THE PENTECOSTAL DOCTRINE OF SPIRIT BAPTISM:

A THEODRAMATIC MODEL, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO

THE CONCEPT OF THE *IMAGO DEI*

by

C. Elmer Chen

A thesis submitted to
The University of Birmingham
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

School of Philosophy, Theology and Religion
College of Arts and Law
University of Birmingham
April 2017

ABSTRACT

The pentecostal tradition began as an eschatologically-driven pneumatological missionary movement whose identity was shaped by the empowering experience of Spirit baptism. Although characterised by an impulse towards biblically-rooted doctrine as well as an affinity for narrative, the movement has been founded largely on a truncated narrative of 'Calvary, Pentecost and Parousia'. Previous models of Spirit baptism have not been sufficiently narrative, nor have they engaged with the larger canonical perspective.

This study addresses the deficiency by constructing a theodramatic model of the pentecostal doctrine of Spirit baptism, locating it in the context of a canonically-shaped theodrama that is organised around the *imago Dei* motif. It sets the stage for the drama by developing the Spirit-constituted *imago Dei* role using the covenantal structure of sonship, shaping and sending, which corresponds to the pentecostal concern for relationship, sanctification and mission, evidenced in the three-stage *ordo salutis* of Holiness Pentecostalism. The thesis proceeds to trace the plot from creation to the church with attention to the anthropological, Christological and ecclesiological manifestations of the image. Using this dramatic framework, it argues that Spirit baptism is the initiation of God's new covenant people that recreates them through union with Christ as the Spirit-bearing *imago Dei*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

AG	Assemblies of God
AH	*Against Heresies* (Irenaeus)
ANE	Ancient Near East(ern)
ANF	*Ante-Nicene Fathers*
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
CCEL	Christian Classics Ethereal Library
CD	*Church Dogmatics* (Barth)
CJPCC	*Canadian Journal of Pentecostal-Charismatic Christianity*
Dem.	*The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* (Irenaeus)
Gen. Hom.	*Genesis Homily* (Origen)
ISBE	*International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*
IVP	InterVarsity Press (USA) or Inter-Varsity Press (UK)
JEPTA	*The Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JPT	*Journal of Pentecostal Theology*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
JVG	*Jesus and the Victory of God* (Wright)
NACP	North American Classical Pentecostalism
NIDNTT	*New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*
NIDOTTE	*New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*
NICNT	The New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	The New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIGTC	The New International Greek Testament Commentary
NIVAC	*The NIV Application Commentary*
NPNF	*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*
NT	New Testament
NTBT	*A New Testament Biblical Theology* (Beale)
NTPG	*The New Testament and the People of God* (Wright)
OT	Old Testament
PFG	*Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (Wright)
PNTC	The Pillar New Testament Commentary
RSG	*The Resurrection of the Son of God* (Wright)
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology*
SPCK	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
TD	*Theo-Drama* (Balthasar)
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*
TynBul	*Tyndale Bulletin*
WAGF	World Assemblies of God Fellowship
WBC	*Word Biblical Commentary*
WJK	Westminster/John Knox Press

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The modern pentecostal movements emerged beginning at the turn of the twentieth century and grew rapidly as a pneumatological missionary movement with a distinct experiential spirituality. According to Allan Anderson, 'Pentecostalism in all its diversity, both inside and outside the older churches, was probably the fastest expanding religious movement worldwide in the twentieth century, and by the beginning of this century it had expanded into almost every nation on earth'.[1] Anderson highlights the diversity of pentecostal movements but notes that they share a common emphasis on the experience of the Spirit and the practice of spiritual gifts.[2] North American Classical Pentecostalism (NACP) originated in the USA with a theological emphasis on a post-conversion empowerment experience of 'baptism with the Holy Spirit' and the 'initial physical evidence' of speaking in tongues.[3] This thesis will

---

[1] Allan Anderson, 'Varieties, Taxonomies, and Definitions', in *Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theories and Methods*, ed. Allan Anderson et al. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010), 13–14; Anderson also cites the 'debatable estimate' that the movement 'had well over half a billion adherents by the end of the century, a quarter of the world's Christian population'; see David B. Barrett, Todd M. Johnson, and Peter F. Crossing, 'Missiometrics 2008: Reality Checks for Christian World Communions', *International Bulletin for Missionary Research* 32:1 (2008): 30.

[2] Anderson offers four overlapping types of pentecostalism, each of which could be further divided into subtypes: (1) Classical Pentecostals, (2) older independent and Spirit churches in the majority world, (3) older church charismatics, (4) neo-Pentecostal and neo-charismatic churches; Anderson, 'Varieties, Taxonomies', 17–19; Allan Heaton Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism: Global Charismatic Christianity*, Second Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 1–6. I have chosen to use the terms 'pentecostal' and 'pentecostalism' to denote these diverse groups collectively. I will use the capitalised forms, 'Pentecostal' and 'Pentecostalism', to refer to the early Pentecostal movement that originated at the turn of the twentieth century and the Classical Pentecostal tradition that has developed from it. In this I follow the practice of James K. A. Smith, *Thinking in Tongues: Pentecostal Contributions to Christian Philosophy* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010), xvii.

[3] Anderson notes that Classical Pentecostalism originated in the US, and in this sense, the designation *North American* may be redundant, Anderson, *Pentecostalism*, 2. But I retain this designation to emphasise its North American roots in contradistinction to movements from the majority world, and to account for the fact that these characteristics are more dominant in North America than elsewhere among 'Classical Pentecostals'; see sect. 2.1.2.2.

address critical problems with the NACP model of Spirit Baptism and offer an innovative alternative that nevertheless reflects the essential characteristics of pentecostalism.

1.1 The Historical Trajectory of the Pentecostal Doctrine of Spirit Baptism

The doctrine of Spirit baptism began as John Fletcher's modification of John Wesley's 'entire sanctification', while that of evidential tongues is usually attributed to Charles Parham.[4] The early Pentecostal formulation of the doctrine was derived primarily from the book of Acts. Myer Pearlman and E.S. Williams were significant proponents of the NACP tradition.[5] Although this formulation of Spirit baptism is not representative of the broader global pentecostal movements, its centrality as a distinctive of NACP is difficult to deny.[6] Eschatology was certainly a major theological influence in the spirituality of early Pentecostalism, but because it was continuous with the Holiness and revivalist predecessors of the nineteenth century, it caused less provocation. Due to the disproportionate influence of westerners in academic dialogue, much of the pentecostal theological conversation in the early stages can be traced to these teachings on Spirit baptism. The pentecostal emphasis on pneumatological experience and missional empowerment is a significant contribution that can be gainfully brought into dialogue with other traditions. Therefore, this thesis will also seek to advance the intertraditional dialogue on Spirit baptism, engaging a broad range of sources.

---

[4] Fletcher was likely the first to apply the language of Spirit baptism to empowerment experiences, a practice that became dominant among the Keswick stream of the Holiness movement by the end of the nineteenth century; see Anderson, *Pentecostalism*, 26–9; Grant Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 2; also see H.I. Lederle, *Theology with Spirit: The Future of the Pentecostal & Charismatic Movements in the Twenty-first Century* (Tulsa: Word & Spirit Press, 2010), 58.

[5] Myer Pearlman, *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible*, rev. ed. (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1937, 1981); Ernest S. Williams, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols. (Springfield: GPH, 1953).

[6] Anderson, *Pentecostalism*, 2–3, 181–2; H.I. Lederle, *Treasures Old and New: Interpretations of 'Spirit-Baptism' in the Charismatic Renewal Movement* (Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 1988), xi; Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *Pneumatology: The Holy Spirit in Ecumenical, International, and Contextual Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 95–6; Frank D. Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006), 21–22.

The Charismatic Renewal Movement that began in the 1960s represents the beginnings of such a dialogue. Participants from older streams of Christianity, including Roman Catholics, Anglicans, Lutherans and Presbyterians, brought the resources of their traditions into their study and reflection on their renewal experiences. Moving beyond the older Pentecostal 'Bible doctrine' approach, such voices as Kilian McDonnell, Francis Sullivan and Thomas Smail heightened the dialogue by engaging a wider variety of historical and contemporary theological thought.[7] Particularly notable are McDonnell's development of a sacramental model of Spirit baptism and Smail's Reformed Christological approach.

In 1970, challenges to the Pentecostal doctrine were published by two NT scholars, each by way of a broadly NT pneumatology. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* by Methodist scholar James Dunn was appreciative of the movement but critiqued the exegetical bases for both Classical Pentecostal and sacramental charismatic teachings on Spirit baptism.[8] Presbyterian missionary and scholar F.D. Bruner's similar study of Pentecostalism, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit*, was more polemically-minded.[9] Roger Stronstad's *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* was a significant Pentecostal response that criticised Dunn, as well as Michael Green and John Stott, for reading Luke through the lenses of Pauline theology, and argued for a distinctive Lukan charismatic pneumatology.[10] Robert Menzies followed with his PhD thesis, *The Development*

---

[7] Also Simon Tugwell, Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan and David Watson. See chap. 2 for an overview of the most important contributions.
[8] James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (London: SCM, 1970).
[9] Frederick Dale Bruner, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970).
[10] Roger Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* (Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 1984),10–12. This book was based on his 1975 Master's thesis. Stronstad later wrote *The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999). Also see John R.W. Stott, *Baptism and Fullness: The Work of the Holy Spirit Today*, Second Edition (London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1975); Michael Green, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, Revised Edition (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004).

of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke-Acts, which examined the intertestamental Jewish literature before proceeding to argue for a discontinuity between Luke and Paul. Menzies argues that Luke follows the Jewish tradition in emphasising Spirit-inspired prophetic speech.[11] Mediating accounts have been produced from within the movement by Gordon Fee and from without by Max Turner, each of whom see a soteriological element in the primarily charismatic pneumatology of Luke-Acts, and deny the NACP doctrine of subsequence.[12] In a radical departure from the preceding scholarship, John Levison's *Filled with the Spirit* reads the Lukan texts through the lenses of Greco-Roman philosophy and mysticism, seeking points of continuity also in intertestamental Jewish literature. He finds two conflicting streams of influence—ecstatic mysticism and the Stoic wisdom tradition—which manifest in Luke-Acts as a tension between Luke's mystical source narratives of glossolalic ecstasy and his own preference for reason and comprehension.[13] To this may be added a third stream of influence, that of Israelite scriptures, which Levison confines to the speeches and prayers in Acts.[14] Levison's work follows a tradition of historical

---

[11] Robert P. Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), based on his 1989 thesis for the University of Aberdeen, later released as *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994). Also see William W. Menzies and Robert P. Menzies, *Spirit and Power: Foundation of Pentecostal Experience* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000).

[12] Gordon D. Fee, *Gospel and Spirit: Issues in New Testament Hermeneutics* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), 98–9, 101; Max Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts: Then and Now* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1996), 44–5, 164–6. Other generally sympathetic works on Luke-Acts include: James B. Shelton, *Mighty in Word and Deed: The Role of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991); John Michael Penney, *The Missionary Emphasis of Lukan Pneumatology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, (1997); Youngmo Cho, *Spirit and Kingdom in the Writings of Luke and Paul: An Attempt to Reconcile these Concepts* (Bletchley: Paternoster, 2005); Martin W. Mittelstadt, *Reading Luke-Acts in the Pentecostal Tradition* (Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2010); Gonzalo Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers: The Holy Spirit in the Book of Acts*, ed. Paul Elbert, trans. Scott A. Ellington (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2011); William P. Atkinson, *Baptism in the Spirit: Luke-Acts and the Dunn Debate* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2011). The most significant of these scholarly voices, and the Lukan texts in question, will be treated in more detail in chapter 7.

[13] John R. Levison, *Filled with the Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009). See especially his reinterpretation of the Pentecost narrative, p. 323.

[14] Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 354.

criticism that assumes the ancient author's limited competence in mastering the source materials to produce a coherent piece of literature, and simultaneously claims a modernistic confidence that the scholar is fully capable of reconstructing the history behind the text. The result is a reconstruction that fragments the text according to the scholar's own philosophical and methodological presuppositions.[15]

The advent of the new millennium brought significant advances in pentecostal constructive theology from those who align themselves with the tradition, but engage with the broader theological community. Amos Yong is the most prolific pentecostal theologian today, covering many topics using a correlationist approach and seeking to engage broader streams of academic, cultural and interreligious dialogue. His treatment of Spirit baptism in *The Spirit Poured Out* is a concise but insightful contribution. Frank Macchia's *Baptized in the Spirit* was the most significant recent work on the topic, presenting the pentecostal metaphor as an organising principle for an ecumenical systematic theology. Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen wrote several helpful historical-global surveys on the major theological topics and has now produced four of his five-volume constructive theology. His fourth volume, *The Spirit and Salvation*, includes a brief, well-balanced treatment of Spirit baptism.[16]

---

[15] Compare his exclusively 'Hellenistic' reading of Acts 2:1–4, p. 323, with my mostly canonical reading in chap. 7. Would it not make more hermeneutical sense to grant that the same Israelite scriptures that saturate the sermons also served as the primary sources for the narratives? Do these sermons not prove that Luke is well acquainted with the Old Testament? Levison assumes that Luke functions more as a redactor than as an author in his own right.

[16] Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *The Spirit and Salvation*, A Constructive Christian Theology for the Pluralistic World, vol. 4 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 393–401.

1.2 What Does Pentecostalism Offer to the Christian Theological Tradition?

The modern pentecostal movements have become a major identifiable stream of Christianity, bearing not only a distinct spirituality, but also a unique theological emphasis on the charismatic empowerment of the Spirit. N.T. Wright commented in passing that 'the [western church] was able to develop a view of "salvation" and the East a view of "transformation", each of which needed the other for a balanced completeness'.[17] Although his incidental remark oversimplifies the matter—especially in view of the fact that transformation is fully integrated into salvation in Eastern Orthodoxy—these distinct emphases are certainly discernible, and offers a way towards a more holistic view of the Christian identity. That the doctrine of justification was at the crux of the Reformation may be symptomatic of the western view of guilt as the core human problem. As for Eastern Orthodoxy, for which corruption appears to be the core problem, the centrality of *theosis* in its theological and spiritual tradition is well known. Kärkkäinen also notes the orientation towards *theosis* in the East and justification in the West.[18] Although justification has been a point of contention since the Reformation, and recent reinterpretations of Paul and of Luther have incited a resurgence, the personalist turn in twentieth century theology suggests that reconciliation and adoption, as the gospel's response to the human experience of alienation, may be more fitting metaphors for contemporary western soteriology.[19] These prevailing paths of salvation have become major sources of the Christian identity in their respective traditions. I propose that these two emphases can be supplemented with the pentecostal emphasis on 'mission' in order

---

[17] He considered this 'one of the greatest tragedies of the Schism'. N.T. Wright, *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2009), 235. Counter-examples should be acknowledged. For instance, the Jesuits, following Ignatius of Loyola, have a well-developed system of 'transformation'.

[18] Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *One with God: Salvation as Deification and Justification* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2004), 4.

[19] This hypothesis deserves more attention than can be given within the confines of this thesis. But the work of Stanley Grenz, for instance, certainly points in this direction. Stanley J. Grenz, *The Social God and the Relational Self: A Trinitarian Theology of the Imago Dei* (Louisville: WJK, 2001).

to produce a more complete view of the Christian identity. The Christian spiritual life consists not only of relationship and transformation, but also of mission. Evangelical movements have contributed the impulse towards world evangelisation, which has been combined in pentecostalism with empowerment through Spirit baptism in an eschatological context to produce a pneumatological missionary movement.[20] Anderson notes that from its beginnings, pentecostals have understood the Holy Spirit poured out at Pentecost as a 'missionary Spirit', and the church full of the Spirit as a 'missionary community'.[21] Driven by mission and eschatology, the Classical Pentecostal doctrine of Spirit baptism was part of a larger teleological impulse towards the evangelisation of the world before the anticipated eschaton. An element of dramatic movement was woven into Pentecostalism from the beginning.

The early Pentecostals quickly formed their self-identity around the experience of Spirit baptism. I want to suggest three reasons for this. First, Spirit baptism was an encounter with the living God through the Holy Spirit. It provided a relational-experiential dynamic that implicitly addressed the question of belonging: Whose am I?[22] Second, Spirit baptism was viewed as an 'ordination' to a mission. It addressed the question of purpose: Why am I here?[23] Third, Spirit baptism was an experience that built upon the premise of sanctification

---

[20] To this may be added the social justice impulse that was prominent among the liberal and liberation streams, and which is gaining awareness among some evangelicals. E.g. Murray W. Dempster, 'Christian Social Concern in Pentecostal Perspective: Reformulating Pentecostal Eschatology', *JPT* 1.2 (1993): 51–64.

[21] Anderson, *Pentecostalism*, 199.

[22] On relationship as a basis for personal identity, see for example, Kevin Vanhoozer, 'Human Being, Individual and Social', *The Cambridge Companion to Christian Doctrine*, ed. Colin E. Gunton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 175, 180. On the importance of relationship and encounter in Pentecostalism, see Juan Sepúlveda, 'Reflections on the Pentecostal Contribution to the Mission of the Church in Latin America', *JPT* 1 (1992): 101; Steven J. Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom* (Cleveland: CPT Press, 2010), 70; Keith Warrington, *Pentecostal Theology: A Theology of Encounter* (London and New York: T & T Clark, 2008), 20.

[23] For mission as a key to identity, see Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theo-Drama: Theological Dramatic Theory, vol. III: The Dramatis Personae: The Person in Christ*, trans. Graham Harrison (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1992), 154–7.

and anticipated empowerment. It addressed the question of distinctiveness and characterisation: What (manner of being) am I?[24] Wolfgang Vondey has called for the formation of a pentecostal identity that will be appropriate for the task of discipleship. Such an identity will take into account not only the locutionary ('what', meaning) and perlocutionary ('why', consequences) aspects of the task, but also the illocutionary ('how', condition).[25] I suspect that such a well-formed pentecostal identity requires a story larger than that of the promise, fulfilment and consequence of Spirit baptism. Even the story oft-told in early Pentecostalism of the movement from Calvary to Pentecost to the Parousia may be inadequate, being limited to the NT story.[26]

1.3 Purpose: Addressing the Need for a Larger Narrative

Alasdair MacIntyre observes that, in premodern societies, 'the individual is identified and constituted in and through certain of his or her roles, … which bind the individual to the communities'.[27] He argues that personal identity is derived from inhabiting a character that is set within a story. One's personhood and life, utterances and actions, become meaningful only in the context of an intelligible narrative.[28] I want to propose that Spirit baptism can best

---

[24] We may also state this question in the form 'How shall I be?' See Vondey's description immediately following. Cf. Vanhoozer, 'Human Being', 181.

[25] Wolfgang Vonday, 'Pentecostal Identity and Christian Discipleship', *Cyberjournal for Pentecostal-Charismatic Research* 6 (1999): 2–3. Note that illocution and perlocution corresponds to the questions of characterisation and purpose respectively. The language of locution, illocution and perlocution originated with J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962).

[26] Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality*, 67–8.

[27] Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, Third Edition (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), 172.

[28] MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, 210, 217. Vanhoozer cites Paul Ricoeur as being 'representative of philosophers who have come to appreciate the singular power of narrative to articulate human action, identity, historicity, and especially temporality'; Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *Faith Speaking Understanding: Performing the Drama of Doctrine* (Louisville, KY: WJK, 2014), 251; Paul Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, 3 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984). Ricoeur's contribution is certainly significant. But MacIntyre's work was originally published in 1981, three years prior.

contribute to identity formation for pentecostals, and for members of other Christian traditions, by being located within the larger canonical narrative of the *imago Dei* theodrama. In Christianity's canon and tradition, the *imago Dei* motif stands out as the key contributor to the human identity, though its interpretation has been widely debated.[29] Due to its location in the canon at the climax of the creation account, the creation of humanity 'in the image of God' has often been viewed as an important clue to the place of humans in the world. The status of the *imago Dei* as an identity marker may also be attributed to its ontological, relational and teleological implications. Although some theologians have suggested the link between Spirit baptism and the restoration of the *imago Dei*—both of which motifs originate from the biblical text—the intersection between the two doctrines has not yet been developed theologically.[30] This may be due in part to the lack of an explicit connection in the Bible between the two concepts. By exploring both of these themes in light of the canonical narrative and relevant literary and historical backgrounds, I will show that they can be profitably brought together in the notion of a Spirit-baptised image.

Therefore, this thesis aims to contribute to the dialogue regarding the doctrine of Spirit baptism by setting it in the context of a theodrama that is structured around the theme of the

---

[29] Grenz, *Social God*, 141; Vanhoozer, *Faith Speaking Understanding*, 127; David H. Kelsey, 'The Human Creature', *The Oxford Handbook of Systematic Theology*, ed. John Webster, Kathryn Tanner and Iain Torrance (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 129; Norma Wirzba, *The Paradise of God: Renewing Religion in an Ecological Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), Chap. 5; Nonna Vera Harrison, 'Women, Human Identity, and the Image of God: Antiochene Interpretations', *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 9:2 (2001):205–49. Note for instance, that the rational view of the *imago Dei* resulted in a corresponding view of the human identity; Wolfgang Vondey, 'Pentecostal Identity and Christian Discipleship', *Cyber* 6 (http://www.pctii.org/cyberj/cyberj6/vondey.pdf; accessed 6 October 2016), 2.

