family used in the LXX for the letting down of the hair in the bitter-water rite of a suspected adulteress (Num. 5:18). Paul may have been telling the women to continue wearing their hair in proper fashion.

(b) It seems best to conclude, as with the situation for the men, that we simply do not know and will probably never know with certainty, what this refers to. As Fee notes, though, "her action (1) must have been deliberate, (2) must be understood to bring shame on her 'head,' and (3) probably had inherent in it a breakdown in the distinction between the sexes" (Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 510).

(3) Note that Paul did not prohibit the woman from praying and prohersying--only from doing it uncovered (or "without authority", v. 10).

c. An argument from creation (7-12)

i. Man is the image and glory of God; but woman is the glory of man (v. 7). Paul does not give a
complete parallel. Man is in God's image and glory, but he avoids mentioning woman as in man's image. Why the difference?

(1) The SOURCE perspective:

Paul probably means that the existence of the one brings honor and praise to the other. By creating man in his own image God set his own glory in man. Man, therefore, exists to God's praise and honor, and is to live in relationship to God so as to be his "glory." What we are not told here is why being God's glory means no covering; v. 4 indicates that it had to do with his not shaming Christ. But that, too, was left unexplained.

As in v. 4, however, this word about man is not the point of the argument; it exists to set up Paul's real concern--to explain why women should be covered when prophesying. But in coming to that concern, he picks up on the word "glory," saying only that "the woman, on the other hand, is man's glory." The implication is that by praying and prophesying in a way that (apparently) disregarded distinctions between the sexes (being already as the angels), she brings shame on the man whose glory she is intended to be. Paul does not hereby deny that woman was created in God's image, or that she, too is God's glory. His point is singular. She is related to man as his glory, a relationship that somehow appears to be jeopardized by her present actions. (Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 516)

(2) The AUTHORITY perspective:

The chapter is concerned for authority relations: social, functional relations in which God is head, Christ is head, and men are head. Paul has not been discussing personal dignity or worth (ontological value). Man, in his authority relation to creation and to his wife, images the dominion of God over the creation (a central theme in Gn. 1) and the headship of Christ over his church (Eph. 1:20-22; 5:22-23, etc.) The woman is not called to image God or Christ in the relation which she sustains to her husband. She images instead the response of the church to God and Christ by willing, loving self-subjection (Eph. 5:22-23). In this particular sense of authority relationships, the main topic of 1 Corinthians 11, it is absolutely appropriate to say that the man images God and that the woman does not. I want to stress that in saying this there need be no implication whatsoever that women are not the image of God in other senses. Paul did not say that man was the image of God and that the woman was the image of the man. (Hurley, Man and Woman, p. 173)

ii. Paul further explains the statement that "woman is the glory of man" in vv. 8-9.

(1) The SOURCE perspective: Paul is noting that man is not complete in-and-of himself--he needs a partner. The only one capable of serving in that capacity is one taken from him, who is bone of his bone, one who is like him but different from him, one who is uniquely his own "glory." . . . She is . . . man's glory because she "came from him" and was created "for him." She is not thereby subordinate to him, but necessary for him. She exists to his honor as the one who having come from man is the one companion suitable to him, so that he might be complete and that together they might form humanity.

Paul's point, of course, it that in the creation narrative this did not happen the other way around--man from woman and for her sake. Hence he is her "head" (her source of origin) and she is his "glory." She must not be uncovered when praying and prophesying, and thereby disregard one of the (apparently) visible expressions of differentiation, because in so doing she brings shame on him by trying to dissolve the right male/female relationship that still obtains in the present age. (Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 517).

(2) The AUTHORITY perspective: Paul places the subordination of woman in the order of creation (vv. 8-9), not in the fall. Woman was created out of man and for his sake. See also the discussion on 1 Tim. 2:8-15.

iii. Finally, Paul reminds man and woman of their mutual dependence (vv. 11-12).

(1) What is the "authority", and what is the woman in relation to that authority?

(a) The SOURCE perspective: the woman has authority over her own head; she has the
freedom to choose to do as she wishes, but no one knows for sure exactly what this means (this is the best option from the grammar, but one of the more difficult from the direction of Paul's argument; Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 520).

(b) The AUTHORITY perspective (which is the traditional view): the woman has the "covering" as a sign of authority over her head (NIV, Living Bible; but the verb "has authority" is nowhere else ever used in this way; Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 519).

(2) What is the function of vv. 11-12?

(a) The SOURCE perspective: this is a not a corrective to vv. 8-9, but a qualification to vv. 8-9 to "limit their application to the immediate argument" (Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 517).

The thrust can be summarised:

While it is true that woman is man's glory, having been created for his sake (v. 9), Paul now affirms that that does not mean that woman exists for man's purposes, as though in some kind of subordinate position to his aims and will. To the contrary, God has so arranged things that "in the Lord" the one cannot exist without the other, not meaning of course that every Christian man and woman must be married, but that as believers man and woman are mutually dependent on each other... . . . Both man and woman, not just man, are from God. God made the one from dust, the other through man, and now finally both through woman. This seems clearly designed to keep the earlier argument from being read in a subordinationist way. (Fee, 1 Corinthians, pp. 523-4)

(b) The AUTHORITY perspective: this is a counter-balance (or corrective) to prevent men from abusing their authority.

d. An argument from propriety or nature (vv. 13-16)? Paul relates that "nature" tells us that long hair on a woman is her glory (vv. 14-15). What does this mean?

i. "Nature" may mean "social custom" or "the natural feelings of their contemporary culture", and Paul's comment is thus culture dependent (Fee, 1 Corinthians, pp. 526-7).

(1) On the other hand, however, "nature" may mean "God's design for nature" (see Rom. 1:26, 2:14, 27). If this is the case, then we should "urge believers to adopt this particular symbol, noting carefully that relative rather than absolute length is in view and that styles are not stipulated. Absolute length and styles may vary as they will from group to group and time to time" (Hurley, Man and Woman, p. 183).

e. What, then, is the overall framework and view of the passage?

i. The SOURCE perspective:

There can be little question that in the new age inaugurated by Christ women participated in worship along with men. For the most part, in these matters Corinth followed the traditions they had received when Paul was among them. But some women either were actually praying/prophesying (most likely), or were arguing for the right to do so, without the customary "head covering" or "hairstyle." Probably this is related to their being pneumatikos ("spiritual") and to their somewhat overrealized eschatology. It seems difficult to understand Paul's answer unless their spiritualized eschatology also involved some kind of breakdown in the distinction between the sexes. Already they had arrived in the Spirit; they were already acting as those who would be "like the angels," among whom sexual distinctions no longer existed. As a part of their new "spirituality" they were disregarding some very customary distinctions between the sexes that would otherwise have been regarded as disgraceful. Paul feels strongly enough about the issue to speak to it, even if his argument lacks its customary vigor. (Fee, 1 Corinthians, p. 498)

ii. The AUTHORITY perspective:

Upon examination, we found that the basis of Paul's view of the headship of men was not in an area
which is culturally relative. His appeal to a Christological hierarchy and to the creational relation of Adam and Eve are independent of the actual cultural setting of the Corinthians. He does not, for instance, indicate that the women’s lack of training or the possibility of offending certain cultural groups influenced his hierarchical teaching. His specific application of the hierarchy involved the women and men of his congregation in practical ways. The two were to retain their appointed roles and the symbols thereof. This, in my understanding, was specifically directed to the women who had begun to wear their hair loose in the manner of the men. Paul understood this rejection of their relation to men as rejection of a divine structuring of relations. Its consequence was not the pride of equality but the shame of rejection of divine ordinance. A woman’s hair, he directed, should continue to be a sign of her place within the creational hierarchy of God, Christ, man, woman (and then angels and the rest of creation). In addition, he directed that her hair is a sufficient sign; no shawls are needed. (Hurley, *Man and Woman*, p. 184)

12. 1 Corinthians 14:14: If I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays, but my mind is unfruitful.
   a. Here we see a distinction between man’s spirit, (the part that responds and yields to God) and man’s mind (the part in which intelligent religious reasoning takes place, see Harder, *NIDNTT*, 3:127). In what way is the “mind” another part of man (compare to Romans 7, where the "law of mind" wages war against the "body of sin")?
   b. Also note that Paul shows that mind has a definite and rightful place in our relationship with God (this does not refer to "dry intellectualism") (Morris, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 194-5).

13. 1 Corinthians 14:34-35: Let the women keep silent in the churches; for they are not permitted to speak, but let them subject themselves, just as the Law also says. And if they desire to learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is improper for a woman to speak in church.

There have been four basic methods proposed for dealing with this text (see full discussion in Hurley, *Man and Woman*, pp. 185-94, Fee, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 699-708). Of the four presented below, either the first or one of the options under the fourth would seem most reasonable:
   a. *The text is not authentic.* We will not go into all the arguments for this here (see Fee, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 699-703, for more extended discussion of this option). The biggest argument against this position is that there is no direct textual evidence for it.
   b. *Paul contradicts himself.* If this is the case, however, then we have to give up our concept of inerrancy. It is better to find another alternative!
   c. *Paul did not really give women permission to speak in 1 Corinthians 11. There he dealt with authority; here he deals with talking, and forbids it* (see Robertson and Plummer, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 324-5). A close look at chapter 11 shows that women had the same rights as men in regard to praying and prophesying.
   d. *Chapter 14 deals with a different circumstance than chapter 11.* There are several ideas as to what the differences could be:
      i. Chapter 11 has informal meetings in view, and chapter 14 has formal ones. Unfortunately, it is impossible to prove that there even were such “differences” in the NT times. Additionally, prophecy is a public gift, and women are allowed to give prophecy in chapter 11.
      ii. Chapter 14 refers particularly to wives, chapter 11 to all women. In response, we ask “Why should married women be singled out?” Chapter 11 also included wives, and Paul made no distinction there as to who could pray or give prophecy.
      iii. Paul’s comments were culturally related, because the Corinthian women at that time were uneducated or badly behaved. They were disrupting the worship service by shouting out questions or comments, and Paul was trying to re-establish order. But would this cause Paul to silence all women?
      iv. Paul says that women may not judge the prophets (the context v. 29 states the rule, vv. 30-35 then give the further explanation of the rule). Hurley’s conclusion is:
The intent of this passage is to teach that women ought not to participate in the examination of prophets, an exercise which Paul understood as incompatible with the subordinate role which he considered God had assigned to women in the home and in the church. The passage does not in any way stand in opposition to 1 Corinthians 11, which specifically presumes that women will speak to pray and to prophesy in the church. Nor is it in conflict with the teaching of chapters 12-14, which assume that the various members of the body of Christ will all participate in the corporate meetings. (Hurley, Man and Woman, p. 193)

14. 1 Corinthians 15:35-58: (The resurrection of the dead)

a. Paul's central thrust is to show that we will be raised from the dead. The whole discussion may be seen as a response to objections concerning the resurrection. Within that framework, he makes several interesting points about our state before and after that resurrection.

b. The main question seems to be this: "How can the body that dies and the one that is raised be the same body?" Or, "How can that which is destroyed or decomposed or disintegrated be raised from the dead?"

Paul's answer: Even nature itself (through the death of a seed and birth of a plant) show you that the dead and risen bodies do not need to be the same. This is confirmed by Scripture as well. Our resurrection is certain! Just as a plant seed disintegrates to form the plant, so it will be with our bodies.

c. Our present bodies are a "bare grain" of what they will be, just as a seed is a "bare grain" of the plant which grows out of it (vv. 35-38). Our new bodies will be far more glorious than our current ones, and may not resemble them in anyway.

d. Just as birds, men, cattle, etc., do not have the same body, so we will not be the same (vv. 39-41). The same applies to heavenly bodies (probably beings, not stars), and the sun, moon, and stars. Each has its own peculiar type of glory.

e. The resurrection body is contrasted to the earthly one (vv. 42-49):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our earthly bodies:</th>
<th>Our resurrection bodies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are sown perishable (v. 42)</td>
<td>Are raised imperishable (v. 42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are sown in dishonour (v. 43a)</td>
<td>Are raised in glory (v. 43a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are sown in weakness (v. 43b)</td>
<td>Are raised in power (v. 43b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are sown a natural body (v. 44)</td>
<td>Are raised a spiritual body (v. 44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are from the earth, earthy (v. 47, &quot;made of dust&quot;)</td>
<td>Are from heaven, heavenly (v. 47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear the image of the earthy (v. 49)</td>
<td>Bear the image of the heavenly (v. 49)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. Paul's final encouragement concerns our victory over death (vv. 50-58, see also 5:25-6). When that comes, we will have put our imperishable, immortal bodies (v. 53), and will have done so instantly ("in the twinkling of an eye," v. 52). "Put on" is a term used of clothing; does this confirm further a distinction between a "non-material" and a "material" part of man?