[30] E.g. Amos Yong, *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 102; Lisa P. Stephenson, *Dismantling the Dualisms for American Pentecostal Women in Ministry: A Feminist-Pneumatological Approach* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 126, 130; Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 177.

imago Dei.[31] In engaging Pentecostal doctrine, I want to demonstrate that Spirit baptism is best understood within the context of the larger biblical narrative. Key elements of the Pentecostal movement were birthed from the intersection of the narratives of early twentieth century pragmatic Americans and that of Luke-Acts. Pentecostal spirituality and theology has been nurtured on the abundance of story-rich preaching and testimony.[32] James Smith has observed that the pentecostal epistemology is narrative by nature, and by situating experience within a story, provides a new context for understanding their experience.[33] Steven Land notes that the early Pentecostals saw themselves as participating in the story of God.[34] Although the movement has self-consciously adhered to the authority of the Bible, the rootedness of Classical Pentecostal theology in the biblical narrative was largely focussed on Luke-Acts.[35] Pentecostal theologians have yet to unlock the Bible's full potential for doctrinal development.[36] Frank Macchia's book on Spirit baptism attempts to expand the scope of pentecostal biblical engagement to include the gospels, Paul and John as key sources, but from a propositionalist rather than narrative framework.[37] Kenneth Archer has constructed a

---

[31] Certainly other major themes such as kingdom and covenant are equally important, and will be incorporated into my theodramatic account.

[32] Cheryl Bridges Johns, *Pentecostal Formation*, JPT Supp. Series, 2 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 87; Smith, *Thinking in Tongues*, 51; Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality*, 73.

[33] Smith, *Thinking in Tongues*, 69. Note that Smith's project aims to describe a 'pentecostal philosophy' of the small-*p* variety, i.e. one that is shared by 'Pentecostals, charismatics, and "third wavers"'; p. xvii.

[34] Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality*, 63–7. Wolfgang Vondey has also noted these features of pentecostalism and their affinities with Vanhoozer's theodramatic approach; Wolfgang Vondey, 'Review of Kevin J. Vanhoozer. *The Drama of Doctrine: A Canonical-Linguistic Approach to Christian Theology*', *Pneuma* 30 (2008): 365-6.

[35] Walter J. Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals: The Charismatic Movement in the Churches*, Third Edition, trans. R. A. Wilson (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988), 336; Donald W. Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* (Metuchen, NJ and London: The Scarecrow Press, 1987), 23.

[36] Early Pentecostals viewed the xenolalia given at Pentecost as a reversal of the divergence of languages in the Babel narrative in Gen 9. While this is valid, it may be too narrow of a narrative thread to support the weight of the doctrine that has been suspended from it.

[37] Frank D. Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*. His central thesis of Spirit baptism as the inauguration or experience of the kingdom of God is effectively limited to Matthew and Acts, with an assist from Paul; e.g. pp. 61, 102.

narrative theology based on the Pentecostal 'Fivefold Gospel'.[38] Stephen Torr has published a dramatic pentecostal response to suffering.[39] Given the traditional pentecostal affinity for story and participation, and their reverence for the scriptures, the lack of a broadly canonical dramatic account of pentecostal theology is problematic.

This project will begin to address the weakness by posing the question: *what is the place of Spirit baptism within the larger drama of the Christian canon?* Critically significant to our question is the event of Pentecost, which marks the historical fulfilment of the pneumatological promise. Therefore, this thesis will argue that Pentecost is the dramatic moment of the re-creation of humanity as the *imago Dei* through Christ's outpouring of the Spirit to mediate the eschatological kingdom and so initiate the church as the kingdom community. Ultimately, it will advance the thesis that *Spirit baptism is the initiation of the new covenant people of God that recreates them through union with Christ as the Spirit-bearing imago Dei to participate in the sonship, shaping and sending of Christ.* En route to this objective, our investigation will also contribute a multifaceted model of the *imago Dei* as a theodramatic role. Taking cues from Irenaeus of Lyons and Hans Urs von Balthasar, I will propose that the *imago Dei* may be viewed as a role in the drama that is developed around the Spirit-mediated covenantal components of sonship, shaping and sending.[40] The notion of a

---

[38] Kenneth J. Archer, *The Gospel Revisited: Towards a Pentecostal Theology of Worship and Witness* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2011).

[39] Stephen C. Torr, *A Dramatic Pentecostal/Charismatic Anti-Theodicy: Improvising on a Divine Performance of Lament* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2013).

[40] My survey of the literature in chapter 3 will show that Irenaeus and Balthasar come closest to the theodramatic model of the *imago Dei* I wish to construct. This is true mainly because they both give multi-faceted models of the *imago Dei*, and because Irenaeus gives attention to the pneumatological aspect and Balthasar to the missional, while also emphasising structure. Pneumatology and mission are key aspects of my own theodramatic model. Finally, they both incorporate the dramatic metaphor, though Balthasar does so more explicitly than Irenaeus.

dramatic role will allow us to incorporate various elements that have been previously offered

as interpretations of the *imago Dei*. Furthermore, by imagining the *imago Dei* as a dramatic

role we can trace the plot of the drama along the development of the theme through the canon.

This dramatic retelling of the macronarrative of the Bible provides a broad context for the

event of Pentecost and the experience of Spirit baptism, and naturally invites the participation

of the reader.[41] And because the narrativity of pentecostalism is oriented not only to story-

telling, but also to an active participatory response, the dramatic method is particularly

appropriate.[42]

This convergence of Spirit baptism, *imago Dei* and theodrama yields gains for each of the

subjects involved. The theodramatic method provides a proper framework for a more holistic

view of the *imago Dei*,[43] and naturally integrates various manifestations of the image:

anthropological, Christological, and soteriological-ecclesial. Spirit baptism highlights the

centrality of the pneumatological element for both the *imago Dei* and the theodrama.

Conversely, the *imago Dei* and theodrama provide the necessary context for the doctrine of

Spirit baptism, moving us away from reading it in the micronarrative of missional

---

[41] My use of the term 'macronarrative' in reference to my contextualised retelling of the larger story of the Bible intentionally avoids the language of 'metanarrative' which implies a universally authoritative worldview-forming story that also implies the subject's unmitigated access to its authoritative view of reality; Jean-Francois Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi, Theory and History of Literature, Volume 10 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), xxiv. Wright uses the term 'metanarrative' to describe the controlling story behind the basic Jewish worldview of Jesus' times; N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London: SPCK; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 155, 201, etc. Pentecostals, as Christian monotheists, believe there is one self-revealing God and therefore, implicitly or explicitly, one grand story—a 'metanarrative'—that is revealed in the Bible; e.g. Archer, *The Gospel Revisited*, 24. But while the Bible may be a mode of divine communication adequate for divine purposes, the interpretive process is conditioned by human finitude and fallenness. Aided by the Spirit, one can expect to access a fallible but adequate reading to the extent that one is receptive to the Spirit's illumination and direction. I therefore offer my particular reading of the Bible as a macronarrative, not as an authoritative reading to be enforced, but as a plausible reading that invites fellow readers to consider its merits and to participate in God's larger story.
[42] Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality*, 66–8.
[43] As we have in Irenaeus, Balthasar and Stanley Grenz; see chap. 3.

empowerment and towards the macronarrative of creation, covenant and the kingdom of God.[44] Spirit baptism serves not only the purpose of world evangelisation, but also the restoration of human identity and the fulfilment of human destiny.

1.4 Method: Towards a Theodramatic Solution

In view of the pentecostal affinities for narrative and participation noted in the previous section, I will implement a theodramatic reading of the Bible in order to outline a storied context for better understanding the experience of Spirit baptism and the church's role as the restored *imago Dei*. Such a narrative location will assist the church and her members to better grasp their identity as covenant participants and their purpose as kingdom agents in preparation for their Spirit-led improvised performance of the role. In describing the methodology, preliminary mention should be made of Hans Frei's *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative*, which calls attention to the inherent narrativity of the Bible, and prepares the way for the theodramatic concept. Kenneth Archer offers a Pentecostal narrative theology centred around the Gospel as the heart of the biblical story, with special reference to the 'Fivefold Gospel'.[45] John Poirier writes an article rejecting 'narrative theology' as being incompatible with 'Pentecostal commitments', and includes a brief section targeting Archer's proposal for a Pentecostal narrative theology. He charges Archer with conflating 'narrative-as-genre with narrative-as-theory-of-existence'.[46] But Poirier apparently fails to consider the possibility of

---

[44] 'Macronarrative' denotes the grand story of the entire Bible, while avoiding the worldview implications of the term 'metanarrative', which is less appropriate for the present discussion.

[45] Hans W. Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1974); Kenneth J. Archer, *The Gospel Revisited: Towards a Pentecostal Theology of Worship and Witness* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2011), xix, 13. The traditional Pentecostal fivefold gospel is composed of the Christological affirmation of Jesus as the Saviour, Sanctifier, Healer, Spirit-Baptiser and Coming King. Also see sect. 5.5 of this thesis.

[46] John C. Poirier, 'Narrative Theology and Pentecostal Commitments', *JPT* 16 (2008): 73-4.

narrative-as-method, which can be implemented apart from the philosophical commitments of the postliberal school of narrative theologians. Archer speaks of 'narrative' not as a theory of truth separate from reference to 'spacetime actuality', but as a literary form in which the Gospel is cast and a methodological form in which Pentecostal theology may also be cast. He clearly links the 'Pentecostal narrative tradition' with 'God's dramatic involvement both in reality and the Pentecostal community.'[47] This conversation illustrates the fluidity of broadly conceived theological methods, which can be variously implemented without strict adherence to the particular commitments of their originators.

Balthasar's magisterial *Theo-Drama* was the first theological work to explicitly use the label, and outlined some basic concepts now shared among the various practitioners of the method, such as the attention to action, event, praxis, participation and dialogue. He uses the metaphor of drama to depict the interplay between divine infinite freedom and human finite freedom and the resulting dialogical action. He also emphasises the concept of mission which gives shape to the characters and plot. N.T. Wright is not a practitioner of theodrama as a theological method. But his 1989 lecture, 'How Can the Bible Be Authoritative?', influentially depicted the plot of the biblical narrative as a five-act drama, the last act of which began in the book of Acts and is to be continued in the improvised performance of the

---

[47] Archer, *The Gospel Revisited*, 13, 25; cf. Poirier, 'Narrative Theology', 75-8.
Note also that Vanhoozer's 'postconservative', 'postpropositionalist' theodramatic approach does not discard the proposition, but seeks to 'reclaim' the proposition by dramatizing it; Vahoozer, *Drama of Doctrine*, 88. 'The *post* in *postpropositional* does not mean *against* but *beyond*. There is *more*, not less, in the canon than propositional revelation'; p. 276. I suspect that Archer's understanding of story and reality is closer to Vanhoozer's than Lindbeck's, especially in light of his affirmation of 'the Christian metanarrative'; Archer, *The Gospel Revisited*, 24. Also note that Archer cites Vanhoozer's distinction between 'conservative' and 'radical' reader response approaches, favouring the former; Archer, *A Pentecostal Hermeneutic for the Twenty First Century: Spirit, Scripture and Community* (London / New York: T & T Clark, 2004), 173-4; Kevin J. Vanhoozer, 'The Reader in New Testament Interpretation', Joel Green (ed.), *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995), 305-12.

church. Wells and Vanhoozer acknowledge the five-act scheme, but make more use of the

dialogical and performative elements to explore the notion of improvisation as a metaphor for

contemporary praxis.[48] These pioneers of dramatic theology guide us to conceive of the

Triune God as the divine Author of a drama about his purpose to communicate life to the

world through the missions of the Son and the Spirit in the acts of creation and redemption.

'*The purpose of the two missions, then, is communion, and community: a sharing in the truth

and love—the very life—of God*'.[49] The incarnate Son becomes the primary Actor on the

world stage, and the Spirit is the Director behind the scenes. The twofold mission of the

Triune God issues forth the missions of Scripture and of the church. Vanhoozer proposes that

'the mission of Scripture is to serve as a script which, when followed, leads us in the way of

truth and life. … *The mission of the church, and therefore of theology, is to participate in and

continue the joint mission of Word and Spirit*'.[50]

Among Pentecostals, Wolfgang Vondey offers the most in-depth critical engagement with

Vanhoozer's theodramatics.[51] Noting the points of resonance between Vanhoozer's proposal

---

[48] Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theo-Drama: Theological Dramatic Theory*, trans. Graham Harrison, 5 vols (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988–98); N.T. Wright, 'How Can the Bible Be Authoritative?' *Vox Evangelica* 21 (1991): 7–32; Samuel Wells, *Improvisation: The Drama of Christian Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2004); Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *The Drama of Doctrine: A Canonical-Linguistic Approach to Christian Theology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005). Wright's five acts consist of: creation, fall, Israel, Christ and the church. In his Christian Origins and the Question of God series, he continues to refer to the plot of the narrative, even if he rarely refers to the five-act drama. Other notable proponents include Ben Quash, *Theology and the Drama of History* (Cambridge / New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005) and Wesley Vander Lugt, *Living Theodrama: Reimagining Theological Ethics* (London / New York: Routledge, 2016).
[49] Vanhoozer, *Drama of Doctrine*, 70; italics original.
[50] Vanhoozer, *Drama of Doctrine*, 70–1; italics original.
[51] Amos Yong gave a brief descriptive review in *Religious Studies Review* 36.4 (2010): 283. Also see Torr, *A Dramatic Pentecostal Charismatic Anti-Theodicy*, noted in the previous section. Torr gives brief mention of Balthasar, but to my knowledge, there has been no substantial pentecostal response to Balthasar. The pentecostal engagement with Wright attends to more prominent issues in his work; see Janet Meyer Everts and Jeffrey S. Lamp, eds., *Pentecostal Theology and the Theological Vision of N.T. Wright: A Conversation* (Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2015).

and the Pentecostal tradition, Vondey affirms that Vanhoozer's theodramatics challenges Pentecostals to 'go beyond a mere narrating of a single Pentecostal story to a theological reflection on the performance of the multiplicity of stories as dramas in various contexts of the late modern world'.[52] He acknowledges the role of the Spirit as Director in Vanhoozer's proposal, but wishes to better accommodate the Spirit's spontaneous, mysterious work, and to preserve the Pentecostal openness to unscripted pneumatological encounters. Vondey is concerned that Vanhoozer's proposal construes the church's improvisation on the script in an overly cognitive, and insufficiently pneumatological manner. Vondey prefers the notion of 'play' as a Spirit energised, spontaneous, bodily participation in life that is more celebratory than performative, and ultimately arises from a pneumatological imagination.[53] Note that Vanhoozer calls for '*scientia*' in reading the text and '*sapientia*' in improvising one's performance in the present context.[54] There appears to be some congruency between Vondey's notion of play and Vanhoozer's notion of *sapientia*, even if the latter is conceived more cognitively. Acknowledging the element of the Spirit's directorship in Vanhoozer's proposal, and discerning the cognitive element in playful imagination as well as the backdrop of story retained in Vondey's proposal, we can see that the distinction is more of degree than kind, though certainly the choice of metaphor bears impact. I suspect that a mediating position can be achieved by insisting that *sapientia* is cultivated and played out only by virtue of the Spirit's formative action and continued vivification. And by bending the metaphor, we can

---

[52] Wolfgang Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism: The Crisis of Global Christianity and the Renewal of the Theological Agenda* (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010), 37.

[53] Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism*, 40-6. Vondey borrows the idea of 'play' from Jean-Jacques Suurmond, *Word and Spirit at Play: Towards a Charismatic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), and the 'pneumatological imagination' from Amos Yong, *Spirit-Word-Community: Theological Hermeneutics in Trinitarian Perspective* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), 123-217.

[54] Vanhoozer, *Drama of Doctrine*, chaps. 9-10.

observe that the Spirit, as a Director indwelling the Actor, can be effective in animating the improvisation.

In appropriating the theodramatic method, I want to begin with a Wrightian reading of the biblical narrative as a five-act drama. But unlike Vanhoozer, I will give more attention in the present project to the exposition of the plot than to the concept of improvisation in order to provide a narrative context in which to locate Spirit baptism. This approach also yields specific content to the various manifestations of the *imago Dei* as part of that narrative context. Note that the attention to plot also provides context for the church's ongoing pneumatological improvisation. Therefore, I want to propose that we view the *imago Dei* as a role in the drama, played successively in five acts by: (1) Adam, (2) Israel, (3) Christ and (4) the Church until (5) the perfection of the *imago Dei* community and its continued performance in the Eschaton.[55] The *imago Dei* is construed as the primary embodied actor on the stage of creation. To be God's image is to be the Spirit-bearing embodied representative of his kingdom on earth. The image is opposed by Satan, the antagonist, who introduces conflict at critical junctures of the plot as well as mounting continual assaults against the image and the kingdom until his final defeat in the Eschaton. Adam is the first bearer of the image whose misperformance provides the conflict that sets the plot in motion. Subsequent to Adam's failure, the role is finitely assigned to Israel, but ultimately assumed by Christ, the paradigmatic *imago Dei*, whose perfect redemptive performance makes way for the renewal

---

[55] This reflects the acts proposed by Wells, *Improvisation*, 53-5, and adopted by Vanhoozer, *Drama of Doctrine*, 2-3. Vanhoozer's earlier incorporation of *imago Dei* is minimal, but intimates the idea of passive representation on the basis of an undefined resemblance; Vanhoozer, *Drama of Doctrine*, 379. In his later work, Vanhoozer confirms the concept of *imago Dei* as a 'role'; Vanhoozer, *Faith Speaking Understanding*, 116. I arrived at this model independently.

of all things. As the church is baptised in the Spirit at Pentecost, she is recreated through

union with Christ to be the restored *imago Dei*, participating in the covenantal sonship,

shaping and sending of Christ. The church's performance is a Spirit-empowered continuation

of Christ's performance that moves the plot toward the consummation of the kingdom at

Christ's return and the consequent perfection of the image.[56] Due to our primary concern with

Pentecost and Spirit baptism, Act 5 falls beyond the scope of this thesis and will be deferred

to future research.

The distinct advantage of the dramatic method is that it not only provides a storied context for

theology, but also invites the reader to participate bodily in the dramatic action. This ordering

of the theodrama according to the sequential performances of the *imago Dei* role offers the

following additional advantages.[57] First, it makes explicit the rationale for the five-act

sequence of Adam, Israel, Christ, the Church and the Eschaton, which traces the plot of the

imago Dei.[58] Second, the attention to the role of the creature heightens the identity-conferring

participatory nature of theodrama. Set in the context of a theocentric worldview, the drama

immediately locates the reader as an actor within its plot and action in terms of history (past),

---

[56] One may rightly observe that my focus here is on humanity more than the cosmos. But this reflects the primacy given to the human creature in both Gen 1-3 and Rev 21-22, in which the earth is a provision, a token of blessing and a responsibility; see sections 4.1.1.3 and 4.1.1.4.

[57] Note that my choice of the confluence of Spirit baptism, *imago Dei* and theodrama flows in that order. The primary aim of this project is to engage the doctrine of Spirit baptism by presenting it as the restoration of the *Imago Dei*. My aim is not to develop a new theodramatic methodology, but to use it as a means of addressing these topics. Nevertheless, these advantages are certainly welcome.

[58] Wright lists two events (Creation and Fall) followed by three 'actors' (Israel, Jesus, NT Church) without attending to the distinctions and commonalities between these categories; Wright, 'How Can the Bible Be Authoritative?', 19. Vanhoozer more commendably describes each act as being 'set in motion by an act of God'; Vanhoozer, *Drama of Doctrine*, 2-3. But the event of the fall, as part of Act 1 (Creation), is more difficult to integrate into the logical flow of the drama. As a major event in the drama, it initially appears as an inexplicable antithesis to God's initial creative act. See my next point for contrast.

responsibility (present) and hope (future) in the context of the covenant relationship.[59] Given the present location of the reader in Act 4 of the drama, its contents are readily applied to the praxis of the church. Third, it presents an integrated account of the various manifestations of the image in the canonical narrative. It provides a natural way to link the anthropological image with the Christological image, and the protological image with the eschatological image.

1.5 Genre: Constructive Theology

The present work is a constructive theology that makes much use of both the biblical text and of the fruit of biblical scholarship. It has been noted that the disciplines of biblical studies and systematic theology had parted ways since the rise of modern biblical scholarship, the latter of which had liberated itself from dogmatic constraints in preference for a descriptive historical endeavour.[60] In an effort to help bridge the divide between the two disciplines, I shall attempt to read biblical texts with a sensitivity to historical considerations without being strictly tied to them. Although I am inescapably situated in my own historical and theological context, an effort can still be made to discern the 'other' in the text. But because my aim is constructive theology, my reading and application of the text will ultimately be theological.