15. 2 Corinthians 3:18 But we all, with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into the same image from glory to glory, just as from the Lord, the Spirit.

a. In the old covenant, Moses alone was privileged to experience this transformation (Exodus 34:29-35). Paul now shows us that it is for all Christians.

b. "Beholding as in a mirror" is one word in Greek having three possible meanings (Harris, "2 Corinthians," EBC, 10:339 and Hughes, 2 Corinthians, p. 118 n. 19):

i. Beholding as in a mirror (in which case it is Christ who mirrors the glory of God)

ii. Reflecting like a mirror (in which case we mirror the glory of God)
iii. Beholding, as in a glass (again, Christ showing God's image, but we see God's glory only dimly).

c. We are being "transformed" (the same word is used of Christ at the Mt. of Transfiguration, Matt. 17:2 and Mark 9:2). This carries the idea of being changed in essential attributes, not just external appearances (see the discussion on *morphe* in Lightfoot, *Philippians*, pp. 127-33). We need to be cautious in trying to relate the new image we are being transformed into to the image we had before the fall or to the new bodies Paul discusses in 1 Cor. 15. Here, he is concerned with not just externals, but our entire character—which is being changed into the image of Christ. Our transformation is continuous and in stages ("glory to glory").

d. Hughes points out that are three of these conditions needed for this transformation (*2 Corinthians*, p. 121), which is effected by the Lord:

i. Our turning to the Lord.

ii. Every veil that hide Christ must be removed (from us).

iii. His glory, and no other, must be reflected.

16. 2 Corinthians 4:16: Therefore we do not lose heart, but though the outer man is decaying, yet our inner man is being renewed day by day.

a. The "outer man" refers to Paul's physical frame, which is getting older and is in the process of decay and moving towards the grave in a steady process. It must not be restrained purely to that sense, however, as it also carries the sense of all that Paul shows to the world (including his thinking and his physique, see Hughes, *2 Corinthians*, p. 153). It is not to be equated with the "old man" in Rom. 6:6, but it may be the same as the "mortal body" of Rom. 7:14-25.

b. The "inner man" is that which is hidden from the world. This is constantly renewed even as the other decays (the process of 2 Cor. 3:18, "transformed from glory to glory" is carried out in the "inner man"). Harris points out:

NIV appropriately renders the phrases our outer man and our inner [man] by outwardly we—and inwardly we--Paul is not thinking of two distinct entities, the body and the soul, but is considering his total existence from two different viewpoints. His outer man is his whole person in his creaturely mortality (J. Behm, *TDNT*, 2:699), the man of this age; his inner man is his whole person as a new creation (5:17) or a new man (Col. 3:9, 10), the man of the age to come. Pauline anthropology is aspectival not partitive, synthetic not analytic. (Harris, "2 Corinthians", p. 345):

This seems to be the same as the "inner man" of Romans 7:14-25.

17. 2 Corinthians 5:1-10 For we know that if the earthly tent which is our house is torn down, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For indeed in this house we groan, longing to be clothed with our dwelling from heaven; inasmuch as we, having put it on, shall not be found naked. For indeed while we are in this tent, we groan, being burdened, because we do not want to be unclothed, but to be clothed, in order that what is mortal may be swallowed up by life. Now He who prepared us for this very purpose is God, who gave to us the Spirit as a pledge. Therefore, being always of good courage, and knowing that while we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord--for we walk by faith, not by sight--we are of good courage, I say, and prefer rather to be absent from the body and to be at home with the Lord. Therefore also we have as our ambition, whether at home or absent, to be pleasing to Him. For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that each one may be recompensed for his deeds in the body according to what he has done, whether good or bad.

a. Paul expresses his confidence in the coming life after death. There are several important questions on the nature of that life raised here in the passage.

b. Death is described as a "dismantling of our earthly tent" (v. 1; see Harris, "Paul's View of Death in 2 Corinthians 5:1-10" in *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, p. 319). He views death as only a possibility, not a certainty, because Christ might return at any time.
i. The picture of our body as a tent reminds us of our frailty. It is a natural picture for a tent-maker (lit. "leatherworker") to make.

ii. We have this promise: even if our earthly tent is dismantled, we still have a building from God (a permanent, stable, eternal structure; in contrast to the fragile earthly one). That one is "not made from hands" (meaning, "not of this earthly world order", see Heb. 9:11). This building is best seen as our resurrection body, and not our "heavenly home" (see Hughes, 2 Corinthians, p. 165).

c. We groan, longing to be clothed in our dwelling from heaven (v. 2).

i. Romans 8:19-23 noted that the whole creation groans--here this is explicitly applied to Christians.

ii. The word used for "put on" implies putting the new habitation on over the old one (see Hughes, 2 Corinthians, p. 168, n. 31). Plummer translates, "For indeed, in this tent-dwelling we groan, because we long to put over it our true habitation, which comes from heaven" (Plummer, 2 Corinthians, p. 145; see also 1 Cor. 15:33). By the choice of this word, Paul shows that he still hopes to be alive when Christ returns. Those who are will not pass through death, but will "put on" their new resurrection bodies directly over the old mortal ones (Hughes, 2 Corinthians, p. 169), as Enoch (Heb. 11:5) and Elijah (2 Kings 2:11?) did.

d. Paul does not want to be found naked, but clothed in his new body ("life", vv. 3-4).

i. He is possibly directly refuting a Greek philosophical concept that the soul being set free from the body ("nakedness") was ultimate freedom. The "Pythagorean doctrine" was that the body was the prison of the soul, which longed for freedom. In NT times, the Gnostics took up this idea, and Paul may be fighting it here. He shows that to be separated from our body is to be in an incomplete state, awaiting the final completion of putting on our heavenly body.

ii. Paul's thrust is centered on his desire not to have to pass through this incomplete, disembodied state (cf. the souls of the martyrs underneath the altar in heaven, Rev. 6:9-11). He would prefer to be alive when Christ returns and so be able to immediately put his new body on over the old one (see Hughes, 2 Corinthians, p. 171).

e. Our putting on of the new body is done by God, not us (v. 5).

f. Even though Paul would rather not be found naked, to be at home with the Lord (even in naked) is preferred to being present in the body (vv. 6-8; cf. Phil. 1:21-23).

g. Finally, whatever our place or however we may be found, our total ambition should be to be pleasing to God, for we will all face His judgment (vv. 9-10).

18. Galatians 3:26-29: But now that faith has come, we are no longer under a tutor. For you are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus. For all of you who were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free man, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus. And if you belong to Christ, then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise.

a. All Christians are sons of God. We are "clothed" with Christ (a word often associated with leaving behind certain moral habits and taking on new ones; Cole, Galatians, p. 110) and are thus no longer to be distinguished from other believers, who are also clothed with Christ.

b. All cultural, linguistic, religious (all three of these are in "Jew nor Greek"), class ("slave nor free"), and sexual ("male nor female") distinctions are now dropped—in the body of Christ all people are to be given equal consideration. This reverses the dividing of humanity (at Babel), and announces a complete break with the then popular rabbinic concepts.

c. The key to understanding this passage is to recognize that, in the context, Paul is teaching that all men stand either as condemned or as justified before God on an equal footing. In regard to salvation, there is no special privilege of being Jew, free, and male (the "best" of each category). He deals with the equal opportunity of all people to become children of God (see Hurley, Man and Woman, p. 126).
d. Paul is not discussing relations within the body of Christ here—elsewhere he shows clear distinctions in the Church. Here he deals with the basis of membership, and all are on equal footing in that regard.

19. Galatians 5:16-24 But I say, walk by the Spirit, and you will not carry out the desire of the flesh. For the flesh sets its desire against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; for these are in opposition to one another, so that you may not do the things that you please. But if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the Law. Now the deeds of the flesh are evident, which are: immorality, impurity, sensuality, idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousy, outbursts of anger, disputes, dissensions, factions, envyings, drunkenness, carousings, and things like these, of which I forewarn you just as I have forewarned you that those who practice such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God. But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control; against such things there is no law. Now those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires.

a. Paul exhorts us to walk by the Spirit, as it is the only way to avoid carrying out the desires of the flesh. These two oppose each other—is this another way of expressing the battle described in Romans 7?

b. Motyer summarizes the idea of flesh:

   The NT doctrine of the flesh is chiefly but not exclusively Pauline. The 'flesh' is a dynamic principle of sinfulness (Gal. 5:17; Jude 23). The unregenerate are 'sinful flesh' (Rom. 8:3); they are 'after the flesh' (Rom. 8:5). In them the flesh, with its 'passions and lusts' (Gal. 5:24), works 'death' (Rom. 7:5). The flesh, producing 'works' (Gal. 5:19) in those who live 'after the flesh' (Rom. 8:12), is characterized by 'lust' (I John 2:16; Gal. 5:16; I Pet. 4:2; II Pet. 2:10), which enslaves the bodily members and also dominates the mind (Eph. 2:3), so that there is a complete mental affiliation called 'the mind of the flesh' given to fleshly satisfactions (Col. 2:23) and is described as 'sowing unto the flesh,' whence is reaped a harvest of fleshly corruption (Gal. 6:8). Such people are dominated by 'sinful passions' (Rom. 7:5), unable to obey God's law (Rom. 8:3) or to please God (Rom. 8:8). Even their religious practice is astray from God's will because of fleshly thinking (Col. 2:18). They are 'children of wrath' (Eph. 2:23). Very different are those who have experienced God's regeneration. They remain 'in' the flesh, but they are no longer 'after' the flesh (II Cor. 10:3; Gal. 2:20). They need to be watchful. For the fact of the flesh means dullness of spiritual perception (Rom. 6:19), and though the Christian need pay none of the claims of the flesh (Rom. 8:12), yet he must remember that in his flesh there is nothing good (Rom. 7:18), and that if he should repose his trust there again (Phil. 3:3; Gal. 3:3) he would lapse into bondage (Rom. 7:25). He has become the recipient of a new principle of life sufficient to oust the old principle of death (Rom. 8:4, 9, 13; Gal. 5:16-17), 'the life of Christ' in his 'death-bound body' (II Cor. 4:10-11). (Motyer, EDT, "Flesh")

c. Paul says that those who belong to Christ "have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires" (v. 24). This seems to link with the idea of not letting sin reign in our mortal bodies—the crucifixion is not the final eradication of sin, and the Christian must continue to "walk in the power of the Spirit."

20. Ephesians 3:16-17a: . . . that He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with power through His Spirit in the inner man, so that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith . . .

a. This is part of Paul's prayer for the Ephesians (3:14-19). In it he shifts the thrust of the book from man in community to man as an individual (see Marcus Barth, Ephesians, pp. 384-5).

b. He prays that the Ephesians may be "strengthened . . . in the inner man" There are two alternatives:

i. The "inner man" refers to Christ in us, and Paul prays that we might allow more of our lives to be given over to Christ (Barth, Ephesians, pp. 390-4, for arguments for this understanding).

ii. The "inner man" refers to part of us (Rom. 7:22) that delights in God's law (the part that undergoes regeneration when we accept Christ?) (Abbot, Ephesians and Colossians, p. 95).

21. Ephesians 4:20-24: But you did not learn Christ in this way, if indeed you have heard Him and have been taught in Him, just as truth is in Jesus, that, in reference to your former manner of life, you lay aside the old self, which is being corrupted in accordance with the lusts of deceit, and that you be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new self, which in the likeness of God has been created in righteousness and holiness of the truth.
a. "Lay aside your old self" probably refers to the "body of flesh". The verb is used of taking off clothes. It is in the aorist tense, denoting a once-for-all action (Barth, *Ephesians*, p. 505).


c. We are to be renewed (present tense: this is a continuous action) in the spirit of our mind (compare Rom. 12:2).

d. "Put on the new self" (aorist, another one-time act). This new self was created (aorist) 'after God,' (or in His likeness). The total picture of 'taking off' the old self and 'putting on' the new is summarized by Barth:

> The OT and NT show traces of almost all known features of garment and clothing symbolism. The version 'strip off' (4:22), is more in line with biblical precedents than the more tame translation 'put off,' or the cruder 'take off.' 'Stripping off' suggests a violent effort which includes the abandonment, perhaps also the destruction of the old garment. There is nothing to be saved. A connotation of repentance and self-denial is not to be excluded. Correspondingly the garment which is to be 'put on' (vs. 24) is something new, festive, and joyous: Investment with the new robe implies the conveyance of a new status and office; it makes the bearer a member of a given community and involves public responsibility. In 6:10-11 the terms 'to become strong' and 'to put on' are mutually interpretative. (Barth, *Ephesians*, p. 541)

The overall summary, is then given:

> In summary, the clothing metaphors in Eph. 4:22 and 24 and the call for renewal in 4:23 interpret one another mutually. The verbs 'strip off,' 'put on,' and 'become new' convey the good news that now the time, the means, the power, the reality of total change are at hand. If there was an 'Old Man'--and he was real enough-- see how he 'rots' (vs. 22b)! A 'New Man' has appeared and with him come 'true righteousness and piety' (vs. 24). God's creative power attacks, overwhelms, 'renews' man in the center of his being, 'in his mind and spirit' (vs. 23). This power is not a blind force which operates much as a mythical figure, outside and above man. The author speaks in a prophetic tone of that which man is and needs, and what he is being given and is to do: man is neither a lazy spectator to a cosmic drama, nor a mere object or tool of some destiny. With his insight, emotion, will, and decision he participates in the confrontation of the old by the new. He is a partner in the dramatic struggle. He cannot help taking sides and cooperating. (Barth, *Ephesians*, p. 542)

22. Ephesians 5:21-6:9 (Human relationships, compare this with Col. 3:18-24).

In this passage Paul sets forth regulations for relationships between believers in the church. We will look at each major category in turn.

a. We are all to submit to each other out of fear of Christ (v. 21).

i. "Submit" was a military term used of soldiers under their officers. They were required to submit, and Paul gives us the same requirement for our own good. It involves the surrendering of our will under the will of others (Phil. 2:3-4).

ii. This submission comes in the context of being filled (or controlled) by the Holy Spirit. If we are not filled, we will not be able to submit to each other.

iii. This submission comes out of fear of Christ. This does not only refer to reverence, it also refers to fear of the consequences of disobedience.

b. The responsibility of the wife is to be subject to the husband as to the Lord (v. 22).

i. In the Greek the verb is not present; it is supplied from v. 21 ("be subject to one another"). The framework for v. 21 is v. 18; "Be continually filled with the Holy Spirit." Obeying the commands to submit (to each other, v. 21; wife to husband, v. 22) is impossible unless we are filled with the Spirit.

ii. This does not say that every woman is to submit to every man; only the wife to the husband. Her submission to him is part of her submission to Christ.
iii. The central thrust here is for the wife to put herself under the authority of her husband. Obviously, if he commands her to disobey God, she must refuse that particular command. The wife has total freedom and responsibility to discuss her thoughts with her husband when they differ, but must submit to his final authority in family decisions.

iv. Why is the wife to submit specifically to her husband? She is to submit to him because he is the head of their relationship.

1. The husband is head of the wife. Keep in mind the voluntary nature of the submission. In light of that, we see that the place of the husband as head is a place voluntarily given to him by the wife.

   a. He is not to demand it or be a dictator about it.

   b. This is not a command of the law, but is a principle based on our mutual submission.

   c. This does not mean the husband is better than the wife, for she voluntarily submits herself to him. They are both equal, but one, the wife, chooses to submit so that she may be the best wife possible.

2. The husband is head of the wife as Christ is head of the church, His body.

   a. Christ is the head of the church as a basis for the husband's headship of the wife. We see the manner of Christ's headship over the church in Ephesians 1:22-23, "And God placed all things under His feet and appointed Him to be head over everything for the church, which is His body, the fullness of Him who fills everything in every way."

   b. Christ is the head of the church as a model for the husband's headship of the wife. The model Christ gives as head of the church is the model the husband has as head of the wife. Here we see that as the church is the body of Christ, so the wife is the body of her husband. The life of the body is in the head, and both are the same person. There is no separation between them.

3. The husband is head of the wife, as Christ is head of the church, His body, of which He is Savior. This speaks of the type of headship—the role of Christ as head is that He is Savior.

   a. The husband as head is to parallel Christ's headship, therefore he is in some sense savior of his wife. This does not mean that he saves her in the sense of going to heaven, "Savior" here means that he is to protect and care for his wife.

   b. The principle can be seen in the Old Testament where God is the Savior of Israel. It can also be seen in Hosea 3, where God tells Hosea to buy back his wife (who is a harlot sold into slavery) and redeem her. He is thus her savior.

v. The submission of the church to Christ provides the model for the submission of the wife to the husband.

1. But as the church submits to Christ (v. 24).

   a. As in verse 22, the word "submit" is not here. This verse is still governed by verse 21, and the context is still that of mutual submission.

   b. "But" tells us that Paul wants to make clear what he means in saying that the husband is head of the wife and her responsibilities that result from his headship.

   c. How does the church submit to Christ?

      i. We see this throughout Paul's letter to the Ephesians.
(ii) We see it in the nature of the church's mission—we submit to Christ to fulfill the Great Commission.

(2) We see that the relationship of husband and wife is to be a model of the relationship between Christ and the church.

(a) Again, the church does not submit because Christ is a dictator. Rather, it submits because it loves Him.

(b) Even though the submitting is done voluntarily, it is to be done in everything. There is no area of exception in our submitting—it is to be complete. This submission does not mean blind obedience. If ordered to do something against God's word, the wife is to remain submissive but not to obey that specific command.

c. The responsibility of the husband is to love his wife as Christ loved the church (vv. 25-33).

i. The context of this passage is still mutual submission. The husband is to display his part in this submission by loving his wife.

(1) As the head, he has a greater responsibility than his wife.

(2) As the head, he is given a greater command than his wife.

(3) This love is the word used of God's love for us in John 3:16, which says, "For God so loved the world". This love does not wait for the right time. It is not a love that responds to a person, but rather a love that initiates.

   (a) God did not wait for us to love Him first. Instead He was the first to love.

   (b) The husband is not to wait for the wife to initiate, he is to love her first. This love is always seeking a chance to show itself, and not waiting for the other to show first.

(4) This love is dependent on the one loving, not on the one being loved. It does not need a reason for its love. It is not "I love you because . . ." but rather "I love you."

(5) This love continues no matter what. God loved us even while we were sinners! The husband is commanded to love his wife no matter what she does. His love is not as a result of her performance . . . because she loves him . . . because she bears him children . . . because she works the field . . . because she raises the children.

(6) This love does not count the cost of its existence. It will continue no matter how hard it is, and does not even count the wrongs against it.

(7) The purpose of this love is that the husband satisfy every need of his wife. We see how verse 21 affects this. Each partner in the marriage is to put the other first.

   (a) This includes the areas of sexual and friendship needs. Many husbands do not know how to be friends with their wives.

   (b) Some see this command as a basis for having only one wife—we are unable to give ourselves this totally to more than one person.

ii. Christ is our example. We see this in verses 25b-27, which was probably a hymn of the early church that Paul adapted for his teaching in this passage.

(1) Just as Christ loved the church and gave Himself up for her:

   (a) Jesus went to the cross to bring the church into existence—His death was the ultimate act of love. Would you be willing to go to the cross for your wife?
(b) Even though He is God, He did not come to be served, but to serve. Imagine it; God came to earth to serve man! Do you have the same attitude in regard to your wife? Do you find pleasure in serving her? Do you serve her at all??

(2) Why did He give Himself up for the church?

(a) To sanctify her.

(i) Christ chose to die for us so that we could be set apart and enter into a special relationship with God. He did so to take us as His own special possession.

(ii) In this we see the model: Christ's love for the church led Him to give Himself up for her in order to sanctify her, to set her apart from the world and apart to God. The husband's love for the wife should lead him to devote himself to her needs, in order to draw her closer to Christ.

(b) To present her to Himself as a radiant church, without stain or wrinkle or any other blemish.

(i) The picture is of a wedding--Christ gave Himself up to sanctify the church, His bride, and to be able to present her as a faultless bride before God.

(ii) Husbands are to love their wives in order to be able to present them to Christ as radiant believers. They are responsible for her spiritual nurture.

(c) That she be holy and blameless. This completes the picture: Christ gave Himself up for the church to cleanse her, to present her and so that she might be holy and blameless, that she might be set apart from the world and to God. Is this the attitude you have towards your wife? Do you desire to present her holy and blameless before Christ?

iii. What can we conclude from this command to love your wives? (vv. 28-30)

(1) The command is restated by Paul, and he adds an interesting phrase to it: husbands are to love their wives as their own bodies.

(a) The whole picture so far is that the marriage is like the relationship of Christ (head) to the church (body). In that sense, Paul says that the husband (head) is to love his wife (as his own body).

(b) This does not mean as the husband loves his own body, but rather "because the wife is his own body." Certainly she is not his physical body, but neither is the church Christ's physical body. None-the-less, she is still his body in terms of the relationship, just as the church is Christ's body in terms of our relationship with Him.

(c) This goes beyond only the headship idea, however, as we will see when we reach verse 31. The union between husband and wife is a total union that includes both the spiritual and physical aspects.

(d) The tense of the command in the original language indicates that the husbands are to continue loving their wives; this tense does not mean a one-time act, but a continuous one.

(2) Why should the husband love his wife as his own body?

(a) In loving her properly, he is in reality loving himself. This is how God has established His order, whenever we properly love Him or others, we are properly loving ourselves in the process.

(i) The focus is to love others and then you will be loving yourself, not the other way
around. Just as you take proper care of your body by eating, drinking, sleeping, exercising, etc., so you must take proper care of your wife. This proper care includes physical, spiritual, and emotional work on the part of the husband!

(ii) The husband-wife relationship is crucial, and shows that we can most properly love ourselves by correctly loving others. We all need relationships to be complete as people.

(b) In loving her properly, he is showing himself as an example of one who is truly following Christ's example of loving the church.

(i) Christ is the Shepherd of the church--He cares for the flock of believers and watches over them. In the same way, and with the same responsibilities of the shepherd, the husband is to care for and nurture his wife.

(ii) As we said in relation to the wife submitting to the husband, we are unable to do this on our own. We must be filled with the Holy Spirit and in right relationship with God before we can be in right relationship to our spouse!

iv. What is Paul's conclusion concerning marriage? (vv. 32-33)

(1) This is a mystery. It is a secret that was once unknown but that has now been made known in Christ.

(2) The mystery is the union of Christ and the church and how God has established our relationship with Christ as the basis for the marriage relationship.

(3) This mystery brings with it responsibilities, which sum up the point Paul is making.

(a) Here Paul tells the husband his responsibility first--he is to love his wife.

(b) The wife is to fear her husband. Why fear? Her relationship with her husband is the indicator of her relationship with Christ. The sense of fear carries over between the two relationships. This does not mean she is to fear his anger or judgment, but that her attitude towards her husband is to parallel her attitude toward Christ.

v. The basis for the marriage relationship is mutual submission and mutual love because of what Christ has done for us. Wives are to submit, husbands are to love. Wives are the body, husbands the head. As head, the husband is responsible for encouraging and nurturing his wife in her relationship to God. As the body, the wife is to voluntarily submit herself to her husband's authority. Neither is better than the other, both are equal. Yet both have different roles in the marriage relationship.

d. The responsibility of the child is to obey his parents (6:1-3).

i. The child is to do this from two bases (Osborne, "Ephesians", p. 67):

(1) "In the Lord": this obedience can only be fully accomplished in union with Christ.

(2) "This is right": a moral and theological base, as commanded in the OT.

ii. The promise of reward for obedience: that it may be well with you and that you may live long on the earth.

e. The father in relation to his children (6:4, compare Col. 3:21):

i. Do not provoke them to anger (especially by being irresponsible with your authority!).

ii. Bring them up in the discipline and instruction of the Lord. There are two aspects of this (most people lean to one or the other, but both are necessary) (Osborne, "Ephesians", p. 68):
(1) "Bringing up" carries connotations of loving and cherishing (5:29 "no one hates his own flesh, but nourishes it").