This study is distinctly pentecostal in its attention to the pneumatological, missional, canonical, narrative and participatory impulses of the pentecostal traditions. It is also intertraditional in that it seeks to engage sensitively with the academic and faith communities

---

[59] One may critique my rendering for being more anthropocentric than theocentric. But the *imago Dei* is created and commissioned by God to be God's representative in God's world, and exists only in reference to God himself. The attention to creaturely responsibility more easily flows into the complication of the fall. My pneumatological emphasis ensures that creaturely dependency is maintained.

[60] Joel B. Green and Max Turner, eds., *Between Two Horizons: Spanning New Testament Studies and Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2000), 1, 23–43; Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), xvi.

that reside outside of pentecostalism. I will consult Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Lutheran, Reformed-evangelical and pentecostal interlocutors and critically appropriate the useful materials uncovered. Although I stand within the broadly pentecostal and evangelical traditions, I will move beyond the confessional restraints of these traditions where I am compelled to do so by my interpretation of and reasoning from the sources.

This is also a theology of retrieval in that it seeks to be attentive not only to the relatively recent history of pentecostal-charismatic theological development, but also to the much longer history of the Christian tradition, some of which had been largely neglected among pentecostals until the emergence of the charismatic movement.[61] It is hoped that such an effort will yield resources for a broader perspective and consequently richer development of the traditional pentecostal doctrine of Spirit baptism. However, while it will engage in dialogue with historical sources, this project is not a historical theology.

1.5.1 The Use of Various Biblical Texts

Pentecostals have traditionally derived their distinctive theology primarily from the book of Acts, but have not self-consciously adopted an exclusively Lukan theology as their own. In acknowledging Luke as a 'theologian in his own right',[62] one need not expel Paul and John from the conversation. Luke's emphasis on the charismatic function of the Spirit, including external signs of Spirit-reception, corresponds well with pentecostal experience, but can result in deemphasising subtler works of the Spirit. It can sometimes be helpful to have a focussed

---

[61] More recent attempts at retrieval include: Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991); Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *Pneumatology: The Holy Spirit in Ecumenical, International, and Contextual Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002); Herschel Odell Bryant, *Spirit Christology in the Christian Tradition: From the Patristic Period to the Rise of Pentecostalism in the Twentieth Century* (Cleveland: CPT Press, 2014).

[62] Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology*, 11; I. Howard Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian*, third edition (Downers Grove: IVP, 1988), 16.

literary agenda. But cultivating a broader perspective is not only fitting for constructing an intertraditional theology, but will also enhance the pentecostal impulse to ground doctrine and experience in Scripture. Therefore, I will give attention to the Lukan corpus in view of the traditional pentecostal preference. But I will also draw freely from other biblical corpuses as legitimate sources for theological construction. An attempt will be made to read each text with a sensitivity to its own literary context before utilizing it for my own construction.

In this thesis, such terms as 'biblical' and 'canonical' will be used descriptively in referring to the texts of the Bible and at times the scholarship that has developed around the texts. They are not intended to function as confessional appeals to the Bible's authority. The term 'Scripture' carries more theological implications, which is not wholly antithetical to an academic constructive theology. But it will be used more in reference to various ecclesial traditions and not in an uncritically prescriptive manner.[63]

1.6 Outline of the Study

The limited scope of traditional treatments of Spirit baptism on the one hand, and, to a lesser extent, of the *imago Dei* on the other, suggests that a new approach may be in order. Given the pentecostal traditions' affinity for narrative, high view of the Bible and orientation towards experiential participation, a canonical-dramatic approach will be taken in the present work. Chapter 2 will provide a critical overview of the constructive approaches to the doctrine of baptism in the Holy Spirit. Attention will be given to the theological interpretations of pneumatological experience as well as the use of terms and metaphors in describing such experience. I will design an original typology of these models as a tool for classifying and

---

[63] But note that 'prescriptive' does not necessarily mean uncritical, nor is it without a place in academic dialogue.

analysing them. Chapter 3 provides a similar overview of the theological interpretations of the *imago Dei*. The various proposals will be critically described and compared, with special attention to their mutual compatibility as well as their coherence with the canonical story. Such an assessment prepares the way for retrieving and incorporating select elements into a theodramatic model. Chapter 4 begins with a substantial development of a covenantal *imago Dei* Spirit anthropology, which explores Adam's appointment as the *imago Dei* and represents Act 1 of the drama. In particular, the role of the image will be delineated according to the three covenantal aspects of sonship, shaping and sending. This will serve as a foundation for the following acts. The chapter will conclude with a shorter treatment of Act 2, depicting Israel's vocation and failure. Chapter 5 brings us to Act 3, and presents a covenantal *imago Dei* Spirit Christology corresponding to the foregoing anthropology. The self-emplotment of the Son of God as the divine-human *imago Dei* represents the climax of the drama, fulfilling the divine intent for the human creature and making way for the restoration of the image in the next act. Chapter 6 brings the story to Act 4, which is the immediate context of Spirit baptism. I will apply the now familiar pattern in constructing a covenantal *imago Dei* Spirit ecclesiology, which explores the role of the church who is pneumatologically united with Christ and therefore participates in his sonship, shaping and sending. Finally, having outlined the plot of the drama in the preceding chapters, I will present a dramatic *imago Dei* model of Spirit baptism in chapter 7. This will make use of the canonical-dramatic context to locate Pentecost as a decisive moment in the action. Therefore, chapter 7 is the culmination of the previous chapters, applying their resources to the doctrine of Spirit baptism, and ultimately arguing that Spirit baptism is the decisive dramatic moment in the participants' pneumatological experience that recreates them as the restored *imago Dei*.

In short, this thesis seeks to construct an ecumenically sensitive pentecostal account of Spirit baptism by examining its intersection with the concept of the *imago Dei*, building on the resources of previous dialogue and locating these themes within the larger context of a theodramatic plot that flows along the line of anthropology, Christology and ecclesiology. In so doing, it will overcome the limited narrative scope of previous approaches and provide a broader canonical context, and consequently richer theological content, for reshaping the pentecostal ecclesial identity as the Spirit-baptised image.

CHAPTER 2

AN OVERVIEW OF PENTECOSTAL MODELS OF SPIRIT BAPTISM

The birth of the Pentecostal movement at the beginning of the twentieth century took place

within the matrix of a particular set of conditions and influences. The combined heritage of

the Holiness, revivalist and Keswick movements was supplemented with the American

impulse towards primitivism and pragmatism.[1] Of particular interest is the Wesleyan-Holiness

notion of a 'second work of grace', which, although originally referring to entire

sanctification, John Fletcher designated as 'baptism with the Holy Ghost', and broadened to

include empowerment.[2] The Keswick movement would later promote widespread acceptance

of the empowerment emphasis with an alternate view of sanctification.[3] Finally, Charles

Parham contributed the doctrine of speaking in tongues as the initial evidence of Spirit

baptism based on the Acts narratives, a contribution which both reflects the pragmatism of his

day and sets the precedence for the NACP hermeneutic.[4]

In its first decade, proponents of the charismatic renewal adopted the NACP theology of

Spirit baptism and were primarily referred to as 'neo-Pentecostals'. Although participants in

---

[1] Grant Wacker held that primitivism and pragmatism were the major influences in the development of Classical Pentecostalism; Grant Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 11–14. Koo Dong Yun has argued that the most distinctive feature of Classical Pentecostalism is the verifiability of Spirit baptism, which concern he attributes to the influence of pragmatism. Koo Dong Yun, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: An Ecumenical Theology of Spirit baptism* (Oxford: University Press of America, 2003), 144–5, 152–3. On restorationism, see Donald W. Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* (Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, 1987), 25.

[2] Laurence W. Wood, *The Meaning of Pentecost in Early Methodism: Rediscovering John Fletcher as John Wesley's Vindicator and Designated Successor* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2002), xiv, passim; Wood argued that this development was sanctioned by Wesley, a thesis that was vigorously disputed by Donald Dayton. See the review by Dayton and the subsequent exchanges between Wood and Dayton from 2004 to 2006 in *Pneuma* 26.2–28.2. The two authors agree on Fletcher's position.
Wood has found the concept of subsequent Spirit baptism as sanctification in Pietist Gerhard Tersteegen (1697–1769); Wood, 'An Appreciative Reply to Donald W. Dayton's "Review Essay"', *Pneuma* 27.1 (2005): 171.

[3] Henry I. Lederle, *Treasures Old and New: Interpretations of 'Spirit-Baptism' in the Charismatic Renewal Movement* (Hendrickson, Peabody, 1988), 11–12.

[4] Parham understood tongues as xenolalia, authentic languages to be used for cross-cultural evangelisation; Anderson, *Pentecostalism*, 34.

the renewal chose to remain in their churches, the adoption of a theology foreign to their traditions created tensions within the churches. This prompted Kilian McDonnell to issue a call for participants to construct theologies of renewal indigenous to their respective traditions. The resulting effort among the charismatic theologians of the 1970s and early 1980s exhibited innovative theological developments, the fruits of which are only recently being reaped by contemporary Pentecostals. Mention should be made of 'Third Wave' movements which emerged in the late 1970s and are composed of evangelicals who embraced a self-consciously non-cessationist posture and emphasised the charismatic manifestations of power. Proponents identified themselves more with mainstream evangelicalism than with Pentecostalism, and eschewed the emphases on Spirit baptism and glossolalia. This chapter presents an overview of the constructive models of Spirit baptism from broadly pentecostal perspectives, followed by an analysis of these models with respect to the critical issues involved.

2.1 Descriptive Overview

In describing the existing pentecostal models of Spirit baptism, a brief study of the relevant typology will assist both our understanding and our analysis. South African born Presbyterian Henry I. Lederle, in his 1988 survey entitled *Treasures Old and New*, divided the various interpretations of Spirit baptism in the charismatic renewal into three types, though his typology was not strictly followed throughout the book. They are: neo-Pentecostal, sacramental, and integrative.[5] The neo-Pentecostal approaches followed Classical Pentecostalism in conceiving of Spirit baptism as non-repeatable experiences of the Spirit distinct from and usually subsequent to conversion, the primary purpose of which is

---

[5] Lederle, *Treasures*. This basic typology is reflected in the chapter divisions of his book, preceded by the first chapter entitled 'Pre-charismatic Interpretations of Spirit-Baptism', and followed by his own proposal.

empowerment for ministry. Any further 'fillings' of the Spirit is theologically distinguished from Spirit baptism. Sacramental proponents tend to identify Spirit baptism with the reception of the Spirit conferred through the initiatory rites of water baptism or confirmation. They interpret charismatic renewal experiences as subsequent releases of the already indwelling Spirit. The integrative models include those who see Spirit baptism as part of the larger process of Christian initiation and ongoing Christian experience outside of a sacramental framework. Their shared concern is to integrate Spirit baptism into the traditional understanding of the Christian faith, avoiding rigid multi-staged structures.[6] The ambiguity of this category is reflected in another, four-part list, which replaces it with two distinct models: Spirit baptism as 'the *final stage of Christian initiation*' and as 'a spiritual growth experience … milestone encounter'.[7] Elsewhere, Lederle identifies three 'positions' to be included in his 'integrative' category.[8] Lederle's ambiguity reflects both the broad diversity of existing positions and the deficiency of his typological approach.

As an alternative to Lederle's typology, I want to propose that there are five identifiable types of theologies regarding Spirit baptism. Interpretations among pentecostals can be logically divided into broad categories according to the definition of Spirit baptism either as an *empowerment* experience theologically distinct from conversion-initiation, or as an experience theologically integrated with the *conversion-initiation* complex.[9] Empowerment models include two distinct types. Type I models conceive of Spirit baptism as a non-

---

[6] Lederle, *Treasures*, 44–45, 144–7; also Lederle, *Theology with Spirit*, 109–10.
[7] Lederle, *Treasures*, 44.
[8] Lederle, *Treasures*, 146. These include a modified neo-Pentecostal non-staged empowerment view, a spiritual awakening/renewal view, which seems to have a sanctification element, and an initiation view that understands Spirit baptism as an aspect of regeneration, but with possibility of subsequent experiences.
[9] One could include a subclass of those who see Spirit baptism as referring to sanctification, but that is unnecessary here, since I will not be treating Holiness models.

repeatable, post-conversion passage into a distinct stage of empowerment. The Type II variation maintains the empowerment thesis, but conceives of the experience apart from a strict multi-staged scheme. Initiation models are also divided into two types, according to sacramental (Type III) and non-sacramental (Type IV) views of Christian initiation. A third category interprets Spirit baptism holistically as referring to the entire Christian experience (Type V). This yields five distinct types of pentecostal-charismatic constructive theologies of Spirit baptism: (I) the multi-staged empowerment model, (II) the non-staged empowerment model, (III) the sacramental initiation model, (IV) the non-sacramental initiation model and (V) the holistic model.[10] The following overview will proceed according to my five-part typology. In the first part of the chapter, I will illustrate each type by describing at least one representative theologian. The holistic model (Type V) requires treatment of both Amos Yong and Frank Macchia, two leading pentecostal theologians who present holistic models that are significantly distinct from one another. This will help to illustrate the variation that is possible, as well as the significance of their respective emphases on 'Spirit Christology' and 'Spirit-Baptiser' themes. I will also analyse and classify some prominent Pentecostal denominations according to their publicly posted statements of faith.[11] In the second part of the chapter I will analyse the various types and their proponents in order to identify the key questions involved in the dialogue. Such analysis will also help to retrieve valuable insights from existing models for my own constructive proposal.

---

[10] To my knowledge, this is a typology of my own origin, though I am indebted to Lederle's earlier example.
[11] Note that initiation and holistic models (types III–V) tend to represent charismatic movements within denominations rather than entire denominations, and for that reason, is less commonly found in official denominational statements of faith.

2.1.1 Type I: Multi-Staged Empowerment Model

The multi-staged empowerment model of Spirit baptism is most widely exemplified in Classical Pentecostalism, especially within the NACP stream. While its features were seminally present in early Pentecostalism, it was later developed into the typical form characterised by four basic assertions. First, Spirit baptism is said to serve the purpose of empowerment rather than salvation. Second, the experience is theologically distinct from and usually subsequent to regeneration. Third, Spirit baptism is usually understood to be non-repeatable, as distinct from subsequent repeatable experiences of being 'filled' with the Spirit. Fourth, it is marked by the initial external evidence of glossolalia.[12] Consequently, Spirit baptism marks an identifiable transition into a distinct stage of missional empowerment. The present work will treat the mature model.

2.1.1.1 Myer Pearlman

Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible by Assemblies of God theologian Myer Pearlman was the first Pentecostal 'systematic theology' in the sense of a book-length topical presentation of the traditional theological loci.[13] He made a distinction between the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and the baptism in the Holy Spirit. The former commences at the moment of faith and repentance and is equated with regeneration.[14] The latter is a distinct and subsequent

---

[12] Note that while the early Pentecostals considered glossolalia the *initial external* evidence, it was not necessarily immediate. 'A person may not speak in tongues for a week after the baptism [of the Spirit], but as soon as he gets to praying or praising God in the liberty of the Spirit, the tongues will follow'; *The Apostolic Faith* 1.11, (October 1907 to January 1908), p. 2; http://www.apostolicfaith.org/Library/Index/AzusaPapers.aspx. This would change in later Pentecostalism. I am indebted to Steven Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality*, 85, for this citation.

[13] Writing in 1937, Pearlman describes his work as a combination of biblical and systematic theology. Pearlman, *Doctrines*, 12.

[14] Pearlman, *Doctrines*, 307. He later cites Rom 8:9, 14, 16; 5:5; 1 Peter 1:11; 1 Cor 6:17; Gal 4:6; 1 Jn 3:24; 4:13 to support this point.

impartation of power. Pearlman regards the purpose of Spirit baptism as 'power for service and not regeneration for eternal life'.[15] He also argues that the disciples, previous to the day of Pentecost, were already in relationship with Christ, had received the Holy Spirit, and were waiting for empowerment.[16] He adds, 'It may be objected that all this relates to the disciples before Pentecost; but in Acts 8:12–16 we have an instance of people baptized in water by Philip, yet receiving the Holy Spirit some days later'.[17] Pearlman explains that the term 'baptism' 'is used figuratively to describe immersion in the energizing power of the Divine Spirit', but also notes that the language of 'filling with the Spirit' can be used synonymously, as on the day of Pentecost.[18] Pearlman lists a variety of expressions as indicative of this experience: 'Whenever we read of the Spirit coming upon, resting upon, falling upon, or filling people, the reference is never to the saving work of the Spirit but always to power for service'.[19] Regarding the initial evidence of Spirit baptism, Pearlman argues that whenever the 'results of the impartation' are recorded, 'there is always an immediate, supernatural, outward expression, … and in every case there is an ecstatic speaking in a language that the person has never learned'.[20] Pearlman's insistence on immediacy stands in contrast to early Pentecostals.[21]

---

[15] Pearlman, *Doctrines*, 309; commenting on Acts 1:8.

[16] John 14:17; 20:22; Pearlman, *Doctrines*, 309. It should be noted that Pearlman does not state, but strongly implies, that John 20:22 narrates a real impartation of the Spirit from Christ to the disciples.

[17] Pearlman, *Doctrines*, 309.

[18] Acts 2:4; Pearlman, *Doctrines*, 310.

[19] Pearlman, *Doctrines*, 309.

[20] Pearlman, *Doctrines*, 313. Pearlman lists Acts 2:1–4; 10:44–46; and 19:1–6 as instances of this manifestation, and Acts 8:14–19 as an implied instance, p. 310.

[21] See *The Apostolic Faith* 1.11, 2, quoted in n. 12 above. Other proponents include E. S. Williams, Stanley Horton, Howard Ervin, and Gordon Anderson.

2.1.1.2 Contemporary Pentecostal Denominations

Most contemporary Pentecostal denominations in the Western world follow the NACP view of Spirit baptism but exhibit some variation in their statements of faith. The World Assemblies of God Fellowship is the largest Classical Pentecostal body in the world.[22] Its statement of faith affirms the basic NACP distinctives: 'We believe that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is the bestowing of the believer with *power* for life and service for Christ. This experience is *distinct* from and *subsequent* to the new birth, is received by faith, and is accompanied by the manifestation of speaking in *tongues* as the Spirit gives utterance as the *initial evidence*'.[23]

The originating body of the WAGF, the Assemblies of God (USA), has a more extensive statement.[24] Statement 7 of their 'Statement of Fundamental Truths' reads:

> All believers are entitled to and should ardently expect and earnestly seek … the baptism in the Holy Spirit and fire. … With it comes the enduement of power for life and service, the bestowment of the gifts and their uses in the work of the ministry. This experience is distinct from and subsequent to the experience of the new birth. With the baptism in the Holy Spirit come such experiences as:
> - an overflowing fullness of the Spirit
> - a deepened reverence for God
> - an intensified consecration to God and dedication to His work
> - and a more active love for Christ, for His Word and for the lost.[25]

---

[22] Hereafter, WAGF.

[23] World Assemblies of God Fellowship Constitution and By-Laws, Article 2, Statement 9, http://worldagfellowship.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/WAGF-Const-Bylaws.pdf; accessed 28 January 2013. Italics mine. The statement cites: Luke 24:49; Acts 1:8; 2:1–4; 8:15–19; 11:14–17; 19:1–7. Note that in this statement, the WAGF follows Pearlman on immediate evidence, rather than the early Pentecostals.

[24] Hereafter, Assemblies of God will be abbreviated as AG.

[25] Assemblies of God 'Statement of Fundamental Truths', http://ag.org/top/Beliefs/Statement_of_Fundamental_Truths/sft_full.cfm; accessed 28 January 2013. Also see Statement 8 for tongues as 'initial physical evidence'. I have omitted the links to the referenced scriptures. The statement cites: empowerment/gifts: Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4, 8; 1 Cor 12:1–31; distinct/subsequent: Acts 8:12–17; 10:44–46; 11:14–16; 15:7–9; fullness: John 7:37–39; Acts 4:8; reverence: Acts 2:43; Hebrews 12:28; consecration: Acts 2:42; love: Mark 16:20.

In addition to affirmations of the WAGF, The AG statement specifies that spiritual gifts are given with Spirit baptism rather than at conversion. This potentially misleading statement is clarified in the AG position paper 'Baptism in the Holy Spirit', which explains that while all Christians may exhibit spiritual gifts, Spirit baptism grants access to a class of 'supernatural' gifts, listed in 1 Corinthians 12:7–10, which were previously unavailable.[26] They also associate Spirit baptism with an effect of intensified sanctification distinct in nature from Wesleyan 'entire sanctification'.[27] The Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada also adopts a similar position, but describes Spirit baptism as 'an experience in which the believer yields control of himself to the Holy Spirit'.[28] Sanctification is not only a result, but also a means to the experience. The Statement of Faith for the Assemblies of God in Great Britain states that Spirit baptism is an empowerment experience, the 'essential biblical evidence' of which is glossolalia.[29] The word 'essential' is a stronger affirmation of evidential tongues. The statement implies but does not explicitly affirm subsequence. Finally, the Holiness-Pentecostal denomination, the Church of God, exhibits a three-stage model, affirming

---

[26] Assemblies of God position paper, 'Baptism in the Holy Spirit', 3, 10; http://ag.org/top/Beliefs/Position_Papers/pp_downloads/PP_Baptism_In_the_Holy_Spirit.pdf; accessed 17 October 2012.