(2) Discipline carries the sense of education and training. Proverbs strongly reminds us of the need for punishment in this framework.

g. Finally, masters are to treat the slaves with same respect as the slaves are to show them.

i. God shows no partiality, so they must show respect. In effect, this wiped out any theological basis for slavery.

f. Slaves are to obey masters as they obey Christ (6:5-8).

i. Nowhere does the NT explicitly abolish the institution of slavery. It does, however, remove the distinctions between slave and master in Christ (note the word to the masters in v. 9: "both their Master and yours is in heaven, and there is no partiality with Him").

ii. Both sides were to show respect for each other. Here Paul stresses the obedience of the slave to his master as to the Lord. This obedience is to be accomplished in sincerity of heart so as to please Christ, who will reward him appropriately.

23. Philippians 1:21-26 For to me, to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I am to live on in the flesh, this will mean fruitful labor for me; and I do not know which to choose. But I am hard-pressed from both directions, having the desire to depart and be with Christ, for that is very much better; yet to remain on in the flesh is more necessary for your sake. And convinced of this I know that I shall remain and continue with you all for your progress and joy in the faith, so that your proud confidence in me may abound in Christ Jesus through my coming to you again.

a. Paul wrestles with the advantages and disadvantages of living and dying. They can be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living:</th>
<th>Dying:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is Christ (v. 21)</td>
<td>is gain (v. 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fruitful labour (v. 22)</td>
<td>be with Christ (v. 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessary for Philippian's sake (v. 24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. The need of the Philippians ultimately outweighs Paul's desire to depart, and he thus knows that he will remain and continue to help them.

c. His departure would result in "being with Christ". Thus, after death, he enters into direct fellowship with Christ. No time lapse between Paul's death and Christ's second return is indicated as coming prior to his being with Christ.

24. Philippians 3:20-21: For our citizenship is in heaven, from which also we eagerly wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who will transform the body of our humble state into conformity with the body of His glory, by the exertion of power that He has even to subject all things even to Himself.

a. Verse 21 may also be translated, "we have our home in heaven, and here on earth we are a colony of heaven's citizens" (Dibelius, cited in Martin, Philippians, p. 147). Christians are thus "resident aliens in the cities of the world and their colony has special rules" (Martin, Philippians, p. 147). The word-play is based on Philippi's civic status as a colony of Rome.

b. Christ will change our lowly body ("body of our humiliation," Martin, Philippians, p. 148) into conformity to His glorified one (see also 3:10 "being conformed to His death"). Lightfoot (Philippians, pp. 130-3) relates that this word applies more to external than internal aspects. If so, does this mean that we will
physically resemble Christ? If so, how will this be manifested? We will only know when the time comes!


Again, Paul gives several important anthropological truths in this passage that merit examination.

a. We have died and our life is hidden with Christ in God (v. 3). See the notes on Romans 6 for discussion on "death" in Christ. Here Paul may be combatting the pagan idea that in death a man is hidden in the earth by showing that the believer is already dead and hidden in Christ (Moule, Colossians and Philemon, p. 112).

b. When Christ is revealed, then we will be revealed with Him in glory (v. 4). If we died with Him, then our identification will also carry over to His resurrection, revealing, and glorification.

c. We are to consider the "members of your earthly body as dead" to sin (v. 5, see also Rom. 6:11). Moule (Colossians and Philemon, pp. 114-5) translates this as "kill self-centredness," and relates that it does not mean to abuse yourself or physically deny yourself in order to gain merit, but more to deny self and follow Christ. Ralph Martin (Colossians and Philemon, p. 103) explains Paul's idea of killing our earthly members: "His physical nature, whether anatomical or belonging to his appetites, is not regarded by Paul as sinful, but it can often be the instrument of evil because man's fallen nature so chooses."

d. We laid aside the old self with its evil practices (v. 9b). The commentators are in agreement that the particular context here is baptismal. Martin summarizes Paul's teaching:

He is recalling the Colossians to their baptism and urging them to remember its dynamic effect in releasing them, as a consequence of their now confessed faith union with Christ, from their old way of life. He proceeds to urge them, in this participial expression, to act upon that baptismal confession by being true to it, and to become in actual fact--by their renunciation and acceptance of their new life, given as they were raised with Christ--what they were declared to be in their baptism. (Martin, Colossians and Philemon, p. 106)

e. Our new self is being renewed in the image of the One who created him.

i. Moule relates of the new and old self:

These phrases do not merely mean 'one's old, bad character' and 'the new, Christian character' respectively, as an individual's condition: they carry deeper, wider, and more corporate associations, inasmuch as they are part of the presentation of the Gospel in terms of the two 'Adams', the two creations. Whereas Adam--Mankind--was created in God's likeness (Gen. i. 26), the Second Adam--new Humanity, Christ--was God's means of re-creating mankind and restoring, renewing (or completing?) that likeness. Whereas Adam was an animate being (a living creature), the Second Adam was an animating spirit (a life-giving Creator) (I Cor. xv. 45). Whereas Adam was 'of the dust of the ground' (Gen. ii. 7), the Second Man is from heaven (I Cor. xv. 47). Thus the terms 'the old humanity', 'the new humanity' derive their force not simply from some individual change of character, but from a corporate recreation of humanity; and what enables the individual to become transformed from selfishness to a growing effectiveness as a useful member of a group is precisely his 'death' in regard to one type of humanity--the great, collectively unredeemed Man--and his 'resurrection' into another: we are back, once more, at the language of baptismal initiation and incorporation . . . (Moule, Colossians and Philemon, pp. 119-20)

ii. That image into which we are being renewed is Christ, the "second Adam".

f. In the "new man image" there is no distinction among men (v. 11, see the comments on Galatians 3:26-29). Here note that the Scythian was viewed in Paul's time as not much better than a beast. It refers to people who lived around the Black Sea, from which the lowest class of slaves came (Martin, Colossians and Philemon, p. 108).

26. 1 Thessalonians 4:13-18: But we do not want you to uninformed, brethren, about those who are asleep, that you may not grieve, as do the rest who have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so God will bring with Him those who have fallen asleep in Jesus. For this we say to you by the word of the Lord, that
we who are alive, and remain until the coming of the Lord, shall not precede those who have fallen asleep. For the Lord Himself will descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trumpet of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and thus we shall always be with the Lord. Therefore comfort one another with these words.

a. We will not seek to deal with the timing of this event, only the anthropology.

b. Paul is responding to a concern of the Thessalonians that those who were dead would not receive eternal life when Christ returned. He assures them that they will.

i. The dead are called "those who are sleeping." The word is a present participle, pointing to continuing activity. I. H. Marshall explains the use of this word:

The word 'sleep' was common in the ancient world as a euphemism for death and is found in both the OT and the NT (Gen. 47:30; Dt. 31:16; 1 Ki. 22:40; Jn. 11:11-13; Ac. 7:60; 13:36; Cf. 7:39; 11:30). Since the term was used in cultures which did not believe in any kind of afterlife but simply drew the obvious analogy between the states of sleep and death, the verb in itself does not convey the sense of a state out of which one may be 'awakened', nor does it say anything specific about the present condition of the dead. (Marshall, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, p. 119)

ii. Those who are dead in Christ (literally "through Jesus") will not be lost. Just as Christ died and rose again, so will those who die in Christ be raised again.

c. Christ will return to claim His own.

i. He will descend with a shout, the voice from an archangel, and the trumpet of God (these may be three different sounds or three different ways of saying the same thing; Morris, Thessalonians, p. 143).

ii. The dead will be raised first.

iii. We who are left alive will then be caught up together with the dead to meet Christ in the air. The phrasing suggests survival until Christ's return, implying that there may only be a few men so left (Marshall, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, p. 127).

iv. It should be noted that we will not only meet Christ, but we shall also meet all those we know who have died before He returns.

v. Our final destination is that we shall always be with Christ.

27. 1 Thessalonians 5:23: Now may the God of peace Himself sanctify you entirely; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved complete, without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Many have felt that this teaches that man is tripartite--body, soul, and spirit. Those who seek to show that it only reflects two aspects of man have largely been unsuccessful. It seems best to conclude with Marshall:

Paul here distinguishes three aspects of the Christian's personality, his life in relationship with God through the 'spiritual' part of his nature, his human personality of 'soul', and the human body through which he acts and expresses himself. The distinctions are loose, and do not suggest three 'parts' of man which can be sharply separated, but rather three aspects of his being. Paul lists them together here to emphasise that it is indeed the whole person who is the object of salvation. (Marshall, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, p. 163)

28. 1 Timothy 2:9-15: Likewise I want women to adorn themselves with proper clothing, modestly and discreetly, not with braided hair and gold or pearls or costly garments; but rather by means of good works, as befits women making a claim to godliness. Let a woman quietly receive instruction with entire submissiveness. But I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man, but to remain quiet. For it was Adam who was first created, and the Eve. And it was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being quite deceived, fell into transgression. But women shall be preserved through the bearing of children if they continue in faith and love and sanctity with self-restraint.
a. The context of this passage is that of public worship, but the principles may also apply elsewhere (Guthrie, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 74).

b. Women are instructed to dress modestly, their dress being the outward reflection of the inward attitude (vv. 9-10). Rather than clothe themselves with elaborate hair styles and dress, they were to clothe themselves with good works (see also I Pet. 3:3-4). In regard to today, we need only look to what is excessive and/or immodest in our own culture. The concept is modesty; elaborate braiding, excessive jewelry, etc. are all examples Paul saw in his own day (Hurley, *Man and Woman*, p. 199).

c. Women in regard to teaching or ruling (vv. 11-14).

i. Women are to "quietly receive instruction with entire submissiveness". The word for "quietly" is not the same word for "silence" in 1 Cor. 14. It has the idea of peacefulness and restfulness, not pure silence.

ii. Women are not to "teach or exercise authority over men." This is parallel to the thought in v. 11:

   v. 11: quietly receive instruction entire submissiveness
   v. 12: not to teach not to exercise authority

   The essence of Paul's teaching is on one topic: "women should not be authoritative teachers in the church" (Hurley, *Man and Woman*, p. 201; for discussion and application of the concept "authoritative teaching," see Ibid., pp. 242-52).

iii. Paul justifies his position by two arguments from the Genesis account (see also 1 Cor. 11:7-9 and Eph. 5:31):

   (1) Adam was formed first, then Eve. Adam had the responsibilities of the first-born son in Israel, who inherited a double share and became head of his father's house (Hurley, *Man and Woman*, p. 207, compare with Col. 1:15-18). Note that this law of primogeniture (being first born) applies only within the human race, and not the animals. Thus, the fact that the animals were formed before Adam has no implication that they are to rule over him. Another thing to note in this regard is that Adam named Eve (and the animals). His naming them indicates his position as head before the fall of man.

   (2) Eve was the first to be deceived, not Adam.

      (a) Paul does not say that Adam was not deceived or did not fall; Romans 5:12-21 shows that he lays the blame for man's sin and death squarely on Adam.

      (b) Here we see that Eve was deceived. Adam (by implication) sinned deliberately. This may tie to the creation order. Adam, as first created, was religious head. He was prepared for Satan's lies, while Eve was not. Hurley explains:

         The man, upon whom lay responsibility for leadership in the home and in religious matters, was prepared by God to discern the serpent's lies. The woman was not appointed religious leader and was not prepared to discern them. She was taken in. Christian worship involves re-establishing the creational pattern with men faithfully teaching God's truth and women receptively listening. (Hurley, *Man and Woman*, p. 216)

d. Women will be "saved through the bearing of children" is a much debated passage. The options for understanding include:

i. "Women will come safely through child birth if they are pious", which is irrelevant to the context and not borne out in history.

ii. "Women will be spiritually saved through child birth", which contradicts Paul's whole teaching on salvation.
iii. "Women will be spiritually saved through the birth (of the Messiah)", but this is such an obscure way to say this that it would be very unlikely to be Paul's meaning (see Kelly, Pastoral Epistles, p. 69).

iv. "Women will be kept safe from usurping men's roles by taking part in marital life" (Hurley, Man and Woman, p. 223).

v. "Women's path to salvation is to accept the role God gave her after the fall (Gen. 3:16), if she continues in faith, love, and sanctification" (Kelly, Pastoral Epistles, p. 69).

29. 1 Timothy 5:8: If anyone does not provide for his relatives, and especially for his immediate family, he has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever.

Anthropology in the General Epistles

1. Hebrews 4:12 For the word of God is living and active and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing as far as the division of soul and Spirit, of both joints and marrow, and able to judge the thoughts and intentions of the heart.

a. There are three sets of parallels that the Word of God pierces:

the soul and the spirit
the joints and the marrow
the thoughts and the intentions (of the heart).

b. Are these "separate" parts of man? Probably not; the idea is that the word of God pierces to the deepest part of our being (Hughes, Hebrews, pp. 165-6). Foulkes states in relation to "soul" and "spirit":

In the NT there are places where man seems to be regarded as bipartite, made up of body and spirit; soul and spirit are regarded similarly and may even be parallel terms (e.g., Luke 1:46, 47); there are other places where man seems to be spoken of as tripartite although even such a passage as 1 Thessalonians 5:23 need not indicate that Paul thought rigidly in terms of three parts of man. Hebrews 4:12 apparently indicates that soul and spirit are to be distinguished though there is difficulty in doing so. The distinction is often defined in terms of the higher and lower aspects of man's psychical life; the soul is said to be the manifestation of the immaterial part of man toward the world, and the spirit its manifestation toward God. (Foulkes, "Spirit", ZPBE, 5:504)

2. Hebrews 7:9-10: And, so to speak, through Abraham even Levi, who received tithes, paid tithes, for he was still in the loins of his father when Melchizedek met him.

Erickson notes: Taken at face value, this comment would argue for the humanity not only of an unborn fetus, but even of persons who have not yet been conceived, since Levi was a great-grandson of Abraham. It is more significant, however, to take this passage as evidence for traducianism, the view that the entirety of a person's human nature, both material and immaterial (or body and soul), it received by transmission directly from the parents; that is to say, the soul is not at some later time (e.g., birth) infused into the body, which was physically generated at conception. If Hebrews 7 does indeed support traducianism (and it appears to do so), this passage would in turn argue for the humanity of the fetus, since it would not then be possible to think of the fetus apart from a soul or a spiritual nature. (Erickson, Christian Theology, p. 554)
3. Hebrews 9:27: And inasmuch as it is appointed for men to die once and after this comes judgement. 

Man faces final judgment on the basis of his one life--reincarnation is not a biblical option. Our appointment with death comes as a result of our sin. There seem to be three exceptions to this rule of death: Enoch (Gen. 5:22-24), Elijah (2 Kings 2:11-12), and the last generation of Christians when Christ returns (1 Thess. 4:15-18).

4. Hebrews 12:22-23: But you have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to myriads of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born who are enrolled in heaven, and to God, the Judge of all, and to the spirits of righteous men made perfect.

a. Westcott points out that the complete absence of definite articles in these verses (until the mention of Abel) shows that everything is in its most abstract form (Hebrews, p. 412).

b. But, you came to the heavenly Jerusalem, Mt. Zion, a place of joy. The description of the city includes the three following elements that appear to have bearing on anthropology:

i. Myriads of angels in festival gathering (contra NASB; see the options in Hughes, Hebrews, pp. 552-3). Note the contrast to Sinai--this is a scene of celebration, not of doom or fear.

ii. An assembly of first-born who are enrolled in heaven (Rev. 20:12; "enrolled" is perfect tense: they have been and will not be removed).

iii. Spirits of righteous men made perfect.

(1) This refers either to:

(a) The OT saints or to

(b) All believers who have died.

(2) Note that these are spirits, not complete glorified people. This almost undoubtedly refers to the intermediate state, in which the redeemed await their final glorification (or resurrection).

5. James 2:26: For just as the body without the spirit is dead, to also faith without works is dead.

a. The body cannot survive without the spirit (this says nothing directly as to whether the spirit can survive without the body, but strongly implies that it can).

b. Further, we see the nature of physical death: it is a separation of the spirit from the body.

6. James 3:9: With it [the tongue] we bless our Lord and Father; and with it we curse men, who have been made in the likeness of God.

a. As in Genesis 9:1-7, we see that man (there is no distinction between saved and unsaved here; the statement is universal in scope) is still considered in the likeness (homoiosis) of God.

b. This is the basis for James' prohibition against cursing any man (v. 10).
i. "The connection is that one cannot pretend to bless the person (God) and logically curse the representation of that person (a human)" (Davids, James, p. 146).

ii. The curse is not just swearing at someone--it is expressing a desire that the person being cursed be cut off from God and eternally damned (Moo, James, TNTC, p. 128).

7. 1 Peter 2:13-20: Submission to human institutions

a. Peter commands us to submit ourselves to every human institution for the Lord's sake.

i. The words "human institution" refers to the common social institutions of society (e.g., the state, the household, the social group, the family, clan, a tribal leadership, etc., see Stibbs, First Peter, TNTC, p. 109).

ii. This includes kings (e.g., national officials) and their official representatives (state, province, district, and/or local officials). Bear in mind that Peter's command is not coming out of a comfortable situation--he himself faced persecution under Rome.

iii. They have a specific task before the Lord, which is to control the society through punishment of those who do wrong and praise of those who do right.

iv. Our submission should not come because we are forced, but because we desire to do so for Christ's sake. This can be taken three different ways (Stibbs, First Peter, TNTC, p. 110):

   (1) "Because by faith Christians recognize such institutions as being divinely ordained"

   (2) "Because as Man, the Lord Himself was submissive, therefore Christians ought to follow His example"

   (3) "In order to commend to others Christ as Lord, and not to bring reproach on His name as well as themselves by unruly behaviour."

b. We are to "recognize and actively enjoy the freedom which is [ours] in Christ, without abusing it." (Stibbs, First Peter, TNTC, p. 112). This is similar to Christ's commands in Matt. 5:39-41, which has as the central idea, "When you have been compelled to submit, you should openly show that you are still free to choose by engaging in more of the same service willingly and on your own initiative." (Ibid.)

c. In continuing application, the point of submission is related between slaves and masters--even to unjust and cruel ones. Peter is not talking of slaves only (the word also includes free men who were servants in a household), but the obedience of all within the household as an institution (Stibbs, First Peter, TNTC, p. 114).

8. 1 Peter 3:1-7: Relations within the household

a. Wives are to submit to husbands (1-6).

i. In the same way that Christ was submissive to authority, wives should be submissive to
their husbands (1-2).

(1) The use of "in the same way" shows that the passage does not make a comment on any inherent superiority or inferiority (Selwyn, 1 Peter, p. 183--Christ was certainly not inferior to the human authorities that He submitted to), it only gives a relational chain-of-command within the family structure. The submission of the wife is the giving of final responsibility for family decisions to the husband. For other comments on this issue, see Howe, Women & Church Leadership, pp. 54-8; Evans, Women in the Bible, pp. 116-21; Hurley, Man and Woman, pp. 152-7.

(2) This applies even if the husband is disobedient. The Christian wife cannot claim that her husband has not fulfilled his obligations and is therefore disqualified from authority because he does not know Christ.

(3) This is so that they may be won to Christ by their wives' behaviour. Especially for non-Christian husbands, a submissive attitude (displayed by "chaste and respectful behaviour") is a form of evangelism. The wife preaches to her husband far more effectively with her attitude than she does with her words! (see Stibbs, First Peter, TNTC, p. 124)

ii. Further, do not let your adornment be only external--let it be internal (3-4).

(1) External adornment involves hair, jewelry, and clothing--all of which are corruptable.

(2) Internal adornment involves "the hidden person of the heart":

(a) It is imperishable (in contrast to external adornment).

(b) It includes a gentle and quiet spirit.

(c) It is precious in God's sight (just as the blood of Christ was precious in God's sight; see 1:18-19)

iii. Women in the past (and Sarah in particular) followed this pattern of internal adornment and submission to their husbands (5-6).

(1) They hoped in God.

(2) They adorned themselves in the "hidden person" by being submissive to their husbands.

(3) Sarah is cited as an example of this type of life.

(a) In the Genesis account she may be perceived as not being the best possible example (see Gen. 18:1-15, which is the foundation for Isa. 51:2, the passage the Peter apparently has in mind here; Selwyn, 1 Peter, p. 185).

(b) Women who are submissive to their husbands are daughters of Sarah (an
(4) The wife should do this and "not give way to fear" (NIV). What does this mean?

(a) "Their submissive trust in the living God will keep them from undue apprehension" (Blum, 1 Peter, EBC, p. 237)?

(b) The wife who submits will not have to fear her husband (see Raymer, 1 Peter, BKC, p. 849)?

(c) "Let the Christian wives do good in serenity of spirit, and leave all else calmly in God's hands" (Selwyn, 1 Peter, p. 186)?

b. Husbands are to live with wives in an understanding way (7).

i. Live with her (a term often used of marital intercourse; Stibbs, First Peter, TNTC, p. 127; but not necessarily limited to the sexual aspect, Selwyn, 1 Peter, p. 186) in an understanding way (lit. "in knowledge"). Be considerate of all of the needs of your wife, possibly with an emphasis on the sexual area.

ii. Recognise that she is a physically "weaker vessel", as women are generally weaker than men in regard to physical (muscular) strength. This carries implications in regard to the husband physically dominating the wife (in the form of abuse?).

iii. Though she is physically weaker, grant her honour as a spiritual equal, a fellow-heir with you, so that your prayers may not be hindered (lit. "cut into").

9. 1 Peter 4:6: For the gospel has for this purpose been preached even to those who are dead, that though they are judged in the flesh as men, they may live in the spirit according to the will of God.

a. The gospel has been preached even to those who are dead.

b. What does this mean (for extended discussion, see Selwyn, 1 Peter, pp. 337-9)? There appear to be three options:

i. Those who are dead hear the gospel after their death, OR

ii. Those who are spiritually dead have the gospel preached to them, OR

iii. Those who are now dead had the gospel preached (the verb is in the past tense) to them while they were alive. This is the best understanding (see Stibbs First Peter, TNTC, p. 151).

10. Revelation 6:9-11: And when He broke the fifth seal, I saw underneath the altar the souls of those who had been slain because of the word of God, and because of the testimony which they had maintained; and they cried out with a loud voice, saying, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, wilt Thou refrain from judging and avenging our blood on those who dwell on the earth?" And there was given to each of them a white robe; and they were told that they should rest for a little while longer, until the number of their fellow servants and their brethren who were to be killed even as they had been, should be
completed also.

a. The souls of the martyrs are under the altar. There is no reason to assume that this refers to "whole" people, especially in light of the clothing given to them. Is this what Paul meant when he wrote about being "naked" before the Lord (1 Cor. 5:1-10)?

b. What are the white robes? Two alternatives have been proposed:

i. Resurrection bodies (Charles, Revelation, p. 176; Caird, Revelation, p. 86).

ii. Symbols of the purity of those who receive them (Mounce, Revelation, p. 160) or of the victory given to them by God (Morris, Revelation, p. 109).

11. Revelation 20:4-6: And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given to them. And I saw the souls of those who had been beheaded because of the testimony of Jesus and because of the word of God, and those who had not worshiped the beast or his image, and had not received the mark upon their forehead and upon their hand; and they came to life and reigned with Christ for a thousand years. The rest of the dead did not come to life until the thousand years were completed. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is the one who has a part in the first resurrection; over these the second death has no power, but they will be priests of God and of Christ and will reign with Him for a thousand years.

a. John sees thrones, upon which "they" sat.

i. Since "they" has no obvious antecedent, who are "they"?

(1) The martyrs (described later in the verse)? Probably best, since in v. 6 they are said to reign with Christ.

(2) The apostles (Matt. 19:28)?

(3) The saints (1 Cor. 6:2-3)?

(4) All who remain faithful in the final trial (Rev. 3:21)?

(5) A heavenly court that will assist in judgment (Dan. 7:26)?

(6) The twenty-four elders of 5:10?

(7) Any combination of the above?

ii. Does this take place on earth (1-3 is definitely on earth, John saw an angel "coming down from heaven") or in heaven (thrones are usually in heaven in Revelation)? Premillennialists prefer earth, amillennialists prefer heaven. The actual text demands neither.

iii. "They" are given judgment. This is probably not salvation judgment. It may mean that judgment is given in their favour, and they receive the kingdom of God (see Dan. 7:22, where it says that judgement is given to the saints).
b. He also sees the souls of those martyred for their faith.

i. Souls means that he sees them in an intermediate state.

ii. Is there one group (martyrs) or two (martyrs plus those who did not worship the beast)? The former seems better, as the image was given power so that every one who refused to worship the image of the beast to be killed (13:15). Are these the martyrs under the altar in 6:9-11? Must we restrict it to those who were literally beheaded, or are all martyrs, irrespective of the method of execution, to be included?

iii. This group "came to life again". The core of the entire millenial problem is seen in the various meanings assigned to this phrase.