[27] 'Baptism in the Holy Spirit'. Also see Statement 9 on sanctification.
The Australian Christian Churches holds a similar position to the American AG. Australian Christian Churches, 'Doctrinal Basis', http://www.acc.org.au/AboutUs/WhatWeBelieve/DoctrinalBasis.aspx; accessed 28 January 2013. Their statement affirms the provision for every believer 'to be made pure in heart and wholly sanctified' through the Spirit, the blood of Jesus and the Word of God, citing John 17:15–19; Acts 15:8–9; Rom 12:1–2; 1 Thess 4:3–4; 5:23–24; Heb 2:11; 10:16–19. This suggests a Wesleyan entire sanctification, but not explicitly as a subsequent experience. For the sanctification element in Spirit baptism, see their shorter statement at: http://www.acc.org.au/AboutUs/WhatWeBelieve.aspx.

[28] The Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada, *General Constitution and By-Laws* (2010), 'Article 5: Statement of Fundamental and Essential Truths', 5.6.3; http://http://www.paoc.org/upload/files2/docs/Stmt%20of%20Fundamental%20and%20Essential%20Truths.pdf; accessed 28 January 2013; citing Matt. 3:11; Acts 1:5; Eph. 5:18.

[29] From the Statement of Faith of the Assemblies of God Great Britain, 1.7; email attachment from AG (GB) office to author, 25 February 2013. The statement cites Acts 1:4–5, 8, 2:4, 10:44–46, 11:14–16, and 19:6.

'sanctification subsequent to the new birth' as well as 'the baptism with the Holy Ghost subsequent to a clean heart', with the 'initial evidence' of 'speaking with other tongues'.[30]

2.1.2 Type II: Non-Staged Empowerment Model

Proponents of the non-staged empowerment model agree with Classical Pentecostals that Spirit baptism is distinct from Christian initiation and primarily functions to empower believers for ministry and mission. But they deny that Spirit baptism constitutes a liminal experience leading into a distinct stage of spiritual progress marked by empowerment. They affirm the occurrence of empowerment experiences, and may to various degrees identify such experiences as 'baptism in the Holy Spirit'. But they reject the use of multi-staged structures.

2.1.2.1 Francis A. Sullivan

Francis Sullivan is a Roman Catholic and a sacramentalist who rejects the sacramental initiation model of Spirit baptism, which enjoys semi-official Roman Catholic support, being outlined in the Malines Document I.[31] He agrees that the Holy Spirit is initially given through the sacrament of baptism.[32] But he rejects McDonnell's distinction between the 'theological' and the 'experiential' aspects of the singular reality of Spirit baptism.[33] Rather, subsequent experiences of a 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' are real impartations of the Spirit, different in kind from that given at initiation, which move the subject into a 'new state of grace'.[34] But for

---

[30] From the Church of God, 'Declaration of Faith'; http://www.churchofgod.org/beliefs/declaration-of-faith; accessed 2 November 2016.
[31] *Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal: Malines Document I*, in *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Vol. III – International Documents*, ed. Kilian McDonnell (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1980), 82. The Type III (sacramental initiation) model will be treated in section 2.1.3.
[32] Sullivan, *Charisms and Charismatic Renewal: A Biblical and Theological Study* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1982), 60.
[33] Sullivan, *Charisms*, 63.
[34] Sullivan, email to author, 1 March 2013.

Sullivan, a 'new state of grace' is not a passage into a distinct new *stage* of spiritual progress. Rather, it is an impartation that grants fresh power.

Sullivan notes that the sacrament of baptism is absent from Acts 2:1–4, and was not prior to Spirit baptism in Acts 10. He concludes that Spirit baptism can be conferred apart from the sacraments and that 'baptize' should be taken in the figurative sense of being 'immersed in' or 'drenched' with the Spirit.[35] Accordingly, he also understands the Day of Pentecost and other experiences of Spirit baptism as post-initiatory.[36] Sullivan interprets synonymously the various expressions used to indicate Spirit impartation in Acts, such as 'baptize', 'pour out', 'give', 'receive', 'being filled with', 'come', 'fall upon'. In each case, there is a real impartation of the Spirit in the theological sense.[37] Consequently, he considers Spirit baptism to be a repeatable experience, although he prefers to speak of a new 'outpouring of the Spirit', which does not carry the sacramental and 'once-in-a-lifetime' connotations suggested by the term 'baptism'.[38]

Sullivan also argues that biblical instances of Spirit baptism include a conscious awareness of the Spirit's work. In Acts 2, 8, and 19, the gift of the Spirit is accompanied by 'experiential evidence'.[39] He cites Paul's argument in Galatians 3:2–5 as an indication that for Paul as for

---

[35] Sullivan, *Charisms*, 65. In adopting this view against conventional Catholic interpretations, Sullivan cites Thomas Aquinas in support of the possibility of new 'sendings' of the Spirit which can move the recipient into new states of grace; Sullivan, *Charisms*, 70–2; Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (ebook; Grand Rapids: CCEL, http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa.pdf; accessed 23 Oct 2013), 1.43.6, rep. 2.

[36] Sullivan, *Charisms*, 59–61. Sullivan confirmed in an email exchange that he views subsequent empowerment impartations of the Spirit as different in kind from that given at initiation, bringing the person 'into a new state of grace'. In this he agrees with Pentecostals, except that he sees these experiences as being repeatable; email, 1 March 2013.

[37] Sullivan, *Charisms*, 66.

[38] Sullivan, *Charisms*, 73–75.

[39] Sullivan, *Charisms*, 66–67.

Luke, the reception of the Spirit was accompanied by a conscious experience of the Spirit's power working in them.[40] He concludes that contemporary experiences of empowerment should also result in 'some kind of experienced change in that person's Christian life'.[41] Regarding the kinds of 'evidence' presented, Sullivan agrees with the Malines Document that (1) Spirit baptism is 'not in any way tied to tongues' and (2) the experiential dimension of Spirit baptism can be manifested as a gradual growth process and 'need not be a matter of immediate experience'.[42] Besides tongues and prophecy, Sullivan quotes Luke's description of the early Christian community as an 'ongoing experience of the presence of the Spirit'.[43] Presumably, one should expect to see a variety of signs and wonders as well as a growth in unity and generosity. Sullivan retains the thesis that renewal experiences confer charisms for the purpose of enabling some kind of task or service.[44] Regarding the lack of conscious experiences at water baptism, he writes, 'When a person is sacramentally baptized, we have the assurance of our faith that he or she has been moved into the "state of grace". We do not need any experiential confirmation of this, nor are we accustomed to expect any, since most often the recipient of the sacrament is an infant'.[45]

2.1.2.2 Elim Pentecostal Churches

The Elim Pentecostal Churches in the UK adopts a broadly defined doctrine of Spirit baptism that is best described as a non-staged empowerment model. Their statement of faith reads: 'the believer is also promised an enduement of power as the gift of Christ through the baptism

---

[40] Sullivan, *Charisms*, 67–68.
[41] Sullivan, *Charisms*, 74.
[42] Sullivan, *Charisms*, 68–69. The first quote is from the Malines Document, and the second is in Sullivan's own words.
[43] Acts 19:6; 2:43–47.
[44] Sullivan, *Charisms*, 78–79.
[45] Sullivan, *Charisms*, 74.

in the Holy Spirit with signs following. Through this enduement the believer is empowered for fuller participation in the ministry of the Church, its worship, evangelism and service'.[46] The statement retains the Pentecostal insistence that Spirit baptism is theologically distinct from conversion and for the purpose of empowerment. But while the phrasing, 'the believer is also promised', implies subsequence, the question is left unaddressed. The content of 'signs following' is unspecified, allowing for a broad range of phenomena, as well as the possibility of a delay before the sign is given. Absent from the Elim statement is any explicit mention of tongues. The result is a broad statement that leaves Spirit baptism temporally fluid, potentially occurring at conversion without tongues. Interpretation on these issues is varied among members of Elim, but most would expect the event to be accompanied by some phenomena.[47] The lack of insistence on the NACP distinctives of subsequence and evidential tongues are characteristic of Type II models.[48]

2.1.3 Type III: Sacramental Initiation Model

The sacramental initiation model arises from the attempt to construct an understanding of charismatic renewal experiences within the pre-existing framework of sacramental theology. Within this framework the Spirit is imparted through the initiation sacraments, usually with

---

[46] Elim Pentecostal Churches, 'Fundamental Truths', http://www.elim.org.uk/Groups/112249/What_we_believe.aspx; accessed 28 January 2013.

[47] Keith Warrington, New Testament lecturer and Vice-Principal at Regents Theological College (Elim's official training centre), affirms subsequence in a lay-level exposition of this statement. *The Message: Elim's Core Beliefs* (Elim Training, n.d.), 24–25. He also affirms the evidential status of tongues (*The Message*, 60–61). Simo Frestadius, also a lecturer at RTC, concurs with my interpretation of the statement, that Spirit baptism is distinct from conversion, temporally fluid, and evidenced by various signs. He personally holds to this basic position, adding that a 'delay' in the sign may occur only in unusual cases caused by a lack of opportunity for immediate expression of the sign; emails to author, 9 September and 10 October, 2013.

[48] Another example of the non-staged empowerment model is that of Charles Hummel, who understands the metaphor of Spirit baptism to be flexible and applicable to either conversion or subsequent repeatable 'fillings' of the Spirit for empowerment. Like Sullivan, he makes no distinction between initial and subsequent empowerment and rejects the division of the Christian life into 'stages'; Charles E. Hummel, *Fire in the Fireplace: Contemporary Charismatic Renewal* (Oxford: Mowbrays, 1979), 167, 169, 172.

the emphasis on baptism, though some would place the impartation at confirmation.[49]

Renewal experiences are understood as subsequent releases of the grace given at initiation. By locating the whole deposit of grace at the beginning of the Christian life, this model paves the way for the more holistic models that follow. Although many sacramentalists expect glossolalia as a part of the renewal experience, it is not as rigidly or pervasively held as in the multi-staged empowerment model.[50]

2.1.3.1 Kilian McDonnell

Kilian McDonnell argues that Spirit baptism belongs to sacramental Christian initiation and not to a later stage.[51] He prefers to see initiation as a complex and unified whole, with the gift of the Spirit being fluidly associated with various rites.[52] Nevertheless, he emphasises water baptism as the point at which the Spirit is given. He observes that 'In Paul the supreme moment for the imparting of the Spirit is baptism'.[53] Likewise, Luke includes Spirit reception in 'the full rite of Christian initiation'. But he also acknowledges that 'Luke presents a certain ambiguity since he both distinguishes between water-bath and the coming of the Spirit, and establishes a pattern relating the two'.[54]

According to the Malines Document I, for which McDonnell prepared the basic text, the language of Spirit baptism is used in two senses in the charismatic renewal: theological and

---

[49] See Stephen B. Clark, *Confirmation and the 'Baptism of the Holy Spirit'* (Pecos, NM: Dove, 1969). Clark understands Spirit baptism as an appropriation of the grace given at confirmation.
[50] Other notable representatives of this position include: Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan, Simon Tugwell, Donald Gelpi, Edward O'Connor, Rene Laurentin. Gelpi takes a panentheistic turn in his basically sacramentalist position, but does not offer much to the questions at hand that is relevantly unique.
[51] McDonnell, 'The Holy Spirit and Christian Initiation', in *The Holy Spirit and Power: The Catholic Charismatic Renewal*, ed. Kilian McDonnell (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975), 81.
[52] McDonnell, 'Holy Spirit', 77.
[53] McDonnell, 'Holy Spirit', 73.
[54] McDonnell, 'Holy Spirit', 74.

experiential. The theological sense refers to sacramental initiation, at which time the Spirit is imparted. The experiential sense refers to subsequent experience, 'the moment or the growth process in virtue of which the Spirit, given during the celebration of initiation, comes to conscious experience'.[55] This distinction between the objective impartation and the subjective experience is the key to the sacramental interpretation. McDonnell considers the latter experience as one of an immediate, direct, concrete presence of the person of Jesus, or of the power of the Holy Spirit.[56]

Lederle questions the distinction made by sacramentalists between the theological dimension, located at initiation, and the experiential dimension, located in a subsequent experience. He suggests that there is an experiential aspect to infant baptism, even if the child does not form permanent memories of the event. There is also a theological dimension to the renewal experience.[57] According to Lederle, 'The major disadvantage of this interpretation is that the renewal experience cannot be seen as … something that God is doing in people's lives at the time at which they experience it. … It is merely a change in the believer's subjective awareness'.[58] Contrary to Lederle, the renewal experience is not interpreted as merely a matter of subjective awareness, but as a release of the Spirit's dynamic power and grace latent in the believer.[59] McDonnell clarifies, 'Nor is it just a psychological moment. Rather it is the sovereign act of Christ now actualized in a new way in the new subjective dispositions and openness'.[60]

---

[55] 'Malines Document I', 82; also see 'The Holy Spirit and Christian Initiation', 82.
[56] McDonnell, 'Holy Spirit', 74.
[57] Lederle, *Treasures*, 108.
[58] Lederle, *Treasures*, 109.
[59] Consider, for instance, Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals* (Paramus, NJ: Paulist Press, 1969), 129 and Dorothy Ranaghan, 'Baptism in the Holy Spirit', *As the Spirit Leads Us*, ed. Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan (Paramus, NJ: Paulist Press, 1971), 8.
[60] Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 84–5.

2.1.4 Type IV: Non-Sacramental Initiation Model

The non-sacramental initiation model rejects the NACP subsequence thesis and associates Spirit baptism theologically with Christian conversion-initiation, but does not identify the sacrament(s) as the means of Spirit reception. These interpretations affirm that the Spirit is wholly given at the beginning of the Christian life. Although they affirm the reality of subsequent 'renewal' experiences, they seek to integrate these experiences conceptually with initiation. While drawing some insights from the sacramental model, they do not embrace the core sacramental thesis.

2.1.4.1 Thomas A. Smail

Thomas Smail was a Scottish charismatic ordained in the Church of Scotland and subsequently in the Church of England. Reflecting the Christocentric Trinitarianism of his mentor, Karl Barth, he understands the work of the Spirit in charismatic renewal to be intimately connected with the person and work of Christ. Wary of all that is individualistic, fanatical, and sectarian, he insists that the goal of the Spirit is to manifest the glory of Christ in the Church.[61] Just as the Son is the image who reflects the glory of God, so Christians 'are being changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another'.[62] 'The Holy Spirit is engaged in a dynamic mediation that has its starting place in the glory of Christ and its destination in the experience of the community of believers. … He changes us into the likeness of the Lord'.[63]

---

[61] Thomas A. Smail, *Reflected Glory: The Spirit in Christ and Christians* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1975), 20–23.
[62] Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 27; citing Col 1:15; Heb 1:3; and 2 Cor 3:18.
[63] Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 29.

The essence of the Spirit's work is to facilitate the Christian's participation in Christ. 'Jesus is the original prototype of the spiritual man, and everything that happens in us by the Spirit is reflection [*sic*] of what has happened in him'.[64] The Spirit shapes us into the likeness of Christ in three ways. First, he brings us into Christ's filial relationship with the Father, by which we participate in his work of prayer and intercession. Second, he brings us into the likeness of Christ's character, and so sanctifies us. Third, he brings us into the likeness of Christ's power, by which we can do his works.[65] Note the threefold identification with Christ in sonship, sanctification, and empowerment, which correspond to the three stages of the Holiness-Pentecostal model, though held together as one.

Smail observes that there is no uniform pattern in Acts regarding the experience of the Spirit. But he argues that the New Testament assumes Christians to have already experienced at initiation the full release of the Spirit, and that the experiences of the Samaritans and of the Ephesians are subnormal exceptions. [66] Smail rejects the subsequence thesis because it falsely dichotomises between Christ's work and that of the Spirit, and implies that there is something lacking in what one receives at conversion.[67] He also denies the Pentecostal doctrine of evidential tongues. While God may graciously confer the gift on some Christians when they are filled with the Spirit, this is not to be formulated as a law. The Spirit is endlessly creative in the way he shapes Christian experience.[68]

---

[64] Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 52.
[65] Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 55.
[66] Acts 8, 19; Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 42.
[67] Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 43–44. Chapter 3 of his book is devoted to denouncing what he calls 'the second blessing presentation' of the Pentecostals, along with the initial evidence doctrine.
[68] Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 43.

Water baptism is the key initiatory rite by which believers enter into conscious participation in Christ and his kingdom. The baptismal act is a confession of faith that results from regeneration and by which the believer shares in the death and resurrection of Christ, receives the Holy Spirit and is commissioned and empowered for Christ's witness and service.[69] Smail insists on the unity of the initiation complex of regeneration, experiential participation in Christ and the Spirit, and baptism.[70] He defines Spirit baptism as 'that aspect of Christian initiation in which, through expectant and appropriating faith in Christ's promises, the indwelling Holy Spirit manifests himself in our experience, so that he works in and through us with freedom and effectiveness as he first worked … in the manhood of Christ'.[71] In so stating, Smail places Spirit baptism in the *context* of initiation into participation in Christ. Yet he defines the *content* of Spirit baptism in terms of manifestation and empowerment.[72] Note that water baptism is, in this context, 'the expression and proclamation' of the experience, rather than a sacramental means. Smail uses explicitly sacramental language in his later works.[73]

The distinction Smail makes between *context* and *content* is critical. For Smail, the empowering experience of the Spirit is a part of the initiation complex and normally

---

[69] Rom 10:9; 6:4; Acts 2:38; Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 87–88. He distinguished three elements of initiation as: (1) regeneration, which is the basis of initiation, (2) entry into participation in Christ, which results from confession, repentance, and faith, and (3) 'The expression and proclamation of this in the rite of being baptized in water'; p. 88. In his later work, Smail describes both infant baptism and the Eucharist in a distinctly Reformed manner, without explicitly affirming baptismal regeneration; Smail, *The Giving Gift: The Holy Spirit in Person* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1988), 82, 194.
[70] Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 88–89.
[71] Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 141.
[72] Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 142–3.
[73] Smail's ambiguity in *Reflected Glory* regarding the sacramental function of baptism reflects his uncertainty at the time of writing: 'Nor do I wish here to take any stand on the relationship of the sacramental aspect—water-baptism—to [regeneration and entry into participation in Christ]'; Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 87–8. He later refers to baptism as 'the sacrament of our regeneration' and 'the sacrament of our commissioning into [Jesus'] messianic mission'; Smail, *The Giving Gift*, 176–7.

accompanies conversion, but is theologically distinct from regeneration. This is clearly illustrated in his treatment of the Samaria narrative. The Spirit was already active in the Samaritans' conversion experience under Philip. 'But there was a receiving of the Spirit which was not regenerative, but which showed itself in a new release of the Spirit in freedom, power and gifts'.[74] Helpfully he states, 'We can pinpoint the difference between us and second blessing Pentecostalism by saying that for us the norm of New Testament initiation is Cornelius rather than Samaria. In Cornelius we see the twin promises of Acts 2:38 fulfilled in complete unity with each other'.[75] Conversion and charismatic expression are one. The situation in Samaria is defective.[76] This naturally raises the question of why the 'Cornelius' experience is not common in our day. Smail's explanation for the prevalence of defective experience is that contemporary ecclesial teaching has largely neglected the Spirit's empowering work, resulting in a lack of expectation in the church.[77]

Smail presents initiation as one integrated reality consisting of two aspects: regeneration and empowerment, the latter of which is identified as Spirit baptism.[78] Although it is theoretically integrated with initiation, he acknowledges that Spirit baptism does not usually accompany conversion in contemporary experience. This, in combination with the theological distinction he makes between Spirit baptism and regeneration, results in a position that agrees practically with the Pentecostal model in significant respects. Spirit baptism is distinct from and usually, though subnormally, subsequent to conversion. But Smail also insists that Spirit baptism is theologically inseparable from the initiation complex.

---

[74] Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 147.
[75] Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 145.
[76] Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 146.
[77] Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 148.
[78] Hence Smail's model could also be classified as a hybrid (non-sacramental) initiation-empowerment model.

2.1.5 Type V: Holistic Models

Holistic models identify Spirit baptism with the whole of the Christian experience. Although some proponents may use the term loosely in reference to a variety of events, it is not limited to particular moments within the Christian life. Spirit baptism is an ongoing, all-encompassing, experiential reality. The holistic approach was already anticipated in the Type III model, which included both the initial impartation at baptism and subsequent renewal experiences under the one reality of Spirit baptism. Simon Tugwell developed a sacramental-holistic model that located Spirit reception at water baptism, but also emphasised the unity of the entire Christian experience.[79]

2.1.5.1 Amos Yong

Amos Yong is currently the most prolific contemporary pentecostal theologian, addressing a wide range of issues such as science, disability and theology of religions, in addition to the traditional loci. His brief treatment of Spirit baptism is found in his book, *The Spirit Poured Out*, in which he subsumes the entire salvation experience under the metaphor of Spirit baptism. He follows Smail in using Spirit Christology as a framework for understanding Spirit baptism. 'Jesus is the revelation of God precisely as the man anointed by the Spirit of God to herald and usher in the reign of God'.[80] Christ's self-understanding is encapsulated in his appropriation of Isaiah 61:1: 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me …'. Being the Spirit-anointed revelation of God means that not only is he anointed to do the works, but his life in

---

[79] Simon Tugwell, *Did You Receive the Spirit?* Rev. Ed. (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1979), 47, 85–6. For economy of space and typological clarity, I have omitted Tugwell's work in favour of the more fully developed and confessionally pentecostal treatments of Amos Yong and Frank Macchia. But Tugwell should be acknowledged as a transitional model between the sacramental and the holistic models.
[80] Yong, *Spirit Poured Out*, 86.

its entirety was 'of the Spirit'.[81] Correspondingly, the promise of Spirit baptism to the disciples is the promise of the Spirit's anointing of Jesus.[82]

In contrast to Smail, Yong understands Spirit baptism to be more than initiation or empowerment. It comprises the whole salvation experience, understood as union with Christ the anointed one in his life, death and resurrection, with all the benefits thereof. Through Spirit baptism, the believer participates in the resurrection of Christ, by which the way is opened to doing the works of Christ.[83] Yong sees salvation, and therefore Spirit baptism, as both a 'once-for-all reception' and a gradual process. He also acknowledges the possibility of subsequent crisis experiences of empowerment as well as sanctification.[84] As a metaphor for the salvation experience, Spirit baptism is divided into three logical moments: the initial conversion experience of receiving the Spirit, the ongoing experience of being filled with the Spirit and future full baptism 'resulting in union with the triune God'.[85]

In understanding the entire salvation experience as Spirit baptism, Yong hopes to highlight its dynamic eschatological nature and thereby overcome various impasses: reconciliation vs. transformation, divine initiative vs. human response, Spirit baptism as conversion-initiation vs. subsequent empowerment, and eternal security vs. the possibility of apostasy.[86] In short, Yong attempts to use this favoured pentecostal metaphor in a thoroughgoing holistic approach

---

[81] Luke 4:18–19; Yong, *Spirit Poured Out*, 87.
[82] Luke 24:49; Yong, *Spirit Poured Out*, 88.
[83] Yong, *Spirit Poured Out*, 101.
[84] Yong, *Spirit Poured Out*, 99. Here he finds agreement in Pentecostal pioneer David Wesley Myland (1858–1943); see Douglas Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit: Theologies of the Early Pentecostal Movement* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003), 117–20.
[85] Yong, *Spirit Poured Out*, 105–6.
[86] Yong, *Spirit Poured Out*, 117–120.

to soteriology. But note that Yong's model is anthropological, in contrast to the cosmic scope of Frank Macchia's model, which will be treated in the next section.

2.1.5.2 Frank D. Macchia

Contemporary Assemblies of God theologian Frank Macchia expands the metaphor of Spirit baptism beyond Yong's holistically anthropocentric-soteriological model to include the entire range of the Spirit's activity in redeeming the world.[87] He then seeks to use the metaphor as an organising principle for pentecostal theology with applications for Christology, ecclesiology and the Christian life. Macchia sees Spirit baptism as God's act of inaugurating his kingdom in history, leading ultimately to the transformation of the cosmos.[88] He argues that the promise of Spirit baptism is related to the kingdom of God, and is therefore 'apocalyptic' rather than ecclesial in reference. Consequently, Spirit baptism is to be understood primarily in relation to the Messiah's final salvific act of ushering in the kingdom, more than its present function in ecclesial life.[89]

The outpouring of the Holy Spirit represents the coming of the presence of God, along with the 'powers of the age to come', to 'deliver creation from the reign of death unto the reign of life'.[90] The kingdom of God involves the renewal of all creation by the dynamic presence of Christ through the indwelling of the Spirit. Spirit baptism, then, makes creation to participate in Christ as the King and in the Spirit as the kingdom.[91] In support of the identification of the

---

[87] This interpretation was also held by Larry Hart. 'Spirit Baptism: A Dimensional Charismatic Perspective', in *Perspectives on Spirit Baptism: Five Views*, ed. Chad Brand (Nashville: B & H, 2004), 111.
[88] Frank D. Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006), 59, 124.
[89] Matt 3:1–2; Acts 1:3, 6; Macchia, *Baptized*, 85–6.
[90] Heb 6:5; Macchia, *Baptized*, 91, 96.
[91] Macchia, *Baptized*, 89, 95.

Spirit with the kingdom, Macchia cites Gregory of Nyssa: 'The Spirit is a living and a substantial and distinctly subsisting kingdom with which the only begotten Christ is anointed and is king of all that is'.[92] He accordingly infers that 'Spirit baptism is the means by which creation is transformed by this kingdom and made to participate in its reign of life'.[93]

Sensitive to the possibility of reading alienating notions into the idea of divine authority and reign, Macchia insists that God's kingdom is a liberating reign of self-giving divine love.[94] In keeping with the Pauline association of the Spirit with divine love, he understands Spirit baptism as the baptism of all creation into the love of God as a transformative field of experience.[95] This transformation is to be understood as both healing and sanctifying.[96] The Spirit brings the kingdom of God to people in acts of deliverance.[97] By the Spirit, creation is drawn into the communion of intra-Trinitarian divine love, by which death is overthrown and the reign of life is established.[98] Ultimately, all creation is redeemed and transformed to become the temple of God.[99]

---

[92] Macchia, *Baptized*, 89. This quote, erroneously attributed to *On the Lord's Prayer*, was in fact taken from Gregory's *On the Holy Spirit*. See Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Holy Spirit*, in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, Second Series, vol. 5, trans. William Moore and Henry Austin Wilson, ed. Philip Schaff (New York: Christian Literature Publishing, 1892; PDF ebook, Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf205.html; accessed 14 June 2011), 508; hereafter *NPNF*. Better support for this notion is found in the former work: 'He who prays for the coming of the Kingdom invokes the alliance of the Holy Spirit. For in that Gospel, instead of "Thy Kingdom come", it is written, "Thy Holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us". … A creation is necessarily under subjection and subjection is not Kingdom. But the Holy Spirit is Kingdom. He is then distinct from created nature'; Gregory of Nyssa, *Five Homilies on the Lord's Prayer*, Discourse Three; http://www.orthodoxprayer.org/Articles_files/Lord%27s%20Prayer/3.%20Hallowed%20Be.pdf; accessed 5 April 2013.
[93] Macchia, *Baptized*, 89.
[94] Macchia, *Baptized*, 46.
[95] Rom 5:5; Macchia, *Baptized*, 56, 60, 124.
[96] Macchia, *Baptized*, 48.
[97] Matt 12:28; Macchia, *Baptized*, 59.
[98] Macchia, *Baptized*, 124, 129.
[99] Macchia, *Baptized*, 106, 191.

For the believer and the church, Spirit baptism is union with God and participation in his kingdom. The Spirit and the kingdom is experienced as a foretaste of the future, the ultimate redemption yet to come. The realm of the Spirit becomes the context for the whole of Christian life.[100] As participation in the kingdom, it is both soteriological and charismatic.[101] Macchia agrees with Dunn that Spirit baptism in Luke-Acts, as part of the conversion-initiation complex, is the decisive sign of the Christian identity.[102] But he also affirms with Menzies and Stronstad that the prophetic calling and empowerment for service are essential to Luke's understanding of Spirit baptism.[103] From the moment of initiation every Christian is ordained as an inspired prophet to praise God and serve others.[104] Macchia's blend of the initiatory and missional themes reflects the complementary emphases found in Paul and Luke respectively.[105] But he notes that the broader theme of the kingdom of God includes not only proclamation, but also *community*. 'In Acts, powerful moments in the Spirit enriched praise and *koinonia*, created devotion to the teaching of the apostles, inspired the common meal, and broke down barriers between estranged people'.[106]

Macchia eschews the tendency of Classical Pentecostalism to view the impartations of the Spirit in distinct stages. 'One enters Spirit-baptized existence at Christian initiation', and continues in that existence as a 'daily walk in the Spirit as well as in definite moments of

---

[100] Macchia, *Baptized*, 56.
[101] Macchia, *Baptized*, 59.
[102] Macchia, *Baptized*, 67; cf. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 92, 226.
[103] Macchia, *Baptized*, 68, 79; cf. Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 44; Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers*, 121–2.
[104] Macchia, *Baptized*, 152.
[105] Macchia, *Baptized*, 87. Macchia also acknowledges that Pauline-Lukan contrast is non-exclusive, since Paul includes the charismatic element and Luke the initiatory.
[106] Macchia, *Baptized*, 79.

Spirit-filling'.[107] With respect to distinct empowering experiences traditionally identified by

Pentecostals as 'Spirit baptism', Macchia shows affinity to the sacramentalist model in

viewing these as 'releases' of the already indwelling Spirit.[108] But he retains an evangelical

understanding of initiation as located in a conversion experience rather than a sacrament.[109]

The identification of Spirit baptism with the kingdom allows Macchia to fully integrate

empowerment with not only initiation, but also sanctification. Like Smail, he criticizes the

early Pentecostals for dichotomizing between the work of Christ as sanctification and the

work of the Spirit as charismatic empowerment. Even in the 'fourfold gospel' of early

Pentecostalism, Christ's work as Saviour is fractured from his work as Spirit-Baptiser.[110] He

commends William Seymour's view of Spirit baptism as 'the gift of power "upon the

sanctified, cleansed life"'.[111]

> Spirit baptism does not just empower us for witness as some kind of naked energy
> applied to life from the outside. We are empowered by being changed and shaped into
> a person able to form and cultivate graced relationships with others in the image of
> God. The power for witness is the power of love at work among us.[112]

Notwithstanding his correctives, Macchia clearly identifies himself with pentecostalism and

seeks to align his theological construction of Spirit baptism with Pentecostal praxis. In

---

[107] Macchia, *Baptized*, 154.
[108] Macchia, *Baptized*, 77.
[109] Macchia, *Baptized*, 77–78.
[110] Macchia, *Baptized*, 80.
[111] Macchia, *Baptized*, 80–81; the original reads: 'Now he is on the altar ready for the fire of God to fall, which is the baptism with the Holy Ghost. It is a free gift upon the sanctified, cleansed *heart*'; italics mine; William J. Seymour, 'The Way into the Holiest' [cf. Macchia: 'The Way into the Holiness'], *The Apostolic Faith* 1/2 (October 1906), 4; http://pentecostalarchives.org/digitalPublications/USA/Independent/Apostolic%20Faith%20%28Azusa%20Stree t%29/Unregistered/1906/FPHC/1906_10.pdf; accessed 7 Oct 2013. Also, 'The Baptism with the Holy Ghost is a gift of power upon the sanctified life'; Seymour, 'The Apostolic Faith Movement', *The Apostolic Faith* 1/1 (September 1906), 2; http://pentecostalarchives.org/digitalPublications/USA/Independent/Apostolic%20Faith%20%28Azusa%20Stree t%29/Unregistered/1906/FPHC/1906_09.pdf; accessed 7 Oct 2013.
[112] Macchia, *Baptized*, 177.

particular, he affirms that Spirit baptism is a definite powerful experience that empowers the believer for witness and is to be expected and sought.[113] Although such experiences are theologically linked with initiation, they can also occur at subsequent moments, bringing new awareness of the missional aspect of one's initiation and ongoing Christian life.[114] Furthermore, these experiences have meaning beyond Christian initiation insofar as they represent the continuing experience of participation in the kingdom that leads ultimately to cosmic transformation.[115]

Macchia's expansion of Spirit baptism beyond the church to include all creation is a novel contribution to Pentecostal thought on the subject, and reflects his extensive use of Jürgen Moltmann.[116] He seems to understand the baptism of creation in the Spirit in an inaugurated sense encompassing both the 'now' and the 'not yet'. He speaks clearly of the transformation of creation as a future reality. The indwelling of believers by the Spirit foreshadows the divine indwelling and transformation of the entire cosmos. There is a 'new creation to come' that will be 'the final dwelling place of God'.[117] But Macchia also suggests that the Spirit is presently and dynamically liberating creation:

> In other words, in the renewal of creation for the divine indwelling, God can be said to be *present already* to establish the reign of the divine love and life, overthrowing the reign of sin and death … The Spirit *liberates creation from within history toward new possibilities* for free, eschatological existence.[118]

---

[113] Macchia, *Baptized*, 153.
[114] Macchia, *Baptized*, 152–3.
[115] Macchia, *Baptized*, 153–4.
[116] E.g. see Macchia, *Baptized*, 95–6 for a decisive engagement with Moltmann.
[117] Macchia, *Baptized*, 104, 148, 151, 154.
[118] Macchia, *Baptized*, 97; italics mine.

Elsewhere he writes, 'Spirit baptism implies a God who seeks to *baptize the world* through and into the divine presence in order to *release* powers of redemption, liberation, and hope *toward* the fashioning of the creation into the very dwelling place of God'.[119] These passages clearly indicate that the Spirit baptism of creation is a present reality awaiting future consummation.

2.2 Analysis

Having described and illustrated the five types of pentecostal constructive models of Spirit baptism, we now turn our attention to identifying and analysing the critical issues involved in the debate. This will identify the promises and pitfalls of various approaches and set the background for advancing the conversation. The three broad categories of empowerment, initiation, and holistic types affords us a useful scheme for examining these issues. Frank Macchia's innovative reading of key texts and his broad application of the language of Spirit baptism raise issues particular to his model, which will be treated in a separate section.

2.2.1 Issues Pertaining to Empowerment

The NACP distinctive doctrine set the course for subsequent conversations on the topic by presenting Spirit baptism as a non-repeatable post-conversion empowerment experience evidenced by glossolalia. Its contrast with other pneumatologies raised the following issues that require attention: the *purpose* of Spirit baptism and whether it is distinct from the conversion-initiation experience, the interpretation of the terminology of Spirit baptism, the question of whether Spirit baptism is subsequent to regeneration, the repeatability of the experience and finally status of tongues as the initial evidence of Spirit baptism.[120] These

---

[119] Macchia, *Baptized*, 117; also p. 89.
[120] Note that the question of purpose and distinction is particularly important, dividing among the three broad categories of empowerment, initiation and holistic models.

questions will be analysed and clarified in the following in preparation for a full engagement in chapter 7 with the evidence and arguments.

2.2.1.1 Purpose and Distinction

The purpose of Spirit baptism is a critical question in the debate, and is variously interpreted as primarily initiatory or empowering, or holistically as referring to the entire Christian experience. Macchia expands the metaphor further still to include the renewal of all creation.[121] Note that although the issue of subsequence is closely related to purpose, the correlation is not rigid. Many members of the Elim Pentecostal Churches may see Spirit baptism as being distinct from conversion, but not necessarily subsequent. Thomas Smail understands it as theologically integrated with initiation, yet often occurring subsequently to conversion in contemporary experience. The principal dividing line is not a matter of temporal location, but of theological relationship to conversion-initiation. Even proponents of the initiation models agree that there is an empowerment aspect of Spirit baptism. But they can differ regarding the theological interpretations and the terms to be used in designating these experiences.[122]

The thesis that Spirit baptism is for the purpose of empowerment rests on the juxtaposition of Acts 1:5 and 1:8. The former records Jesus' promise of Spirit baptism while the latter records his promise of empowerment for witness. But the statement in v. 8, 'you will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you', is technically a promise of *consequence* and not

---

[121] Although I have restricted my treatment to those within the broadly pentecostal-charismatic movements, it is worth noting once again that those outside these movements have traditionally identified Spirit baptism with regeneration.
[122] One could also add the issue of how sanctification is related.

necessarily indicative of Spirit baptism's sole purpose. The AG and PAOC statements acknowledge as much by integrating sanctification. It could be that while Luke emphasises the prophetic function of the Spirit, there is a broader covenantal scope.[123] Most of the Spirit reception narratives in Acts occur in an initiation context and contain no indication that the purpose of the experience was for empowerment.[124] It appears that both initiation and empowerment elements are present in Acts, but how they stand in relationship with each other and with the language of 'Spirit baptism' needs to be clarified. These passages will be examined more closely in chapter 7.

Note that while empowerment models tend to dichotomise between the works of the Spirit in initiation and empowerment, initiation and holistic models view the two as being closely linked. Missional empowerment is theologically related to initiation into the body of Christ. The latter models more readily see all believers as called, gifted, and sent as part of their membership in Christ.[125] Also observe that in spite of the departure from the Wesleyan-Holiness doctrine, sanctification remains an element of Spirit baptism in most of these models. The relation between sanctification and empowerment is acknowledged, even if often left undefined. This affirms the basic impulse of Holiness-Pentecostalism and is part of the larger trend towards holistic rather than dichotomising approaches. Macchia has been careful to link the two together organically by multiple strands. He appeals to the OT image of prophetic vocation as consecration for a holy task.[126] He also defines Spirit baptism and

---

[123] Pearlman believes that references to the impartation of the Spirit in Acts are 'never to the saving work of the Spirit but always to power for service'; Pearlman, *Doctrines*, 309. But he does not offer any supporting argument or citation.
[124] E.g. Acts 2:38–41; 8:14–17; 10:44–48; 19:1–6.
[125] E.g. Macchia, *Baptized*, 152–3.
[126] Macchia, *Baptized*, 79–80.

kingdom in terms of love, so that 'We are empowered by being changed and shaped into a person able to form and cultivate graced relationships with others in the image of God. The power for witness is the power of love at work among us'.[127] These associations are theologically valid and pastorally important. But consecration is first and foremost a function of covenant identity.[128] Sanctification is a natural implication of membership in the holy people of God. Also recall that covenant is both salvific and missional. Perhaps sanctification can be viewed as an aspect of deliverance from sin and a natural preparation for mission within a covenantal context.

2.2.1.2 Terminology

A key hermeneutical question concerns the function of the term 'baptism' as used in regard to the Spirit. Classical Pentecostals tend to interpret 'baptism' in terms of a physical metaphor: believers are *immersed* into the Spirit. Outsiders to the movement and most sacramentalists tend to view 'baptism' as a reference to the initiatory rite. The former interpretation is more conducive to empowerment models, and the latter to initiatory models. Still others prefer to treat the term as non-technical and fluid. Macchia seems to use the term loosely for 'participation'.[129] An examination of the use of the term in NT texts may yield insights. The possibility of Jewish proselyte baptisms as a background for NT usage should also be evaluated.[130]

---

[127] Macchia, *Baptized*, 177.
[128] Lev 11:44–45, 20:7, 26.
[129] Macchia, *Baptized*, 87.
[130] See Oscar Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1950), 62; Ben Witherington III, *Troubled Waters: The Real New Testament Theology of Baptism* (Waco, TX : Baylor University Press, 2007), 27–28; Everett Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 60ff.

The use of terms is significant for two reasons. First, given the impulse of Pentecostals to align their experiences with the Bible, it seems preferable to examine the NT usage of terms and consider whether they can be appropriately applied.[131] Second, metaphors can carry significant psychological impact in the context of particular traditions. Classical Pentecostal spirituality generally favours the notions of being 'immersed' and 'overwhelmed' while many sacramentalists may prefer the ritual connotations of the term. But theologically, what Pentecostals call 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' and what charismatics call 'renewal' or 'release' all refer to the shared transformative and empowering experiences of the Spirit. The terminology used is secondary to the theological issues of how experiences are interpreted and how concepts are shaped and related to one another.

2.2.1.3 Subsequence

The subsequence thesis in the multi-staged empowerment model is largely built upon the precedence of the experiences of the early disciples in Acts. Each of these events, beginning with the day of Pentecost, is interpreted as a passage of already regenerated disciples into the Spirit-baptised state. The fact that Pentecost was a historically unique event raises questions regarding the kind of analogies and inferences that may be drawn. The status of the Pentecost event—whether it was an initiation of the church or a 'subsequent' experience—is critical. Likewise, the nature of other Spirit-reception experiences in Acts also merits careful assessment, particularly those of the Samaritan and Ephesian narratives, which appear to

---

[131] E.g. Aimee Semple McPherson, *This is That: Personal Experiences, Sermons and Writings of Aimee Semple McPherson Evangelist* (Los Angeles: The Bridal Call Publishing House, 1919); http://www.biblesnet.com/Aimee%20Semple%20McPherson%20This%20Is%20That%20Personal%20Experiences%20Sermons%20and%20Writings%20Of%20%20AIMEE%20SEMPLE%20MCPHERSON.pdf; accessed 23 Oct 2013. The title refers to Acts 2:16–18, in which Peter identifies the disciples' experience with Joel's prophecy. The words are used in McPherson's accounts to likewise identify Pentecostal experiences with the promise of Spirit baptism in the Bible; e.g. pp. 57, 126, 259–60.

depict post-conversion experiences.[132] Pearlman appeals to the gospels, notably John, in

arguing for the presence of the Spirit with the disciples prior to Pentecost.[133] But the practice

of reading Acts through the lenses of John is questionable.[134] The possibility of a Sinai

influence upon the text of Acts 2:1–4 should be explored. This should be done through an

investigation of Jewish traditions as well as through a comparison of theophanic elements in

these contexts. An association of Pentecost with Sinai would suggest that the giving of the

Spirit in Acts may function as a covenant marker.