(1) Amillenial interpreters see this as referring to the new birth in Christ, and the "second" resurrection as the actual physical one.

(a) Those amillenialists who see the first resurrection as literal say it refers to Christ's resurrection.

(b) Morris thinks that this refers to any martyrs, who live on in heaven with Christ, and notes that no second resurrection is actually named.

(2) Premillenial interpreters see this as referring to an actual resurrection, parallel to that of the "rest of the dead" mentioned in v. 5. There are thus two physical resurrections. One begins the millenium, and the second comes at the end of the millenium, just before the final white throne judgment. This seems far more reasonable to me. The language gives no real indication that one resurrection (v. 4) is spiritual and the other is physical or that one refers to Christ and the other to men. Alford has often been quoted in this regard, "If, in a passage where two resurrections are mentioned . . . the first resurrection may be understood to mean spiritual rising with Christ, while the second means literal rising from the grave;--then there is an end of all significance in language, and Scripture is wiped out as a definite testimony to anything" (cited in Mounce, Revelation, p. 356).

c. They reign with Christ for 1,000 years

i. The millenium may then serve the purpose of being a reward to those who are martyred for their faith during the time of the beast. If so, what happens to the rest of the dead? Are they in the intermediate state, or a state of soul sleep?

ii. Or the millenium may simply be an undeniable historical proof of God's victory over evil (if we take the martyrs of the first resurrection as a symbolic representation of the entire church; 5:9 indicates that the whole church will reign with God on earth).

iii. Walvood says that all the dead in Christ are raised at the rapture and this is the first phase of the first resurrection. The resurrection of the tribulation martyrs forms the second phase of the first resurrection. Thus, all believers rule with Christ during the millenium and the first resurrection includes all believers.
iv. They are blessed and holy, for three reasons:

(a) The second death has no power over them (20:14 and 21:8 show the second death as being cast into the lake of fire). Thus the first death is universal (except for those raptured), the second is particular. On the other hand, the first resurrection is particular, and the second is universal.

(b) They will be priests of God and Christ--the promise made to Israel in Ex. 19:6.

(c) They will reign with Christ for 1,000 years.

d. We point out here that in vv. 7-10 it is reported that Satan himself is cast into the lake of fire, where the beast and the false prophet "also are," and there is tormented eternally.

12. Revelation 20:11-15: The Great White Throne judgment

a. John now sees the Great White Throne and God (Father, Son, or both in One?) sits upon it. Earth and heaven flee before Him. Is this an expression of His majesty or the dissolution of the universe as we know it (see Isa. 51:6, Matt. 24:35, and 2 Pet. 3:10-12)? The latter is better.

b. All the dead, great and small, stand before the throne.

i. The sea, death, and Hades give up their dead for judgment.

(1) If we view the whole church as reigning with Christ during the millenium, then this is only unbelievers who are judged. The first resurrection is then only for believers and the second only for unbelievers. If that is the case, then what of the righteous ones who die during the millenium? Scripture is silent, and so am I!

(2) If only the martyrs reign, then this is the rest of mankind (believers and unbelievers).

ii. The books were opened (they contain the deeds of men).

iii. Another book was opened, the book of life.

iv. Then are judged according to their deeds. Verse 15 states the condition for entry to heaven: their names must be written in the book of life. What, then, is the judgment of deeds?

(1) For unbelievers, it proves that they do not have a place in heaven.

(2) If believers face this, then it may be the judgment of rewards for their deeds (1 Cor. 3:10-15). Salvation is not an issue for believers in the judgment of deeds; that is determined by their entry in the book of life.

c. Death and Hades are thrown into the lake of fire.

i. Is Hades "Hell" or the "intermediate state of the wicked"?
ii. Are these two literal beings, or is this some sort of symbolic personification?

d. Those whose names are not found in the book of life are cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death.


a. John sees the new heaven and new earth, for the old have passed away (v. 1, see 2 Pet. 3:10-13). The sea no longer exists. Is this symbolic (because of its association with evil in early times) or literal?

b. John sees a new Jerusalem coming down from heaven (v. 2).

i. Is this to be seen as an actual city (Walvoord, p. 313), or as a symbol of the church in its perfected state (Mounce, Revelation, pp. 370)? Whichever it is, it does show man in an ideal community.

ii. It is adorned as a bride for her husband (the adornment is detailed in vv. 11-21). Note the contrast between Babylon the Harlot and Jerusalem the Bride.

c. A voice calls out of heaven declaring that God will now dwell among men (v. 3).

i. The fulfillment of one of the most extensive themes of the OT here come to pass. This will be a permanent dwelling, in contrast to the temple and Christ's earthly ministry (the three fold emphasis of God "among them" highlights this).

ii. The benefits of God dwelling among us (all of these belonged to the first order, which will have passed away):

   (1) He will wipe away every tear.

   (2) There shall be no more death (Isa. 25:8).

   (3) There shall be no more mourning, crying, or pain.

d. God declares that He is making all things new (v. 5), and commands John to write His words.

e. God declares that it is done (lit. "they have come to pass", vv. 6-8).

i. He is the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end (see 1:8 and 22:13).

ii. He will give free water from the spring of life to anyone who thirsts. The water is God Himself (Jer. 2:13).

iii. The overcomer is promised to inherit these things, and God will be his God, and he will be God's son (see 2:7, 11, 17, 26; 3:5, 12, and 21 for other promises to the overcomer).

iv. The wicked, on the other hand, have only the second death in the lake of fire to anticipate. In this we see that Revelation does not give visions without consequences—this is a call
to repent to John's audience.
African Anthropological Issues
A. Scott Moreau, D. Miss.

1. In examining African traditional understandings of man, we must note man's central position:
   a. "African ontology is basically anthropocentric: man is at the very centre of existence, and African peoples see everything else in its relation to this central position of man. God is the explanation of man's origin and sustenance: it is as if God exists for the sake of man." (Mbiti, African Religions and Philosophy, p. 92)
   b. "African Traditional Religion centres on man. The whole emphasis is upon man gaining power needed to live a good life. Life revolves around man and his interests and needs." (Gehman, African Traditional Religion, p. 50)
   c. "Scholars are agreed that humans are the focus of African traditional religion" (Young, Black and African Theologies, p. 65).

2. Two selected early proposals for an African philosophy/anthropology:
   a. Placide Tempels: a Franciscan missionary among the Baluba of Zaire from 1933 on. Mbiti says that he was the one who opened the way for a sympathetic study of African religions and philosophy (Mbiti, African Religions and Philosophy, p. 10). He is known for Bantu Philosophy, originally written in Dutch, first published in French (1945), then translated into English (1953).
      i. A "Bantu philosophy" exists
         (1) He notes that "all human behaviour depends upon a system of principles."
            (a) Based on the observation that people often revert to traditional thoughts and practices when confronted with big problems.
            (b) The faith in a Supreme Being lies at the root of all religious conceptions currently seen in Africa (animism, dynamism, fetishism, and magic).
            (c) He threw out the idea of other anthropologists (of his time) that primitive peoples have no logical system of approaching life (in essence, no true "world view")
      ii. He postulates that if you want to study "primitive" peoples, then you must understand their system of principles. For the Bantu, he felt this was focused in their ontology, or study of being. He relates (Bantu Philosophy, p. 24):
         If one has not penetrated into the depths of the personality as such, if one does not know on what basis their acts come about, it is not possible to understand the Bantu. One is entering into no spiritual contact with them. One cannot make oneself intelligible to them, especially in dealing with the great spiritual realities. On the contrary, one runs the risk, while believing that one is "civilizing" the individual, of in fact corrupting him, working to increase the numbers of the deracinated and to become the architect of revolts. We find ourselves at a loss when confronted by native law and customs. It is impossible to distinguish what is commendable from what is pernicious for lack of any criterion to
enable us to keep not only some good things in native custom, but all that is good therein, cutting out all that is evil. Indeed, there is a reason for safeguarding, for protecting with every care, for purifying and refining everything that is worthy of respect in native custom, in order to make a link, or, if the metaphor be preferred, a bridgehead, by means of which natives can attain without hinderance all that we have to offer them in respect of stable, deep, true civilization. Only if we set out from the true, the good and the stable in native custom shall we be able to lead our Africans in the direction of a true Bantu civilization.

(1) He related that so long as whites did not understand this system of thought, the gap between them and Africans would never be closed.

(2) His primary aim was not to critique or discredit or promote Bantu thought, but rather to understand it.

iii. Bantu ontology

(1) Centered on a single value: "force."

(2) Being tied to "force," rather than "existence." (A dynamic, rather than a static, ontology.)

(3) The greater the "force," the greater the power of the being.

(4) The Laws of Vital Causality (pp. 67-8)

(a) Man (living or deceased) can directly reinforce or diminish the being of another.

(b) The vital human force can directly influence inferior force-beings (animal, vegetable, or mineral) in their being itself.

(c) A rational being (spirit, manes, or living) can act indirectly upon another rational being by communicating his vital influence to an inferior force (animal, vegetable, or mineral) through the intermediary of which it influences the rational being.

iv. Based on this core, what is the resulting system?

(1) Bantu wisdom is based on being able to discern the nature of beings (forces) rather than the nature of "facts." People and relational knowledge are thus more important than "scientific" knowledge.

(2) Bantu psychology has as its base vital force, increase of force, and vital influence (as opposed to the id, ego, etc. of the West).

(3) Bantu ethics are based on ontological considerations.

(a) Good is seen in terms of the rights of a person to maintain and strengthen his "being" within the overall balance of forces in the universe.
(b) Evil, the opposite, is anything that violates such strengthening.

(4) Bantu punishment is based on restitution of "vital force" lost due to the offender's actions, and is measured in lex talionis ("eye for an eye") fashion. That, however, is measured in terms of vital force, not physical equality.

v. Resulting implications for missionaries who want to "civilize" the Bantu: they are already civilized. We must learn to work within the Bantu philosophy, rather than impose a Western system on them.

vi. A preliminary critique

(1) Tempels "is a sign caught at the crossroads of several currents:

(a) Evolutionary assumptions of the late nineteenth century
(b) Levy-Bruhl's theses on prelogism
(c) The European self-declared mission to civilize Africans through colonialization, and
(d) Christian evangelization (Mudimbe, The Invention, p. 136)

(2) On the positive side, he among the first Westerners to propose in writing a genuine philosophy and through process for Africans.

(3) He challenged the view of missionaries of his day by postulating a world view for the African. One (Jean-Felix de Hemptinne) was so incensed by its ideas that he insisted that the book be banned as heretical and that Tempels be expelled from Zaire (Mudimbe, The Invention, p. 137)!

(4) The problem of resolving a total world view within a single framework, and the concept that all people everywhere do have a fully logical and coherent "system" by which they operate. Anthropologists now realize that all human world views have inherently contradictory assumptions which give rise to tensions within the world view itself.

(5) The fact that he has to express the "Bantu" system in Western categories (even though he was able to use semi-indigenous terms) shows the difficulty of analyzing a culture so that an outsider can understand it. Further, Tshiamalenga notes three philosophical weaknesses (Tshiamalenga, "La Philosophie dans la situation actuelle de l' Afrique", p. 179; summarized by Mudimbe, The Invention, p. 140):

(a) One cannot conclude that because the Luba pay a great deal of attention to the reality of force, that force is being;

(b) An ontology cannot be constituted on the basis of its external signs; this is further complicated by the equating of the Bantu notion of force with the Western notion;

(c) The equivalence established between force and being is only an artificial
construct since it could not be accomplished without the Western conceptual foundation used by Tempels.

(6) Without real justification, he hopes to expand from one source (the BaLuba) to cover a wider territory (all Bantu; see the criticism of p'Bitek, *Africa's Cultural Revolution*, p. 59; noted in Mudimbe, *The Invention*, p. 140).

b. Janheinz Jahn: A German missionary who collected much of his data through wide reading. His book: *Muntu An Outline of Neo-African Culture*, was written in 1958 in German, and translated into English in 1961. It attempts to present an exposition on what he calls the neo-African culture, which he says is the result of integrating "modern" life with only what seems valuable in the past into a new overall culture.

i. The book intends to convey (p. 19): namely, that cultural differences rest on the difference ordering and emphasis of something basically similar and not on biological differences between men. Neo-African culture clearly demonstrates that culture is not biologically inherited, that one can voluntarily abandon or acquire a culture, that customs and capabilities, thoughts and judgements are not innate. The static culture of a society of bees is inherited, but human culture, in contrast, is preserved by being handed on from one generation to another. Neo-African culture reveals itself to us as a spiritual phenomenon. If therefore the reader discovers in the course of the exposition that the mystery of African culture, the magical practices of medicine men, the demoniac possession of the Haitian Voodoo cult are not so mysterious after all, and can be interpreted according to a conception of the world intelligible to all men.

ii. His ideas [note that chapters 2 (Voodoo) and 3 (Rhomba) are illustrative examples which set the stage for his concepts]:

In the chapter "Ntu," Jahn seeks to present "the common denominator that allows us to interpret the whole of African culture, both old and new." (p. 27) It is based on the works of Temples and four others who expressed the same concepts in their explanation of African philosophy.