2.2.1.4 Repeatability

The non-repeatability of Spirit baptism in the multi-staged model also raises difficult

questions. The experience is construed as a once-for-all initiation into the Spirit-empowered

life. But it is observed that the effects of this empowering experience can be lost and regained

repeatedly. NACP proponents typically explain this phenomenon by stating that there is one

baptism but many fillings.[135] But in this model, the theological distinction between Spirit

baptism and subsequent 'fillings' is difficult to maintain. If the 'Spirit-baptised' state is

defined as an empowered state, it stands to reason that subsequently disempowered

individuals are no longer in that state. In keeping with the interpretation of the metaphor as

'immersion into the Spirit', they need to be re-immersed.[136] But multi-stage pentecostals are

---

[132] Acts 8; 19.
[133] Pearlman, *Doctrines*, 309; citing John 14:17; 20:22; as well as Matthew and Luke.
[134] Cf. Stronstad's critique of scholars who read Acts in light of Paul; Roger Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* (Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 1984), 9–10.
[135] For an example of this interpretation of disempowerment and repeated filling, see French Arrington, 'The Indwelling, Baptism, and Infilling with the Holy Spirit: A Differentiation of Terms', *Pneuma* 3.1 (1981): 7, 9.
[136] R. A. Torrey, Andrew Murray and Francis Sullivan are among those who believe in repeatable Spirit baptisms.

reluctant to admit repeatable Spirit baptisms because they view it as a liminal event.[137] On the

other hand, they are also reluctant to interpret 'baptism' explicitly in terms of initiatory ritual,

as it calls into question the doctrine of subsequence. This ambivalence results in an

ambiguous interpretation of the metaphor of baptism.[138] Non-staged empowerment

proponents such as Sullivan overcome this dilemma by abolishing the theological distinction

between the first and the subsequent empowerment impartations.[139] In this sense, he is more

consistent than multi-staged pentecostals in treating the terms 'baptism' and 'filling' as fully

synonymous.[140]

2.2.1.5 Evidential Tongues

Regarding evidential tongues, the concept of 'evidence' needs to be re-evaluated. The notion

that Spirit baptism requires verification by way of observable evidence stems from the

question asked by Charles Parham, 'What is the biblical evidence of the baptism of the Holy

Ghost?' which in turn reflects Parham's own modernist and pragmatic contexts. Rather than

'evidence', the biblical category is that of 'signs'.[141] The language of 'evidence' issues from a

human concern for verification and functions to facilitate evaluation, whereas the language of

'signs' suggests a divinely initiated communication. Evidence is a tool for answering our

human questions. Signs are gifts to be received with gratitude. Those who demand signs as

---

[137] Exegetically, the dilemma is illustrated in their interpretation of 'filled with the Holy Spirit' in Acts 2:4 as being synonymous with Spirit baptism in Acts 1:5, but the exact same expression in 4:31 as being distinct in meaning.
[138] Cf. Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology*, 81, who interprets 'baptism' as consecration and 'filling' as empowerment. This is a helpful distinction, but represents a departure from the NACP model. See the discussion in sect. 7.4.1.
[139] This is also true of advocates of the 'Third Wave' movement.
[140] Sullivan's solution is helpful. But the question of whether these terms are fully synonymous requires a close look at the relevant texts. See chap. 7.
[141] E.g. 1 Cor 14:22.

evidence were condemned for doing so. Signs may be graciously given to the faithful, but the lack of a sign for something is no indication of its absence.[142] This is a distinction Pentecostals often fail to make, as some use the terms synonymously.[143] The function of signs in general, and of glossolalia in particular, will need to be assessed.

2.2.2 Issues Pertaining to Initiation

As in the case of the NACP empowerment model, Kilian McDonnell's influential sacramental initiation model raises key questions that are determinative for our discussion. This is so especially because of his distinction between initial impartation of the Spirit at baptism and the subsequent release in the renewal experiences.[144] The first question raised is whether, and to what extent, Spirit reception is to be associated with water baptism or other sacraments. Second, the distinction between initial impartation and subsequent release raises the question about how such language regarding the Spirit's presence and work should be understood. Third, the emergence of charismatic movements intensifies the potential problem of divisiveness within the churches based on their experience and the accompanying theology. Such threats confront all pentecostals with the issue of how to ensure that theological reflection can promote rather than hinder the welfare and mission of the church.

---

[142] E.g. Matt 12:38–39; Rom 4:11. For a discussion of 'sign' vs. 'evidence' also see Frank D. Macchia, 'Groans too Deep for Words: Toward a Theology of Tongues as Initial Evidence', *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 1/2 (1998): 149–73; http://www.apts.edu/aeimages//File/AJPS_PDF/98–2–macchia.pdf; accessed 13 February 2013.

[143] E.g. Roger Stronstad, 'They Spoke with Tongues and Prophesied', *Enrichment Journal* (Winter 2005); http://enrichmentjournal.ag.org/200501/200501_081_tongues.cfm; accessed 6 March 2013.

[144] I single out these two models because they illustrate the issues well by virtue of their contrast to one another and to non-pentecostal pneumatologies. But the issues I discuss are broadly applicable.

2.2.2.1 Sacrament

The sacramental thesis, that the Spirit is received through the rite of water baptism, is given *prima facie* support in Acts 2:38, in which the Holy Spirit is promised to those who would 'repent and be baptised'. The association of baptism with Spirit-reception is also suggested in Acts 10:47 and 19:2–3. The presence of baptismal narratives that make no mention of Spirit impartation raise the question of whether the theological point can be rightly inferred from Luke's narratives.[145] But in light of Acts 2:38 one could also assume that the Spirit is given in those conversions. That the Gentiles at Cornelius' house received the Spirit and spoke in tongues *before* they were baptised is also significant.[146] The question is complicated by the fact that two conditions are listed in the text of 2:38. Representatives of paedobaptist sacramentalist traditions tend to prioritise baptism as the means of Spirit-reception. Many non-sacramentalists would emphasise repentance as the decisive criterion. One could also argue that both are required. The particular relationships between repentance and baptism, and between Spirit-reception and these actions, need to be clarified. That the Spirit was given with the laying on of hands in some narratives also suggests that it may have a role as a sacramental act.[147]

2.2.2.2 The Language of 'Presence'

The contrast between the sacramentalist model and the empowerment models raises significant questions regarding the metaphysics of the Spirit's presence. What does it mean for a believer already indwelt by the person of the Holy Spirit to be further 'filled with the Spirit'? How should such 'fluid' metaphors be understood in light of the Spirit's personhood?

---

[145] Acts 8:38; 9:18; 16:15; 16:33; 18:8.
[146] Montague does not address this problem, but only takes the opportunity to link Spirit reception with water baptism. Montague, *Holy Spirit*, 293; McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation*, 37.
[147] Acts 8:12, 17; 9:17–18; 19:5.

While the metaphors of 'indwelling' and 'outpouring' effectively communicate something about the Spirit's effects, we must also recognise the analogical nature of such language. Pentecostal metaphors of outpouring and immersion communicate something of the intensity of the Spirit's dynamic activity in people and communities. The sacramentalist language of a 'release' of a previously conferred reality is a helpful reminder that the Spirit already resides within, and comes closer to recognising the personal and relational nature of spiritual experience. The challenge is to retain the rhetorical force of fluid metaphors while also illuminating the metaphysical fidelity of relational language.

By acknowledging the limitations of such language, Classical Pentecostals will find much common ground with 'initiation' models without doing violence to their theological concern with the dynamism of Spirit-empowered agency. Yong's and Macchia's holistic models show promise that the vitality of multi-staged empowerment models can be preserved while acknowledging the theological link between subsequent empowerment experiences and the already indwelling Spirit.

2.2.2.3 Experience and Ecumenism

The multi-staged model has been criticised for creating a two-class Christianity that denigrates the status of Christians who lack the subsequent experience.[148] Smail's model, while integrating Spirit baptism with initiation, shares this vulnerability when he admits that many contemporary Christians are lacking this experience. Is it any better to suggest that most Western Christians have an incomplete initiation than to say that they are missing a *donum*

---

[148] Max Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 159; Tugwell, *Did You Receive*, 48.

superadditum of Spirit-empowerment?[149] Both models fail to do justice to the fact that many

Christians who have not had identifiable post-conversion experiences of 'Spirit baptism'

demonstrate remarkable effectiveness in ministry. But note that making distinctions between

Christians based on spiritual criteria is not without biblical precedence.[150] The problem is with

artificial classifications and disparaging attitudes based on values contrary to Scripture.

Also at issue is the relationship between experience and theology. Pentecostals from various

backgrounds have developed theologies of Spirit baptism by reflecting upon their experience

in light of Scripture and Scripture in light of their experience, each in the context of their own

traditions. But in asserting their own unique contribution, it is certainly possible to denigrate

the experiences of other Christian traditions or those within their own tradition who do not

participate in charismatic experiences. The extent to which continuing pentecostal reflection

exhibits sensitivity to the experiences of those outside their movements will determine their

ecumenical value.

2.2.3 Issues Pertaining to Holism

The holistic models of Spirit baptism described in the first part of this chapter raise two

additional issues of interest for our study. First, they present two distinct depictions of the

relationship between Christ's mission and that of the Spirit: Christ as the one anointed by the

Spirit, and Christ as the Spirit Baptiser. Note that these depictions are wholly compatible with

---

[149] Cf. Larry Hart's harsher critique: 'In effect, Smail retreats to the contradictory position (taken also by J. Rodman Williams) that Spirit baptism is an aspect of Christian initiation into which some Christians have entered, while others have not'; Larry D. Hart, 'A Critique of American Pentecostal Theology' (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, 1978), 182.
[150] Acts 6; 1 Tim 3:1–13; Titus 1:5–9.

one another, but presented with differing emphases. Second, the concept of holism and its

application to theology should be addressed.

2.2.3.1 Spirit Baptism and Christology

The analogy between Christ's anointing with the Spirit at the Jordan and the believer's

empowerment through Spirit baptism was already present in early Pentecostalism,[151] and

establishes continuity between Christ's mission and that of the church by way of the Spirit.

Both Thomas Smail and Amos Yong use the concept of union with Christ in constructing an

understanding of the Spirit's work in believers. This pairing of Spirit Christology with the

believer's union with Christ finds precedence in Karl Barth, for whom Christ is depicted at

the Jordan as the 'original Bearer of the Spirit', and Spirit baptism is the means by which the

believer analogously appropriates what was true of Christ, including his sending and

empowerment.[152]

Smail understands empowerment as conformity to Christ's power. In his analysis of

empowerment experiences, Smail specifies faith and expectation as prerequisites that open the

door to specific empowering encounters of the Spirit.[153] Although experiences of

empowerment are certainly common and valid, I would suggest yet another element for

Smail's application of the Christological analogy. For Smail, the believer is sanctified as the

Spirit 'sets himself against our fallen flesh and its desires' in order to bring forth the fruit of

the Spirit, forming the likeness of Christ.[154] The Spirit sanctifies by practically working out

---

[151] E.g. Joseph Hilary King identified Jesus' Jordan experience as 'the baptism of the Spirit' in his 1914 book, *From Passover to Pentecost*, in *A Reader in Pentecostal Theology: Voices from the First Generation*, ed. Douglas Jacobsen (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 121.
[152] Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, ed. G.W. Bromiley and T.F. Torrance (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1956–81), IV/4:31, 27, 34; hereafter *CD*.
[153] Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 148–9. Although Smail's model is technically a Type IV, I include him in this discussion because his use of the Christological analogy is suggestive of a holistic approach.
[154] Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 55.

the believer's union with Christ in conforming us to his character. It would be consistent with his model to add that the Spirit also conforms us to Christ in his mission. Power is actualised as one is directed by the Spirit, whether habitually or incidentally, to act according to the missional intent of Christ. Just as sanctification issues from conformity to Christ in his character, empowerment issues from conformity to Christ in his mission. This establishes not only symmetry between sanctification and empowerment, but also an organic connection between the two, because being Spirit-directed in mission is inseparable from being Spirit-directed in other aspects of life.

Perhaps more prominent in early and Classical Pentecostalism than the Christological analogy was the theme of Christ as Spirit-Baptiser. While Macchia incorporates Spirit Christology, his emphasis is on the Spirit-Baptiser role.[155] This role functions to initiate the kingdom by releasing the Spirit to carry out the goal of universal transformation. While Christ baptises all creation in the Spirit, the work of transformation is directly that of the Spirit whom Christ has sent. To be sure, Macchia does acknowledge the role of the Spirit-baptised church in bearing witness to Christ and the kingdom, but his emphasis on the Spirit baptism of all creation seems to highlight the receptor role of the church over her agent role.[156] Setting the Spirit-Baptiser theme explicitly in the context of the Christological analogy would help emphasise the church's role as Spirit-anointed agents. For Yong, as for Barth and Smail, Spirit baptism is precisely the messianic anointing applied anthropologically in a pneumatological soteriology: 'Jesus the Christ, anointed by the Spirit to do the works of the reign of God,

---

[155] He incorporates both concepts in Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 118–9, 141.
[156] Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 86, 141, 144, 145–53, 191. He sees the church as the 'penultimate fulfillment' of Spirit baptism for Luke, p. 101.

pours out that same Spirit upon all flesh in order that his followers also may accomplish perhaps even greater works than he did'.[157] Yong strikes the necessary balance between these two complementary themes of anointed Messiah (the Spirit through Christ) and Spirit-Baptiser (Christ through the Spirit). Note that a key aspect of the Spirit's mission is to unite the church with the Son and his mission, so that their missions are complementary and interdependent. In the Spirit's transformation and empowerment of the church, she becomes not only a recipient, but also an agent of the kingdom, and the way is opened through the church to the redemption of all creation.

2.2.3.2 The Holistic Impulse

The shift towards the holistic model can be traced by two paths, one through the Sacramental Initiation model, and the other through Smail's Christological analogy.[158] By distinguishing between the theological reality, fully given at initiation, and the subsequent actualisation, the sacramentalist model opens the way for conceptualising a continuous process of unfolding what is already there from the beginning. It also opens the way for integrating particular spiritual experiences with the larger work of the Spirit in the believer.[159] Smail's Christological approach is inherently holistic, since the Reformed concept of union with Christ provides a natural way of integrating the various soteriological themes.[160] While Smail closely ties the mission of the Spirit with the believer's participation in Christ, and so

---

[157] Yong, *Spirit Poured Out*, 88–91; quote from p. 101. Also see Barth, *CD* IV/4, 22–34; Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 55, 144; Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 226.

[158] Tugwell represents a prototype of the holistic model that has not yet achieved coherence in its handling of various issues. Although he understands Spirit baptism as a reference to the larger Christian experience of union with Christ through the sacraments, his suggestion that tongues may be a doorway into an 'inheritance' implies an additional stage; Tugwell, *Did You Receive*, 41–2, 69, cf. 47. The Ranaghans also exhibited some inclinations towards the holistic model; Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *Catholic Pentecostals*, 129; also 116, 122.

[159] Thus Lederle's category of 'integrative' models.

[160] Although not exclusively Reformed, the concept of union with Christ receives most prominence and development in Reformed theology. Its use in Barth and Smail is reflective of their Reformed influence. Yong also uses this concept, but does not cite Barth or Smail on this.

integrates the various works of the Spirit such as regeneration, sanctification, and empowerment, he defines Spirit baptism specifically as the experiential manifestation of power. His distinction between Spirit baptism and the overall experience of the Spirit stands in notable contrast to Yong, who subsumes the latter under the metaphor of Spirit baptism.

As much as holism is fashionable in contemporary theology, the key insight to be gained is that the various theological themes may be organically related to one another and should not to be fragmented. However one conceives of regeneration, sanctification and empowerment, their interrelations must not be lost.[161] Holism also reminds us that often the options in a theological question are not 'either/or', but 'both/and'. But it does not necessarily follow that 'Spirit baptism' as a theological label is best identified with the whole. Given the biblical origins of the clause 'baptise … in the Holy Spirit', it would be appropriate to first examine how it is used in the primary texts, and then use the findings to critically re-evaluate how it is currently used in theological and ecclesial contexts. As much as the popular usage of theological terms can take on a life of its own, such re-evaluation is in keeping with the Pentecostal impulse to correlate spiritual experiences with biblical promises and precedents.

Furthermore, holism as an ideal may not necessarily be a way to overcome an impasse. While holistic approaches attempt to account for the concerns of various other models, they do not represent a neutral vantage point elevated above the others, but rather, an alternative model alongside the others. The extent to which a holistic model overcomes particular problems and impasses needs to be evaluated in light of those issues. For instance, Yong hopes that by understanding salvation as a dynamic process of being progressively reoriented towards God,

---

[161] Or alternatively, justification, sanctification and glorification, to use a broader example.

the question of whether genuine believers can apostatise can be transcended.[162] But the question remains: Within the process stretching from initial conversion and final consummation, is there a persistent potential of truly and finally falling away? Yong's answer is clearly 'yes', based on his reading of Hebrews 6:4–6. Despite his holism, he is still compelled to commit to one side of the debate.[163]

2.2.4 Issues Arising from Frank Macchia's Model

Frank Macchia's work on Spirit baptism has a broader scope than previous proposals, seeking to not only to construct a new model of Spirit baptism, but also to apply the theme to other areas of systematic theology. Consequently, he raises numerous issues particular to his model that deserve a separate treatment.

2.2.4.1 The Promise of the Spirit through John the Baptist

Macchia concludes from his reading of Matthew 3, with support from Acts 1, that Spirit baptism is the Messiah's act of ushering in the kingdom in the power of the Spirit to restore all creation.[164] He insightfully identified the need to begin a study of Spirit baptism with the gospels, which at times have been neglected in favour of Acts. But Macchia's neglect of parallel texts in the other three gospels is notable. Surely an understanding of the Baptist's use

---

[162] Reformed theologians usually refer to this as 'perseverance of the saints', rather than with the language of 'eternal security' Yong uses, which, though used by some earlier Pentecostals, is now viewed as a caricature.

[163] Yong, *Spirit Poured Out*, 120.

[164] Macchia, *Baptized*, 84–85. Contrary to his claim to ground his interpretation in 'all four gospels, p. 61, he uses mostly Matthew and Acts, pp. 85ff. Turner supports an association in Acts 1 between Spirit baptism and the kingdom. But he does so in reference to Jesus' Spirit-empowered ministry that manifests the kingdom, and which will now be extended through the Spirit-empowered disciples as the ascended Christ exercises his reign through the Spirit. Turner, *Power*, 295–8. The eschatological cosmic kingdom is not in view here. Indeed, Acts 1:6–8 seems to clarify that Spirit baptism functions to empower the disciples for witness and *not* to bring about the eschatological restoration of the kingdom to Israel. Perhaps Mark 1:8, cf. 1:15, can be added to Matt 3:11 in weak support of Macchia.

of the term requires a comparative study of each of the texts involved. The gospel materials need to be treated each in their own terms, and then brought into conversation with one another and with the rest of the canon.

In both Luke and John, the Baptist's promise occurs in the absence of any explicit mention of the kingdom.[165] While the association of Spirit baptism with the kingdom finds some support in Matthew, Acts and perhaps Mark, the omission in two gospels casts doubt on whether this connection is as definitive as Macchia claims. The New Exodus theme, present in the relevant passages of all four Gospels, may be a more fitting context for reading the promise of Spirit baptism.[166] Also, given the promissory nature of the utterance, the obvious exegetical move is to ask how each of the gospel writers understands the fulfilment of the promise of Spirit baptism, either actual or anticipated. The repetition of the promise in Acts 1:5 has an obvious anthropological and ecclesial fulfilment in Acts 2.[167] Indications of a further fulfilment encompassing all creation is absent from the text. The Fourth Gospel seems to provide anthropological and ecclesial fulfilment in John 14–16 and 20:22. For Matthew and Mark, proclamation and deliverance through Christ and the disciples are the identifiable works of the Spirit.[168] It is difficult to find in these texts a clear link between Spirit baptism and the

---

[165] Luke 3:16; John 1:33. Luke elsewhere dissociates 'the Spirit' from 'the kingdom' where Matthew joins them: 'But if it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you', Luke 11:20; cf. Matthew 12:28 – 'by the Spirit of God …'.

[166] Turner, *Power*, 315. While the New Exodus can be interpreted in kingdom terms, each motif carries its own distinct set of meanings and are not interchangeable. The former is more specifically anthropological and covenantal in contradistinction to the New Creation theme and applications Macchia desires to introduce.

[167] Youngmo Cho's study of the Spirit and the kingdom in Luke and Paul concludes that while Paul views the Spirit as the essence of the kingdom, Luke sees the Spirit in a more restricted role of inspiring kingdom proclamation; Youngmo Cho, *Spirit and Kingdom in the Writings of Luke and Paul: An Attempt to Reconcile these Concepts* (Bletchley: Paternoster, 2005), 197. Acts 1:6–8 also seems to contrast Spirit baptism and kingdom restoration, rather than identify the two.

[168] Proclamation: Matt 10:20; 12:18; Mark 13:11; deliverance: Matt 12:28; Mark 3:29–30, cf. v. 22.