(1) There are four primary categories of African philosophy.

(a) The categories are:

(i) *Muntu*: "human being", living and dead, plus the spirits. A force endowed with intelligence, an entity which is a force which has control over Nommo, the "word" (the driving power that gives life and efficacy to all things).

(ii) *Kintu*: "thing", forces which cannot act for themselves, can only become active on the command of a Muntu. This includes plants, animals, minerals, tools, objects of customary usage.

(iii) *Hantu*: "place and time", which are not separated in Africa as in the West.
(iv) *Kuntu*: "modality", laughter, beauty, etc., which are seen to have independent existence.

(b) He says: "Muntu, Kintu, Hantu, and Kuntu are the four categories of African philosophy. All being, all essence, in whatever form it is conceived, can be subsumed under one of these categories. Nothing can be conceived outside them." (p. 100)

(2) Underlying all categories is the concept of "NTU". Jahn attempts to explain this (p. 100) as follows:

NTU is the universal force as such, which, however, never occurs apart from its manifestations: Muntu, Kintu, Hantu and Kuntu. NTU is Being itself, the cosmic universal force, which only modern, rationalizing thought can abstract from its manifestations. NTU is that force in which Being and beings coalesce. NTU is--so we may say by way of suggestion--that Something which Breton probably had in mind when he wrote: 'Everything leads us to believe that there exists a central point of thought at which living and dead, real and imaginary, past and future, communicable and incommunicable, high and low, are no longer conceived of as contradictory.'

NTU is that 'point from which creation flows' that Klee was seeking: 'I am seeking a far off point from which creation flows, where I suspect there is a formula for man, beast, plant, earth, fire, water, air and all circling forces at once.' But in NTU Breton's contradictions have never existed, nor is it something 'far away'. If we said that NTU was a force manifesting itself in man, beast, thing, place, time, beauty, ugliness, laughter, tears, and so on, this statement would be false, for it would imply that NTU was something independent beyond all these things. NTU is what Muntu, Kintu, Hantu and Kuntu all equally are. Force and matter are not being united in this conception; on the contrary, they have never been apart.

NTU expresses, not the effect of these forces, but their being. But the forces act continually, and are constantly effective. Only if one could call a halt to the whole universe, if life suddenly stood still, would NTU be revealed. The driving power, however, that gives life and efficacy to all things is Nommo, the 'word', of which for the moment we can only say that it is word and water and seed and blood in one.

Note that NTU is not God, for God is the great Muntu (p. 105). NTU has no independent existence, but is part of all that does exist. It is thus not a fit object to worship (p. 114).

(3) Other important terms in Jahn's book are:

(a) *Buzima*, means the union of a "shadow" (or "force") with a body. The union of body and shadow is life, the separation is death. It is used only for "biological" life.

(b) *Magara*, means the union of a spiritual force (called Nommo-force) with a body resulting in a "spiritual" (or human) life. Magara is what Temples calls the "vital force." Note: All animals have buzima, but only humans have magara.
in addition to buzima. When a man dies, only the Nommo-force is left, and he is called muzimu, a human being without existence. (Muzima is a living person, and the second "u" is the negative in muzimu). Thus, the dead are alive, but they do not have buzima.

(c) *Ubwenge*, "intelligence." It is part of magara, and only man possesses it. Nothing of the Kintu category has it, and so the Kintu class can be controlled by the Muntu in the form of magic. This is not "book" intelligence, but wisdom in life.

(4) The dead fit within the category of Muntu. Jahn explains his understanding of the African view of the dead (p. 109):

The intelligent living creature is in their eyes indeed a composite, but during his lifetime an undivided entity. Only when the principle of intelligence is separated from the body, does it become muzimu, an intelligent being without life. And if it has needs, it can only turn to the living.

Strictly speaking, therefore, it is false to say that the dead 'live'. They do not 'live', but exist as spiritual forces. As spiritual force, the dead man, the ancestor, is in communication with his descendants. He can, as Tempels expresses it, 'let his "life force" work on his descendants'. Only when he has no further living descendants is he 'entirely dead'.

(a) Their role is to influence their descendants in such a way as to increase their life force (p. 110). Borrowing from Tempels concepts, he relates that there is a system between the dead and the living, which is governed by growth of the magara (p. 111).

The system of 'life-strengthening' and 'life-weakening' is founded on it also; the system in which one force can inwardly strengthen or weaken another and in which individual growth can take place only in and with the growth of human nature.

What is 'growing' here is magara, that 'life force' which is expressed in the living being in contentment and happiness, and which increases in him thanks to the influence of his dead forebears. But this force, the wisdom that gives happiness, intelligence, the principle which distinguishes man from all other living things, exists in 'pure' form only in the dead: it is a force from their kingdom. In this sense the wise man is 'nearer to the dead' and has already a 'share in their nature'. On the other hand, man is able to strengthen his ancestors, to let magara flow upon them through honor, prayer and sacrifice.

(b) Further on, he relates (p. 112):

The individual dead are therefore of different 'strengths', according as they have many or few living descendants who honor them and sacrifice to them. Thus an ancestor, who is an aggregate of magara, can transfer to many new-born individuals the small share of magara that they need to begin their lives. This 'quantity' is not great, and it must be constantly 'strengthened' in the course of the individual's development, and even as an adult he will always beg
the ancestors to 'strengthen' him further. This 'strength' is not to be understood as physical; it is not strength of the buzima principle, otherwise the 'old men', aged and often physically infirm, could not occupy the first place in the hierarchy of the living. But they, the 'wise men', are the most powerful forces.

The magara principle, which makes the living and the dead, bazima and bazimu, close kin, who can mutually 'strengthen' one another, seems to us characteristic of African culture.

(5) All religions and ethics are built upon proper use of magara within the structure of the four classes of NTU. He relates (pp. 116-117):

ethics is also derived from the philosophical system. The bazimu, the departed, are the guardians of morals. In the life of the community each person has his place and each has his right to magara, to well-being and happiness. If the magara of one person is weakened by the fault or neglect of another, then the latter must reinstate the former's well-being . . .

In contrast to the European sense of justice, which measures liability by material damage, it is according to African philosophy the loss in force, in joy of life, that is evaluated, independently of material considerations.

(6) The basic African understanding of the world, then, is built upon all of this.

(a) Jahn says (p. 123):

That active, habitual wisdom or intelligence which constitutes true understanding is in fact the knowledge of the nature and relationships of the world, as we have presented them in the preceding chapter. And this includes the knowledge of the manner in which muntu, the being with human intelligence, makes use of the kintu or 'things' and activates the forces asleep in them. The European-Christian conception ascribes the growth of the corn, the flow of milk from the cows, the malleability of gold to the agency of God. "Give us this day our daily bread,' the Christian prays, and he thanks God for all the earthly goods that he obtains. On the other hand, European materialism ascribes all events and effects in nature to the laws of nature, without, however, being able to explain why the corn grows, or what life really is.

(b) How does man interact with the world? Through use of Nommo in the shape of the word. Jahn describes (p. 125) that even people need to be "activated":

For the new-born child becomes a muntu only when the father or the 'sorcerer' gives him a name and pronounces it. Before this the little body is a kintu, a thing; if it dies, it is not even mourned. Only the giving of a name adds the magara principle to the buzima principle. A creature which is sharply distinguished from the animal and has its place in the community of men is produced, not by the act of birth, but by the word-seed: it is designated. To this giving of a name, the designation of the human being, corresponds the designation of images, and even the designation of the gods . . .
Note: All control is exercised through the use of "word" magic; how does this relate to John 1?

iii. Critique of Jahn

(1) Positively, he was one of the first to recognize the bias in the early ethnographic accounts of Africa and that the "history" of Africa is somewhat arbitrary and dependent on the view of the observer:

The Africa presented by the ethnologist is a legend in which we used to believe. The African tradition as it appears in the light of neo-African culture may also be a legend--but it is the legend in which African intelligence believes. And it is their perfect right to declare authentic, correct and true those components of their past which they believe to be so. (Jahn, Muntu, p. 17; see the discussion of this statement in Mudimbe, The Invention, pp. 192-4)

(2) As with Tempels, we question whether or not it is possible to subsume the worldviews of all Africans to a single set of philosophical foundations.

(3) His explanation makes logical sense, but does there have to be a logical explanation for a worldview? His whole methodology of categorization and compartmentalization seems to ignore others who say that the African view is wholistic.


4. Man's original state: Generally it is thought the man was created in a happy state of bliss in a setting of paradise (Ibid., p. 95), which was marred in some way by man's falling short (see Dickson, Theology in Africa, p. 52).

5. Man in community (see, in addition to sources noted below, Shorter, African Christian Theology, pp. 122-8; Dickson, Theology in Africa, pp. 63-4; Oduyoye, "The Value", pp. 110-1).

a. Over the years, many have proposed variations on an African statement of ontology that contrasts to Descartes (Western) statement *cogito, ergo sum* (I think, therefore I am). Some may be noted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proponent</th>
<th>Ontological Summary Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Pobee</td>
<td>I have blood relations, therefore I am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mbiti</td>
<td>I am, because we are; and since we are, therefore I am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swailem Sidhom</td>
<td>Existence-in-relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John V. Taylor</td>
<td>I am because I participate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. African societies have almost universally defined the person in terms of the community. As
Pobee notes, the basic African "ontology and epistemology, despite social change, is still *cognatus sum, ergo sum*, 'I have blood relations, therefore I am' [see chart above]. A man or a woman is affirmed as human, only to the extent he/she is affirmed in and by a community, especially his/her kinship-group." (Pobee, "Life and Peace", p. 18). He mentions five consequences of this outlook:

i. Morality is not just ascent to the spirit-realm but also fulfillment of one's obligations to the society.

ii. There is stress on reciprocity and communalism.

iii. A sense of mutuality, i.e., the sense that there is a kind of inescapable involvement of the one with the all, the sense that one's deeds affect not only the individual but also the rest of the society.

iv. Egocentricity and individualism are deprecated.

v. Reciprocity implies the idea of individual responsibility.

c. "In traditional life, the individual does not and cannot exist alone except corporately. He owes his existence to other people, including those of past generations and contemporaries. He is simply part of the whole. The community must therefore make, create or produce the individual; for the individual depends on the corporate group." (Mbiti, *African Religions and Philosophy*, p. 108)

Note, for example, one socialization factor which both demonstrates the communal linking and perpetuates it: infants in Africa are hardly ever separated from their parents (day or night). The American practice of giving a child his or her own room to sleep in shortly after birth is viewed as "cold" by the African (see also the discussion in Taylor, *The Primal Vision*, pp. 87-8).

d. This whole area is too vast to be explored here. For a thorough introduction, see M. Angulu Onwuejeogwu, *The Social Anthropology of Africa: An Introduction*.