'apocalyptic' and 'cosmic' applications. Beyond the gospel narratives, the OT and intertestamental sources of the promise also deserve attention.[169]

Even in Macchia's key text in Matthew, the promise is that Christ 'will baptise *you* with the Holy Spirit and fire'. It is difficult to stretch the object of Spirit baptism beyond the covenantal context, much less beyond the anthropological. Macchia justifies this expansive reading by appealing to the Baptist's 'eschatological' reference. But the term is broad in usage and ambiguous in meaning. He writes, 'But Hagner notes insightfully that this church also recognized the unique eschatological undertones in the complex of events at the Jordan that await fulfilment at the end of salvation history'.[170] This is a misreading of Hagner, who says nothing about the future fulfilment at the end of salvation history, but was referring to the fulfilment that occurs in the suffering and death of Jesus.[171]

2.2.4.2 The Spirit and the Kingdom in Gregory of Nyssa

Macchia appeals to Gregory of Nyssa in support of his thesis that Spirit baptism refers to kingdom inauguration and participation, including the Spirit's indwelling of all creation in the eschaton. The association of the Spirit with the kingdom certainly finds support in biblical literature, but his particular use of Gregory is questionable at points.[172] First, Gregory's

---

[169] E.g. Joel 2:28; Isaiah 4:4, 30:27–28, and 4 Ezra 13.8–11.

[170] Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 86; citing Donald A. Hagner, *Word Biblical Commentary Volume 33A: Matthew 1–13* (Nashville: Nelson, 1993), 60.

[171] Compare Hagner's own words: 'All of this is in keeping with the will of God, who will *now bring salvation to the world. Thus John and Jesus perform their respective roles, fulfilling 'all righteousness' … [The] Servant … through the mystery of his suffering and eventual death … completes the task of the Servant … but* [Matthew's church] would also have been conscious of the uniqueness of this complex of events in the life of Jesus, with all of its undertones for the *fulfilment of salvation-history*. With this insight into the secret of Jesus, the readers are being prepared to read *the narrative of Jesus' ministry* with deeper understanding'; Hagner, *Matthew*, 60; italics mine.

[172] E.g. Matt 12:28; John 3:5; Rom 14:17.

identification of the Spirit with the kingdom in *On the Lord's Prayer* is based on a dubious

textual variant of Luke 11:2, in which 'Thy kingdom come' has been replaced with 'Thy Holy

Spirit come upon us and cleanse us'.[173] The 'Spirit' reading is found in only one extant

manuscript, miniscule 700 (XI), against the vast majority, including Codex Vaticanus (IV)

and $\mathcal{P}^{75}$ (early III).[174] It is clearly an inferior variant. Second, the object of the Spirit's

cleansing is the disciples, not all creation. Gregory interprets the petition as a petition for

sanctification. Third, the text Macchia quotes from *On the Holy Spirit* refers to the Spirit not

as the 'kingdom of God' in the broad sense, but as the kingly anointing upon Christ.[175]

Fourth, in both texts of Gregory, he is arguing for the deity of the Spirit. The identification of

the Spirit's activity with the kingdom in *On the Lord's Prayer* is incidental. Consequently,

Macchia's interpretation of Spirit baptism fits poorly with Gregory's texts, and is only

minimally supported by the Cappadocian Father. Perhaps a better use of Gregory would be to

assert that as the Spirit is the kingly anointing on Christ, he is also the kingdom anointing that

sanctifies and empowers Christ's people.[176] But neither these texts from Gregory nor those

from the NT can support his application of Spirit baptism to the entire cosmos. Throughout

Acts and elsewhere in the NT, the language of Spirit baptism is applied anthropologically and

---

[173] Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Lord's Prayer*, Discourse Three.
[174] *Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th revised edition, ed. Eberhard Nestle, Kurt Aland et al. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993), 195; Reuben Swanson, ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Luke* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 201. I follow the Nestle-Aland in using Roman numerals to designate the century of origin of manuscripts.
[175] Macchia, *Baptised,* 89; cf. Gregory: 'For the Son is King, and His living, realized, and personified Kingship is found in the Holy Spirit, Who anoints the Only-begotten, and so makes Him the Anointed, and the King of all things that exist'. Gregory argues that since the Spirit is the sign of Christ's kingship, he belongs in the class not of subject but of ruler, and therefore he must be deity; Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Holy Spirit*, in *NPNF* 2–05:508.
[176] Note that this relates to my earlier discussion of anointed Christ vs. Spirit-Baptiser.

covenantally, even if inferences to the inanimate creation can sometimes be made.[177] Hence, his broad application of the metaphor should be held loosely.[178]

2.3. Summary

Each of the models treated in this chapter offer important insight to be retained. Perhaps the most valuable contribution from the initiation models is the theological link between initiation into Christian life and missional empowerment through the Spirit. The Spirit given at the beginning is the same Spirit who empowers for life and mission. Questions about what initiation entails are of secondary importance to the continuity of the Spirit's work. The contribution of the empowerment models is that there are empowerment experiences available to the believer through the Holy Spirit to be actively sought after and not simply assumed. This insight is not negated by questions regarding whether such experiences are theologically distinct from initiation, or how labels such as 'baptism', 'fullness' or 'release' should be applied. The holistic models help us to see that theological constructions of Spirit baptism need not be limited to isolated theological questions such as subsequence, signs or sacraments, nor to exegetical questions regarding particular texts. They show that the task of theology calls for a broad view of interrelated themes and a vision for how they can be integrated.

---

[177] Besides the explicit references to Spirit baptism in the gospels and Acts, also see Joel 2 as well as Lukan references to the Spirit's work (e.g. Luke 1–2). Even Romans 8 emphasises the glorification of God's children, though it mentions the redemption of all creation (v. 19–23). Rev 21–22, as well as source texts in Isa 65–66 and Ezek 40–48, hint at the universal indwelling of the Spirit in the new creation.

[178] Macchia's use of the metaphor is also questioned by Mark J. Cartledge, 'A Response to Frank D. Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology*', Presentation, Annual SPS Conference (2007), Andrew M. Lord, 'Network Church: A Pentecostal Ecclesiology Shaped by Mission' (PhD Thesis, University of Birmingham, 2010), 78, and Andrew Gabriel, 'Review Essay: Frank Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology*', *Canadian Journal of Pentecostal-Charismatic Christianity* 1 (2010): 124–5.

Smail has retrieved the key insight from Barth that Spirit baptism is best understood in terms of union with Christ in his sonship, character, and power. To this we may add mission as an implication of sonship and a presupposition of empowerment. Just as initiation into salvation naturally requires power for living, so initiation into missional vocation naturally involves power for service. This affords a coherent integration of these various themes.

It may be observed that until recently, most treatments of Spirit baptism are restricted to the intersection of pneumatology, soteriology and mission. This is due in part to the initial development of Pentecostal theology primarily as reflection on the book of Acts in a restorationist-pragmatic context. The result was a narrow focus on the church's empowerment for witness. These treatments fail to take adequate account of the shape of the larger biblical narrative. By integrating the work of the Spirit with the believer's union with Christ, Smail points to a broader framework. Yet he continues to define the content of Spirit baptism in the narrow terms of missional empowerment. Macchia's impulse to address the cosmic scope of redemption is valid, but he strains the metaphor of Spirit baptism in his unbounded application.[179] Within the larger biblical narrative, redemption has a universal scope, but a clearly anthropological and covenantal focus, which takes a Christocentric turn in the New Testament. An examination of Spirit baptism in canonical perspective along anthropological and covenantal lines in view of the Christological paradigm may prove to be a fruitful venture. Towards this end, I will sketch a dramatic framework in chapters four to six of this thesis using the concept of the *imago Dei*, before presenting a theodramatic model of Spirit baptism in chapter seven.

---

[179] Turner has argued that Spirit baptism is about the restoration of Israel. Max Turner, *Holy Spirit*, 36; idem, *Power*, 301, 315.

CHAPTER 3

THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATIONS OF THE *IMAGO DEI*

This thesis uses the *imago Dei* as the major theme around which to structure the canonical

drama in order to contribute a theodramatic model of Spirit baptism. Having described five

types of pentecostal theological models of Spirit baptism in chapter 2, we must now survey

the principal theological interpretations of the *imago Dei* that have been proposed throughout

the history of Christian thought. Much attention has been given to the creation of humankind

as the *imago Dei* and its *locus classicus*, Genesis 1:26–28. Although some theologians have

proposed composite views of the image, and many others have included subtle complexities

in their single-themed constructions, descriptions of such views have often been

reductionistic.[1] This chapter endeavours to provide fair-minded treatments of the most

significant voices in the dialogue.

Triplex typologies have been used by Millard Erickson (substantive, relational and functional)

and Stanley Grenz (structural, relational and telic).[2] Although the Reformation views are

usually classified as 'relational', I have chosen to treat them separately under the designation

of 'ethical', which refers to the notion of a morally righteous life and character. While the

concept of original righteousness certainly has a significant relational dimension, the same

could also be said of the best representatives of the structural and functional approaches.

Moreover, the Reformation model differs from the contemporary manifestations of the

relational approach in important ways. The 'telic' classification suggested by Grenz consists

---

[1] See for example, Emil Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, trans. Olive Wyon (London: Lutterworth Press, 1939), 93–6; Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, Second Edition (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998), 520–31.
[2] Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 520ff; Stanley J. Grenz, *The Social God and the Relational Self: A Trinitarian Theology of the* Imago Dei (Louisville/London: WJK Press, 2001), 177; cf. Stanley J. Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994), 219ff.

of the primacy of Christ and the idea that the *imago Dei* is a destiny for which humankind was created, and is consequently more eschatological than it is protological. But this is found in proponents of other models in varying degrees. Also, although the 'telic' concept is significant, it answers a different question than the rest, one of chronological development, and consequently can be filled with content from the other views. In the case of Grenz, the eschatological image consists of communion and moral conformity. For these reasons, I am proposing a fourfold typology.

Three of the four types may be loosely associated with particular historical periods by virtue of their emergence to prominence and primary development.[3] The *structural* type locates the image in structural features of humankind, typically 'rationality' or 'volition', though some proponents may specify 'spirituality' or 'personality'. This type was consistently dominant in pre-Reformation eras, and underwent considerable development from Irenaeus to Thomas Aquinas. It continues to be important to Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox traditions through the Reformation and modern eras, and also retains popularity among Protestants.[4]

---

[3] That these features came to attention in their respective periods may be reflective of their philosophical and theological climates: rationality in the early centuries, righteousness among the Reformers, and relationality in the twentieth century. Even the way the functional view is conceived in the patristic and contemporary periods reflect aspects of ancient worldviews and modern biblical scholarship respectively.

[4] International Theological Commission 2000-2002, 'Communion and Stewardship: Human Persons Created in the Image of God', (http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/cti_documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20040723_communion-stewardship_en.html; accessed 21 Apr 2014), chap. 1; Grenz, *Social God*, 170-3. One may also argue that this type has also been dominant in the Eastern Orthodox tradition, particularly in the pre-modern eras and perhaps even now. I have chosen to classify Lossky and Zizioulas under the *relational* type in view of their relational ontologies, though they are certainly multifaceted and nearly 'holistic'; See sections 3.3.1.2 and 3.3.2.2. Note that the Vatican document 'Communion and Stewardship' also affirms a relational ontology in its multifaceted view of the *imago Dei*; see par. 1.1.10. As the title suggests, the view presented emphasizes relation ('communion', chap. 2) and function ('stewardship', chap. 3). But the ethical or formational aspect is also clearly present; e.g. par. 1.3.24. One could create a category for 'holistic views'. But the varying degrees to which different proposals incorporate selected features of the image would present the problem of what specific criteria to use in defining the view. For that reason, I generally use 'holistic' with respect to *imago Dei* views in a relative sense of *more* or *less* 'holistic', rather than as an absolute category.

The interpretation of the *imago Dei* as 'original righteousness' had been present since the patristic era as a lesser element somewhat overshadowed by the emphasis on rationality. But the *ethical imago* as a distinct type, characterised by active moral conformity to Christ, was developed by Martin Luther and rose to prominence in the Reformation.[5] Similarly, a relational aspect of the *imago Dei* was present in Irenaeus' thought, but developed as a *relational* type in its contemporary form only in the early twentieth century, and is dominant among Protestants. Influenced by modern philosophical personalism, this type conceives of the image in terms of relational existence, both as an unconditional reality and as a dynamic to be cultivated.[6] The *functional* type has been a minority view throughout, being present in the Antiochene Fathers, but is now gaining more attention in a different form with advances in ancient Near Eastern scholarship. This type understands the image as a divinely assigned function of the human creature within the created realm, both in terms of divine intent and active fulfilment. While these four types emphasise different features of humankind as being central or definitive, many proponents acknowledge that there are multiple aspects of the image. I will treat these four types in this order.[7]

This may also be referred to as an 'ontological' or 'substantive' view, though the former is ambiguous. Claudia Welz would include this type in her 'mimetic' category, which emphasises resemblance. But this fails to distinguish the variations based on the content of the resemblance, as evidenced by her including Augustine, Luther and Bonhoeffer in this category; Claudia Welz, '*Imago Dei*: References to the Invisible', *Studia Theologica* 65 (2011): 74-91.

[5] See Grenz, *Social God*, 162–6 on this development, though he labelled it as the 'relational *imago*'. One may also refer to this as a 'moral', 'formational' or 'transformational' view. My hesitation with the latter two terms is that they require a commitment to the idea of *inherent progress*, which is plausible in regards to the original state (Irenaeus, Grenz), but raises questions about the 'final state' of humanity. One must reconsider the meaning of the 'perfect' and the possibility of a perpetual transformative process in the final state—a question better left to future research. For our present purposes, I suggest that viable alternatives to 'ethical' or 'moral' could be 'conformational', or simply 'sanctification' view. These terms are all broad enough to include Luther, for instance, while also designating more developed theories of spiritual transformation, as in Chandler; see n. 8 below.

[6] For more on the distinction between the ethical and relational types, see sections 3.2 and 3.3. The relational type can be further divided into the *personal* and the *Trinitarian* sub-types. See further definitions and distinctions in sect. 3.3.

[7] Henri Blocher uses a similar typology of the interpretations of the *imago Dei*: (1) spirituality, (2) dominion, (3) original righteousness and (4) face-to-face relationship; Henri Blocher, *In the Beginning: The Opening Chapters of Genesis*, trans. David G. Preston (Leicester and Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1984), 80–1.

Under the classification of 'The Structural *Imago*', the thought of Irenaeus, Origen, Augustine and Thomas Aquinas will be addressed. They are of monumental significance not only for the development of theology in general, but of the doctrine of the *imago Dei* in particular. Hans Urs von Balthasar is chosen as a representative recent proponent of the structural view and as a Roman Catholic. Martin Luther and John Calvin are indisputably key thinkers, not only as architects of two major streams of Reformation theology, but also as important contributors to the ethical view of the *imago Dei*. For the relational type, I have selected contrasting representatives from the 'neo-orthodox' (Emil Brunner and Karl Barth), Eastern Orthodox (Vladimir Lossky and John Zizioulas) and contemporary (Alistair McFadyen, Robert Jenson and Stanley Grenz) categories. Representing the functional type, the Antiochenes are distinct as Patristic proponents and Lisa Stephenson offers the unique combination of being contemporary, Pentecostal and feminist.

3.1 The Structural *Imago*

The structural view of the *imago Dei* is the oldest in the Christian tradition, and defines the image as a uniquely human structural capacity that somehow resembles God and elevates humankind above the other creatures. Perhaps the most common forms identify the image with rationality, though many also identify it as free will. Contemporary variations may also define the image as personality or spirituality.[8]

---

[8] See sect. 3.1.5. Diane Chandler lists seven formational dimensions: (1) spirit, (2) emotions, (3) relationships, (4) intellect, (5) vocation, (6) physical health and wellness, and (7) resource stewardship; Diane J. Chandler, *Christian Spiritual Formation: An Integrated Approach for Personal and Relational Wholeness* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2014), 17, 20. Elsewhere she describes these in terms of 'capacity', 'propensity', 'ability' and 'potential', suggesting that these seven dimensions may also constitute a holistic view of human ontology that underlies her theory of formation; p. 31, 32, 36; see my discussion in sect. 4.1.6, and especially 4.1.6.1. Also note James Smith's attention to 'desire' and 'imagination', noted in the same section, which I believe would be helpful for Chandler's project. The first is subsumed under 'emotions' and the latter is given only minimal attention by Chandler. Perhaps the more inclusive term, 'affections', would be preferred in place of 'emotions'.

3.1.1 Irenaeus

There is a significant sense in which the early church father Irenaeus stands apart from the other figures presented in this section.[9] He combines a broad view of biblical material with the Greek categories of his contemporaries to produce a multifaceted view of the image which includes ontological structure, ethical righteousness and relation to God through the Spirit. Ultimate fulfilment of the *imago Dei* is realised in the recapitulative incarnation of the Son and the eschatological redeemed humanity. Irenaeus is widely noted for distinguishing between image and likeness, though the distinction is somewhat inconsistent.[10] Where the distinction is made, the image refers to the ontological constitution of human beings while the likeness refers to the goal of righteous living in relation to God, which is possible only through the indwelling Spirit.[11] Brunner interprets Irenaeus as dichotomising between natural

---

Her description of Luther's 'relational view' of the image as 'powers to know God' closely resembles the lower levels of Augustine's and Aquinas' views of the image as the ability to understand and love God; sect. 3.1.3–4. Note also my distinction between the ethical and relational views, which roughly correspond to her 'relational' and 'spiritual' dimensions respectively. See further discussion on Chandler in sect. 3.2, n. 117. Unfortunately, Chandler's work came to my attention only in the final stages of this thesis, and was therefore not fully incorporated.

[9] He has been included in this section for organisational simplicity and to show the line of influence. My citations of Irenaeus' *Against Heresies*, hereafter *AH*, are taken from Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1 (Buffalo: Christian Literature, 1885–96; PDF ebook, Grand Rapids: CCEL; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf01.pdf; accessed 18 August 2013); hereafter *ANF*.

[10] In *AH* 3.18.1 both image and likeness are lost; in 5.6.1 image is retained but the likeness is lost. The parallel usage of the terms in 4.38.3 is implicitly synonymous, occurring in a context in which 'likeness' could have been used distinctively. The distinction between the terms is supported by Briggman, Cairns and Grenz, but is minimised by Gunton and Steenberg and denied by Osborne; Anthony Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012; Oxford Scholarship Online, 2012; doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199641536.001.0001; accessed 24 July 2017), 175; David Cairns, *The Image of God in Man*, rev. ed. (London and Glasgow: Collins, 1973), 81, Grenz, *Social God*, 145, Colin E. Gunton, *The Triune Creator: A Historical and Systematic Study* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998), 196; Matthew C. Steenberg, *Irenaeus on Creation* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 138, Osborn, *Irenaeus of Lyons* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 212–3. Balthasar notes the varying usage in Irenaeus and defends the distinction as useful. Hans Urs von *Balthasar, Theo-Drama: Theological Dramatic Theory, volume II, The Dramatis Personae: Man in God*, trans. Graham Harrison (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1990), 324–5; hereafter *TD*. While I agree that a distinction between 'image' and 'likeness' cannot be defended exegetically, there is certainly a conceptual distinction between the image retained post-fall, and the image eschatologically achieved. I propose that Irenaeus sees the parallel in Genesis, but is pragmatic in his varying usage of the terms.

[11] Irenaeus, *AH* 4.4.3; 5.6.1.

capacities operating independently of God and 'the gift of supernatural communion with

God'.[12] He considers this to be the foundation for the medieval scholastic distinction between

nature and grace, in which human capacities remain intact even though the communion is

lost.[13] Influenced by Brunner's misinterpretation, Colin Gunton initially attributed to

Irenaeus' influence the unfortunate trajectory leading to Thomas Aquinas' definition of the

image in terms of rationality as a static possession of the human, to the detriment of

relationality and embodiment.[14] To his credit, Gunton later acknowledges that 'rationality' for

Irenaeus is a matter of 'right human living'.[15]

In assessing these criticisms, an examination of Irenaeus' anthropology will be helpful.

According to Irenaeus, the human being, created in God's image and likeness, is composed of

a rational soul, a physical body, and the indwelling Spirit of God.[16] Each of these components

---

[12] Emil Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 93.

[13] He misleadingly quotes no more than one incomplete sentence from Irenaeus, *AH* 4.4.3, and suggests provocatively that 'His anthropology is Gnosticism purified by Scripture. … (Human) reason is conceived wholly in the sense of Greek rationalism … not as something which is actually related to God'; Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 504–5. Cairns agrees that Brunner's assessment is inaccurate, pointing out that Irenaeus did not hold to the nature–grace distinction and was not a proponent of natural theology. Moreover, Thomas Aquinas in his exposition of nature and grace did not make use of the distinction between image and likeness. Cairns, *The Image of God in Man*, 298 n. 29. Also see Balthasar, *TD* 2:325.

[14] Colin E. Gunton, 'Trinity, Ontology and Anthropology: Towards a Renewal of the Doctrine of the *Imago Dei*', *Persons, Divine and Human*, ed. Christoph Schwöbel and Colin E. Gunton (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991), 48–49; Gunton cites only Brunner, with no reference to Irenaeus's text. Note that this is a caricature not only of Irenaeus, but also of Aquinas; see sect. 3.1.4.

[15] Gunton, *The Triune Creator* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998), 194.

[16] Most commentators agree that the 'Spirit' in humankind that confers the 'likeness' refers to the divine Spirit; e.g. Matthew C. Steenberg, *Of God and Man: Theology as Anthropology from Irenaeus to Athanasius* (London: T & T Clark, 2009), 40–1; idem., *Irenaeus on Creation*, 111–2, 127; Osborn, *Irenaeus*, 212, 214–5; John Behr, *Asceticism and Anthropology in Irenaeus and Clement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 99–100; Dominic Robinson, *Understanding the 'Imago Dei': The Thought of Barth, von Balthasar and Moltmann* (Farnham and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011), 12; Anthony Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012; Oxford Scholarship Online, 2012; doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199641536.001.0001; accessed 24 July 2017), 164–5, 175, 181. Balthasar reads Irenaeus inconsistently as trichotomist in *TD* 2:143 and dichotomist in 2:325. *AH* 5.6.1 repeatedly lists the three parts as body, soul and the Spirit of God, including a comment on 1 Thess 5:23. According to Cairns, the third element of 'spirit' is a 'human spirit', resulting in a tripartite anthropology. He quotes but misinterprets J. Lawson, who states, contrary to Cairns, that the third element is 'the indwelling Spirit of God. … not part of man's nature'; Cairns, *Image*, 84; John Lawson, *The Biblical Theology of St. Irenaeus* (London: Epworth Press,

constitutes an indispensable element in Irenaeus' understanding of the *imago Dei*.[17] His anti-Gnostic affirmation of the body as part of the image and his high regard for embodiment sets him apart from the Alexandrian Fathers.[18] In the passage discussed by Brunner, Irenaeus writes regarding fallen humanity, 'having been created a rational being, he lost the true rationality, and living irrationally, opposed the righteousness of God, giving himself over to every earthly spirit, and serving all lusts'.[19] Clearly, 'rationality' in Irenaeus denotes more, though not less, than intellectual capacity.[20] His primary concern is with spiritual perception expressed in moral living before God.[21] Neither does Irenaeus conceive of human rationality as independently remaining intact through the fall. He insists that human beings are incomplete without the indwelling Spirit, so that fallen humanity, having lost the 'likeness', live 'irrationally'.[22] While it is true that human beings are still human, bearing 'the image', they are an *incomplete* humanity, a *corrupted* image.[23]

According to Grenz, Irenaeus' polemic against Gnostic fatalism also leads him to invoke free will rather than 'nature' as the reason why some are righteous and others unrighteous, thereby

---

1948), 207. A careful reading of *AH* 2.33.5 vindicates Lawson against Cairns; see Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons*, 160-1.

[17] Irenaeus, *AH* 5.6.1.

[18] Irenaeus, *AH* 5.6.1. Also Irenaeus, *The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* (London: SPCK, 1920; PDF ebook, Grand Rapids: CCEL; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/irenaeus/demonstr.pdf; accessed 21 October 2013), sect. 11 (hereafter *Dem.*); *AH* 5.9.1, 5.11.2. Osborne, *Irenaeus*, 215; Denis Minns, *Irenaeus* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1994), 57. Irenaeus' insistence on God's immediate creation of the material world also affirms its value. *AH* 4.20.1; Steenberg, *God and Man*, 25; *Irenaeus on Creation*, 72–3; Osborn, *Irenaeus*, 221; Thomas G. Weinandy, 'St. Irenaeus and the Imago Dei: The Importance of Being Human', *Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture* 6/4 (2003): 17.

[19] Irenaeus, *AH* 4.4.3.

[20] Rationality is certainly essential to his ontology.

[21] Cf. Eph 4:17–18; Rom 12:1. Also see Irenaeus, *AH* 2.6.1, cf. Rom 1:19–20, 2.31.1, 5.1.3, 5.8.2, 5.8.3; Steenberg, *Irenaeus on Creation*, 138.

[22] *AH* 4.4.3, 5.8.2–3; also see Osborn, *Irenaeus*, 221.

[23] *AH* 5.6.1.

elevating free will above reason.[24] Balthasar suggests that Irenaeus' distinction between the 'essential being and its active fulfilment through choices in accordance with God's will' opens the way for Tertullian and Gregory of Nyssa to define the image as freedom.[25] It is true that the exercise of free will was necessary to the development of the eschatological likeness that is central to Irenaeus' thought. But unlike those who follow him, Irenaeus holds reason and free will to be inseparable, together included in the image, but subordinated to the indwelling Spirit of God.[26]

Steenberg and Weinandy have both identified a relational-personalist strand in Irenaeus' thought.[27] It is true that for Irenaeus, the likeness of God in humanity is dependent on relation to God.[28] But Weinandy goes further in seeing 'an authentic Christian personalism within the very heart of Irenaeus's thought', one grounded in God's Trinitarian life.[29] There is certainly an incipient personalism in Irenaeus. But this should be distinguished from the more developed forms of personalism in twentieth century philosophy, which tend to ground

---

[24] Grenz, *Social God*, 145, 148. Grenz may also be overstating the point in characterising Irenaeus' original Adam by 'the mere possession of free will'; p. 148. Adam possessed a will that was aided by the Spirit and directed towards righteousness. In *AH* 5.36.3, Irenaeus refers to 'what we had lost in Adam—namely, to be according to the image and likeness of God—that we might recover in Christ Jesus'.

[25] Balthasar, *TD* 2:326–7. For Tertullian (as for Irenaeus), human choice for or against God determines the realisation or loss of the 'likeness'; Tertullian, *De Baptismo* 5, 6–7; also *Adv. Marc.* II, 6, 4–5. For Gregory, freedom is 'pre-eminent' because it is the basis for virtue; Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Making of Man*, 16.10, *NPNF* 2–05:637.

[26] For his polemical insistence on free will, see *AH* 4.37. For the relationship between reason and will, see, in addition to previously cited passages, Irenaeus, Fragment 5, in *ANF* 01. Osborn, *Irenaeus*, 21–22, and Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 504, view rationality as the key to Irenaeus' thought; Steenberg, *Of God and Man*, 52–3, and *Irenaeus on Creation*, 102, understands communion, life and Spirit to be more central. Note that Irenaeus' affirmation of free will is more polemically driven than his emphasis on rationality.

[27] Steenberg writes, 'To be a human person, for all that this mystery means, one must be first of all in communion with the Son through the indwelling of the Spirit, whereby the material creation is made the living child of the Father. Irenaean anthropology is one of godly relationship, of the experience of he who is, in his living person, all that his creation is meant to become'; Steenberg, *Of God and Man*, 53.

[28] Irenaeus, *AH* 5.6.1; 5.8.1–2; see Osborn, *Irenaeus*, 221.

[29] Weinandy, 'St. Irenaeus and the *Imago Dei*', 19–20.

personhood ontologically in interpersonal relations.[30] For Irenaeus, the 'likeness' is grounded

in ontological and relational participation in God. To be like God is to live in relation to him.

But Irenaeus does not have a personal ontology grounded in relation. The likeness that results

from union with God consists in moral conformity. Human beings who lack such a union are

incomplete and corrupt, but nevertheless continue to be human.[31]

Irenaean anthropology is ultimately Christological and eschatological. Although humans are

created 'according to' the image, only the incarnate Christ is the fullness of the image.[32]

Christ is both the redemptive revelation of God and the manifestation of true humanity as his

image and likeness.[33] The hiddenness of the true image in the beginning left Adam vulnerable

to temptation and sin. In his incarnation, Christ reveals the true image and likeness,

'assimilates man to himself' and thereby restores humankind in the likeness of God.[34] Note

that for Irenaeus, recapitulation is the means of the new creation, because he is the true

human, and a second fashioning (*secunda plasmatio*) parallel to that of Adam.[35] And although

the image and the likeness of God were present at creation, the full likeness is attained only in

the eschaton through participation in Trinitarian glory.[36] Steenberg suggests that this economy

of salvation is the proper context for understanding Irenaeus' distinction between image and

likeness. The intended contrast is between the incomplete protological image-likeness and the

---

[30] See the various proponents of the relational *imago* in sect. 3.3 of this chapter.
[31] Also see Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit*, 164–5, 176–7.
[32] Irenaeus, *AH* 5.16.2; *Dem.* 22; Osborne, *Irenaeus*, 212.
[33] Irenaeus, *AH* 4.6.6, 5.16.2.
[34] Irenaeus, *AH* 5.16.2; *Dem.* 22.
[35] Irenaeus, *AH* 3.18.1, 3.22.1, 5.1.3, 5.36.3, 5.23.2; Osborne, *Irenaeus*, 213.
[36] Irenaeus, *AH* 4.38.1–3, 5.16.1. Grenz sets Irenaeus in contrast to Calvin, who 'believed that the "end" for which God created humans was completely present in the beginning'; Grenz, *Social God*, 178. Horton disagrees with Grenz's interpretation of Calvin in this respect. Michael S. Horton, *The Christian Faith: A Systematic Theology for Pilgrims on the Way* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011), 393 n. 56.

full eschatological image-likeness.[37] To this can be added Briggman's contention that the contrast is between temporal life, which is sustained merely by the Spirit's *instrumentality*, and eternal life, which is empowered by the *presence* of the Spirit.[38] The eschatological likeness entails a full reception of the Spirit's power by which human beings achieve a state of perfection beyond the prelapsarian state of Adam and Eve.[39]

Irenaeus developed a complex view of the *imago Dei* that served as an effective apologetic response to the Gnostic threat. He incorporated relationally conditioned rationality, volition, embodiment and ethics into his anthropology within a broader framework of the divine economy of recapitulation and eschatological fulfilment. These themes would later be selectively developed, with particular attention to rationality and volition in patristic-medieval thought, and ethics and relation in the Reformation and beyond.

3.1.2 Origen

Origen interpreted the language of 'image' in terms of *resemblance* or *quality*, which bore consequences for his view of the image of God as well as that of many who followed him.[40] He sometimes uses the term to designate moral resemblance, as in his comment that one's image can become more like the image of the devil as a result of sin.[41] But more frequently it

---

[37] Steenberg, *Irenaeus on Creation*, 138. The same progression is also found in Clement of Alexandria. Grenz, *Social God*, 149–50.

[38] Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit*, 151, 166–7; italics mine. Briggman is at pains to argue that, for Irenaeus, the Spirit's vivifying 'indwelling', or 'presence', is reserved only for the followers of God, and is not the animating force in fallen humanity; also p. 167.

[39] Briggman, *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit*, 179-82; Briggman sees a distinction here between the original 'likeness' and communion through the Spirit that was lost, and the eschatological 'likeness', or 'perfection', that comes through a full reception of the Spirit.

[40] Jenson takes the same view of Origen. Robert W. Jenson, *Systematic Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 2:54.

41 Origen, *Homilies on Genesis and Exodus*, The Fathers of the Church, a New Translation, vol. 71, trans. Ronald E. Heine (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1982), 1.13; hereafter *Gen. Hom*.

is used in the sense of ontological resemblance. He locates the image of God in the soul, which ontologically resembles God in being 'invisible, incorporeal, incorruptible, and immortal'.[42] Consequently, and in contrast to Irenaeus, he excludes the body from the image, since that would imply that God is also 'made of flesh and in human form. … It is most clearly impious to think this about God'.[43] Even in his exposition of Christ as the image of God, Origen insists that the image is incorporeal. 'So that as the Father is invisible by nature, he has begotten an image that is also invisible. For the Son is the Word, and therefore we must understand that nothing in him is perceptible to the senses. He is wisdom, and in wisdom we must not suspect the presence of anything corporeal'.[44] Note the degradation of corporality, which stands in stark contrast to Irenaeus.

For Origen, human beings are not the image of God, but are made 'according to the image'. Christ is the prototypical image of God and the principle of the noble qualities of human nature.[45] Christ as the image shares uniquely in the divine qualities of the Father in which we participate only in a derivative sense. The Son's unique ontological participation in the Father qualifies him to reveal the Father.

> Our Saviour is therefore the image of the invisible God, the Father, being the truth, when considered in relation to the Father himself, and the image, when considered in relation to us, to whom he reveals the Father; [the Greek text continues:] We, therefore, having been made according to the image, have the Son, the original, as the truth of the noble qualities that are within us. And what we are to the Son, such is the Son to the Father, who is the truth.[46]

---

[42] Origen, *Gen. Hom.* 1.13. Also see Mark Julian Edwards, *Origen Against Plato* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), 104.
[43] Origen, *Gen. Hom.* 1.13.
[44] Origen, *First Principles*, trans. G.W. Butterworth (London: SPCK, 1936), 1.2.6.
[45] Origen, *First Principles*, 1.2.6; also 1.1.8; *Comm. John* 2.3, 6.37, 10.23; *Gen. Hom.* 1.13; see Henri Crouzel, *Origen*, trans. A.S. Warall (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989), 139, 141; Balthasar, *TD* 2:328. He even refers to other human beings as the 'image of the image' in *Comm. John* 2, 3; also Edwards, *Origen Against Plato*, 104; citing Theodoret, *Questions on Genesis* 20, which cites Origen's lost commentary.
[46] Origen, *First Principles*, 1.2.6.

Note that this revelatory function is tied to the concept of 'truth', by which he means the substance of God.[47] For Irenaeus, the revelatory function of the image (i.e. Word) is closely associated with redemption, as in John. The Word is a *salvific* revelation of the Father.[48] In contrast, Origen ties revelation primarily to the Son's ontological *resemblance* to the Father and his mediation of the Father's being to the creature.[49]

Origen, like Irenaeus, sometimes distinguishes between image and likeness and sometimes treats them as a unity. Where he so distinguishes, the 'image' refers to the structural features present in humankind at creation, particularly the volition by which he would be able to attain perfection. The likeness is found only in the perfected man at the consummation, consisting of moral conformity to God and achieved by his 'earnest efforts to imitate God'.[50] Origen also believed that humans were destined for an eschatological state that is superior to their original state.[51]

In keeping with his insistence on the incorporeality of the image, Origen held that, not only was humankind incorporeal in the beginning, but will again be incorporeal in the end. There

---

[47] Earlier in the passage he cites Genesis 5:3 and comments, 'This image preserves the unity of nature and substance common to a father and a son'. Rufinus' Latin translation is more explicit about the revelatory function: 'through which image we know the Father, whom "no one" else "knoweth save the Son and he to whom the Son hath willed to reveal him". And he reveals the Father by being himself understood'; Origen, *First Principles*, 1.2.6.

[48] See for example, Irenaeus, *AH* 5.16.2; also *Dem.* 34.

[49] Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2:54.

[50] Origen, *First Principles* 3.6.1; also see Edwards, *Origen Against Plato*, 102. Curiously, he quotes 1 Jn 3:2 in this context, in which the eschatological transformation is the result of the vision of Christ. But he draws attention to the imperative of 'hope'. Perhaps one's act of hoping and consequent self-purification is part of the means of achieving moral perfection. It could well be that the act of 'beholding' or contemplating is also a matter of 'effort' for Origen.

[51] Origen, *First Principles* 3.6.1. But Origen is inconsistent in this, as he writes elsewhere of the 'original likeness'. In his first Homily on Genesis, he is referring to the moral resemblance to God which humans possessed in the original state. It is by 'beholding the image of the devil' that they are 'made like him by sin'. Similarly, it is by 'beholding the image of God' that they will be restored in the image and likeness of God; Origen, *Gen. Hom.* 1.13.

are two reasons for this. First, because God is incorporeal, and we will be 'one' with him, we must also be incorporeal in the final state. Second, Origen believed that embodiment inevitably leads to corruption. Therefore, being free from corruption requires that we be disembodied.[52] Jacobsen puts it more strongly: 'According to Origen, the corruptibility that Rom. 8,20 refers to is actual corporality. It is not corporality that is subject to corruptibility; corporality is itself corruptibility'.[53] Consequently, 'the destruction of the outer man leads precisely to the deliverance of the inner man'.[54] Origen's interpretation of the image in terms of resemblance, with the emphasis on ontological resemblance, along with its consequent devaluation of the body would set the course for subsequent development of anthropology, making way for the dominance of the structural image until at least the Reformation.

3.1.3 Augustine

Augustine's theology of the *imago Dei* offers a clear articulation of the structure of the human soul.[55] But the soul's capacities are oriented towards its purpose of communion with its Creator. As is well known, Augustine held that humankind is created in the image of the Trinity.[56] He argues this from the plural possessive pronoun in '*our* image and likeness' (Gen 1:26).[57] The content of the *imago Trinitatis* is derived from Augustine's psychological

---

[52] 'The first creation of rational creatures was also an incorporeal one, which was not meant to be in bondage to corruption for the reason that it was not clothed with bodies; for wherever bodies are, corruption follows immediately'; Origen, *First Principles* 3.6.1; John 17:21; 1 Cor 15:44, Rom 8:21, and 2 Cor 5:1, in juxtaposition with 2 Cor 4:18.

[53] Anders Lund Jacobsen, 'Genesis 1–3 as Source for the Anthropology of Origen', *Vigiliae Christianae* 62 (2008): 221–2.

[54] Jacobsen, 'Genesis 1–3', 222; Origen appeals to 2 Cor 4:16 for his radical distinction between the outer and the inner person.

[55] Lewis Ayres notes that Augustine and other prominent pro-Nicene Fathers locate the image in the soul; Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; Oxford Scholarship Online, 2005; doi:10.1093/0198755066.001.0001; accessed 7 July 2017), 326.

[56] Grenz considers this to be Augustine's greatest contribution to the doctrine; Grenz, *Social God*, 156.

[57] Augustine, *On the Trinity*, 12.6; also 14.19.

analysis of the mind as memory, understanding and will, developed in Book Ten of *Confessions*.[58] Some passages suggest that the image is located in the mind's capacity to contemplate the eternal.[59] But more frequently, it is located in the act of remembering, understanding and loving itself, so bearing the image of the Triune God.[60] More essentially, the image consists in its capacity to remember, understand and love God, and its actually doing so. This is the purpose for which humankind is made, and is its ultimate fulfilment.

> Hence, this Trinity of the mind is not on that account the image of God because the mind remembers itself, understands itself, and loves itself, but because it can also remember, understand, and love Him by whom it was made. And when it does so, it becomes wise; but if it does not, even though it remembers itself, knows itself, and loves itself, it is foolish. Let it, then, remember its God, to whose image it has been made, and understand Him and love Him.[61]

Hence the renewal of the mind involves a turning, by grace, of desire from created objects towards the creator. Furthermore, Lewis Ayres proposes that for Augustine, '[the] mind is perfected as *imago Dei* not merely when the object of desire is God, but when its act as mind is towards, from and in the divine'. Note the attention to the *manner* of remembering, knowing and loving.[62]

---

[58] Augustine, *The Confessions of St Augustine*, translated with an introduction and notes by John K. Ryan (New York: Random House, 1960), Book 10, 193–241; but also in Augustine, *On the Trinity*, 12, 14.

[59] Augustine, *On the Trinity*, 12.3–4. Note that, like most ancients, Augustine exhibits some variation in his use of terms. Ayres observes that Augustine, like Gregory of Nyssa, offers such analogies in developed reflections that not only applies our imagination to the unity the soul, but also demonstrates the insufficiency of our imagination to grasp the unity of God; Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy*, 291, 329.

[60] Augustine, *On the Trinity*, 14.8.11; Lewis Ayres, *Augustine and the Trinity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010; doi:10.1017/CBO9780511780301.013; accessed 24 July 2017), 279.

[61] Augustine, *On the Trinity*, 14.12.15. Ayres sees some variation in Augustine's use of the triads: being, knowing and willing as well as *mens*, *notitia* and *amor*. He also notes Augustine's distinction between higher and lower parts of the soul, and his locating 'the *imago Dei* and both of the triads … in the *mens*, the highest "part" of the soul', which is the seat of the human ability to know and love God; Ayres, *Augustine and the Trinity*, 286 n. 25.

[62] Ayres, *Augustine and the Trinity*, 307–8.

Augustine's exposition of the image is oriented not towards an isolated rational capacity, but towards the love and knowledge of God and a personal participation in him by grace, wherein the human image is fully itself.[63] According to Grenz, Augustine's stress on the mind's actual communion with God through grace not only opens the way for the triumph of the structural view, but also its critique in the Reformation.[64] I would argue that this same impulse was already present in Irenaeus and partially preserved in Clement and Origen. More importantly, for Augustine as for Irenaeus, human ontology implies a vocation towards participation in the divine that awaits fulfilment.

Like the Church Fathers before him, Augustine identifies the Son of God as the perfect image.[65] The *imago Dei* in humankind is conceived in terms of participation in the Son, who is uniquely the image and likeness of God.[66] Regarding content, this means that human rationality is present by virtue of participating in the rationality inherent in the Son, the *Logos* of God. But he diverges in affirming, based on 1 Corinthians 11