6. The nature of man

a. According to Pobee, man is seen as a whole:

   Being is as physical as it is spiritual. The secular and the sacred flow readily into each other and the borders of the sacred are much broader than in a modern secular society. . . . Consequently, being and existence are seen very comprehensively--they are as physical as they are spiritual, as external as internal. They have a wholistic view of life." (Pobee, "Life and Peace", p. 17; see also Oduyoye, "The Value", pp. 111-2).

b. A number of African peoples see man as dichotomous (soul and body; e.g., the Akamba--Gehman, *African Traditional Religion*, p. 56). For more extended discussion on the "body" and "soul" among various West African peoples, see Parrinder, *West African Psychology*, pp. 17-68 and *West African Religion*, pp. 113-4. It is this dichotomized concept of body/soul which helps to "provide the basis for the transformation of human beings into ancestors and supply a link between the living and the dead" (Onwuejeogwu, *Social Anthropology*, p. 241).
c. Imasogie explains the Yoruba idea of man's soul itself as tripartite, consisting of (Guidelines, pp. 56-7; see also Taylor, Primal Vision, pp. 48-58; Onwuejeogwu, Social Anthropology, p. 241; and the extended discussion in Parrinder, West African Psychology, pp. 29-68):

i. Life force: given to man by God at conception, the part of the soul that animates man the physical body.

ii. Personality (or "life-soul"): The aspect of the soul that does not die. Before coming ot birth, each person, in the form of his personality-soul, chooses a destiny which he desires to actualize on earth. . . . Man is responsible to God my means of this aspect of his soul. This soul is also responsible for his character, and it is the part of him that does not perish with the body when the 'life-force' is destroyed.

iii. Alter ego (or "guardian genius" or "transcendent soul"): in a sense, the duplication of the 'personality-soul' in heaven during the earthly pilgrimage of the individual. Its main duty is to take charge of man's destiny and to ensure that it is actualized. Although the 'alter-ego' being purely spiritual, lives in heaven, yet it is immanent on earth to guide the individual.

7. Stages in the life of man: most Africans held that man progressed through stages in development throughout life (see, for example, Sidhom, "Theological Estimate", pp. 106-11). Mbti maintains:

Physical birth is not enough: the child must go through rites of incorporation so that it becomes fully integrated into the entire society. These rites continue throughout the physical life of the person, during which the individual passes from one stage of corporate existence to another. The final state is reached when he dies and even then he is ritually incorporated into the wider family of both the dead and the living. (Mbti, African Religions and Philosophy, p. 108; see also Taylor, The Primal Vision, p. 92)

a. Among the Akamba, for example, several stages may be noted (diagram from Dave Ness):
We may consider the following as general categories in life:

b. The unborn (see Mbiti, *African Religions and Philosophy*, p. 107)


d. Childhood (Mbiti, *African Religions and Philosophy*, pp. 118-20)


The following chart depicts differences between African and Western traditional marriage concepts (from Shorter, *African Culture*, pp. 181-2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western Marriage Concepts</th>
<th>African Marriage Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oriented to nuclear family</td>
<td>Oriented to lineal family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>Dynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synchronic</td>
<td>Diachronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent of partners</td>
<td>Consent of partners as members of a group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute stability from the beginning</td>
<td>Growing stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children not essential to survival of the union</td>
<td>Children essential to the union, otherwise dissolution or polygamy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More equality between partners</td>
<td>Less equality between partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal (if not practice) of indissolubility</td>
<td>Recognition of solubility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal of monogamy</td>
<td>Polygamy sometimes ideal; usually permitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extra-marital unions create problems for children produced by such unions | Children of extra-marital unions catered for by customary law

g. Death and the living dead (see Imasogie, Guidelines, pp. 57-9; Adeyemo, Salvation in African Tradition, pp. 63-73; Mbiti, African Religions and Philosophy, pp. 149-65; Gehman, African Traditional Religion, pp. 62-3; Sidhom, "Theological Estimate", pp. 104-6; Parrinder, Africa's Three Religions, pp. 82-4; Parrinder, West African Religion, pp. 106-12; Dickson, Theology in Africa, pp. 192-99)

h. On the possibility of reincarnation, see Parrinder, Africa's Three Religions, pp. 84-7; Taylor, The Primal Vision, p. 90; Shorter, African Culture, p. 60.

8. The following is a list of African anthropological topics from previous class discussions. It is listed alphabetically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alliances</th>
<th>Dowry</th>
<th>Naming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancestors</td>
<td>Extended family</td>
<td>Oathing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty</td>
<td>Handedness</td>
<td>Obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blessings</td>
<td>Harmony</td>
<td>Parental rights (over children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannibalism (spiritual and/or physical)</td>
<td>Home management</td>
<td>Polygamy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonies of marriage</td>
<td>Hospitality/generosity</td>
<td>Revenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumcision</td>
<td>Inheritance</td>
<td>Searing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliments</td>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>Social organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curses</td>
<td>Land ownership</td>
<td>Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death and burial rites</td>
<td>Levirate marriages</td>
<td>Twins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mediators</td>
<td>Wealth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Western Christian Anthropological Issues
A. Scott Moreau, D. Miss.

1. Issues of man's origin (adapted from Erickson, Christian Theology, pp. 478-482):
   a. The origin of the human race (Adam and Eve): there is a spectrum of views proposed, here we give only a few under the two ends of that spectrum.
      i. Creationism:
         (1) Fiat Creationism: Adam and Eve were historic persons who were directly created (without ancestors) by God at the end of a literal seven-day creation of the universe.
         (2) Progressive Creationism: God created the universe (and man) in a series of steps widely separated in time. Between each of the steps of His direct work, He allowed natural change processes to proceed. The final direct act of God was the ex nihilo creation of Adam and Eve, the first human beings.
      ii. Evolutionism:
         (1) Theistic Evolutionism: God began the whole process of creating the universe, and has continued to be involved in that work by personally supervising the evolutionary process. Adam and Eve were physically descended from other creatures, but God created a spiritual component (the soul?) and placed it in them, separating them from the rest of His creation.
         (2) Deistic Evolutionism: God began the process of evolution, and has since allowed "nature" to run its course. In this view, there is no necessity to posit Adam and Eve as historic persons. Even if they were, they were only the "natural" result of the evolutionary process initiated by God.
         (3) Naturalistic Evolutionism: Adam and Eve are only symbolic; there were no such historical persons.
   b. The origin of the soul in the individual person
      i. Creationism: man inherits his physical components from his parents, but his "soul" is created uniquely by God and given to the new person sometime early in life (views generally range from conception to birth). This is the general view among Reformed theologians.
      ii. Traducianism: man inherits everything from his parents, including his soul.
   c. The beginning of "human" life is linked to the origin of the soul, and carries implications for subjects such as
      i. Abortion and the possibility of fetal "experimentation"
      ii. Methods of birth control (natural, drug-related, or "apparatus" related)
      iii. Artificial help in conception (such as in vitro fertilisation, "test-tube" babies, fertility drugs, etc.)

2. Issues of man's nature:
   a. Man's "make-up": (each with implications for our approach to health, disease, poverty, the spirit realm, man's state after death, etc.)
      i. Monism or Holism: man is an indivisible unity (popular in the neo-orthodox movement)
      ii. Dichotomism: man consists of two "parts" ("probably the most widely held view in the history of Christian thought", Erickson, Christian Theology, p. 521; see, for example, Gundry, Soma in Biblical Theology for extended biblical and historical discussion):
         (1) A material part: the body
(2) An immaterial part: the soul

iii. Tripartism: man consists of three "parts" (popular in conservative Protestant circles):

(1) The physical element: the body
(2) The psychological element: the soul
(3) The religious element: the spirit

iv. "Conditional Unity" (Erickson, *Christian Theology*, pp. 536-8; see also VanLeeuwen, *The Person*, pp. 44-6, 104-6?):

According to this view, the normal state of man is as a materialized unitary being. . . . This monistic condition can, however, be broken down, and at death it is, so that the immaterial aspect of man lives on as the material decomposes. At the resurrection, however, there will be a return to a material or bodily condition. The person will assume a body which has some points of continuity with the old body, but is also a new or reconstituted or spiritual body. . . . We might think of man as a unitary compound of a material and an immaterial element. The spiritual and the physical elements are not always distinguishable, for man is a unitary subject; there is no struggle between the material and the immaterial nature. The compound is dissolvable, however; dissolution takes place at death. At the resurrection a compound will once again be formed, with the soul (if we choose to call it that) once more becoming inseparably attached to a body. (pp. 537-8)

b. The "invisible" part of man

i. The "soul" or "spirit" defined: what is it?

ii. The "brain/mind" debate (see Van Leeuwen, *The Person*, pp. 79-106): can the mind be separated from the physical processes of the brain? What is the degree of dependence of the mind from the brain?

iii. Does man possess "invisible powers" (the study of which is known as "parapsychology"; these powers include mind-reading, levitation, teleportation, telekinesis, astral travel, etc.)

c. Man in God's image

i. The nature of the image (adapted from Erickson, *Christian Theology*, pp. 498-510, see also the class OT notes on Gen. 1:26-31):

(1) Substantive views ("the image is identified as some definite characteristic or quality within the make-up of the human", p. 498):

   (a) Our physical bodies
   (b) Our "soul"
   (c) Our ability to reason

(2) Relational views (the image is thought of "as the experiencing of a relationship. Man is said to be in the image or to display the image when he stands in a particular relationship. In fact, that relationship is the image", p. 502; "The image of God is not an entity which man possesses so much as the experience which is present when a relationship is active", p. 508):

   (a) Our vertical relationship with God (or Christ)
   (b) Our horizontal relationships as man and woman

(3) Functional views: ("the image consists in something man does. It is a function which man performs, the most frequently mentioned being the exercise of dominion over the creation", p. 508)
ii. Aspects of the image:

(1) Man as male and female:

(a) Marriage:

(i) Pre-marriage practices:

1) Dating and "going steady"
2) Pre-marital sexual relations
3) Engagement procedures
4) Pre-marital counselling

(ii) Marriage practices:

1) Choosing a partner
2) Divorce and remarriage

(iii) Marriage roles:

1) The husband's role and the question of "headship"
2) The wife's role and the question of submission
3) The role of in-laws (or out-laws??!!)

(b) Roles in society:

(i) Women's liberation

(ii) Clothing styles

(iii) Sexual antagonisms and discrimination: slurs, innuendos, insinuations, harassment, abuse, etc.

(iv) Jobs and leadership

1) "Secular" business jobs and positions
2) "Political" jobs and positions
3) "Church" jobs and positions (especially leadership)

(c) The sexuality of man and woman:

(i) Proper sexual relations (within marriage)

1) Rights and responsibilities
2) Purpose
3) Roles and expectations

(ii) Improper relations (outside of marriage)

1) Pre-marital sex
2) Adultery
3) "Free" sex
4) Prostitution
5) Group sex ("orgies")
6) Rape
7) Sex with children

(iii) Abnormal sexual relations
1) Homosexuality and lesbianism
2) Bestiality
3) Incest
4) Sado-masochism ("SM")

(iv) Public display of sexuality (e.g., pornography, nudist colonies, "strip tease" shows)

(v) Debatable practices: masturbation

(2) Man as a creature of dignity:
   (a) "Human" rights and justice
   (b) "Self" esteem
   (c) Freedom

(3) Man in relationship:
   (a) Individualism
   (b) Community
   (c) Ethnocentrism
      (i) Nepotism
      (ii) Tribalism
      (iii) Racism
   (d) Government
   (e) Society

3. Issues of man's purpose (all of which are related closely to man's nature):
   a. "Ruler of the Universe" or "Speck of dust on a ball of dirt"?
   b. "Going for all the Gusto" (secular hedonism) or "Glorifying God" (theistic humanism)?
   c. Dealing with technology: is it to be embraced or avoided? How do we decide which is appropriate?
d. To know himself, to forget himself, to expand himself, to become a god, or some other option?

e. Man’s relationship with the earth: ecology and related areas of study.

4. Issues of man’s destiny:

a. The extension of life:
   i. Artificially (machine) prolonged life
   ii. Organ transplants
   iii. Drug-therapy
   iv. Suspended animation

b. The termination of life:
   i. Infanticide
   ii. Suicide
   iii. Euthanasia
   iv. Death penalty for certain crimes

c. Defining death:
   i. Explaining death-like phenomena:
      (1) Outside the body experiences (O.B.E.s)
      (2) Suspended animation
   ii. Determining the time of death
      (1) Cessation of brain-waves?
      (2) Cessation of heart-beat?
   iii. The nature of death (related to final destiny below):
      (1) Cessation of existence?
      (2) Soul-sleep?
      (3) Conscious separation from the body?

d. Final destiny:
   i. Non-biblical views:
      (1) Universalism
      (2) Reincarnation
      (3) Complete annihilation
      (4) Becoming "one with the all" (re-absorption into God)
   ii. Biblical framework:
5. Issues in the Study of Man

a. Methodology of anthropological approaches

b. The history of anthropological thought

c. How is the Christian to respond to (Western) psychology? (See Van Leeuwen, *The Person*, for excellent introductory discussion.)

d. “Single” or “Double” anthropology: are the Christian and the non-Christian to be viewed anthropologically as the same or different (see Van Leeuwen, *The Person*, pp. 58-61).

Sources:


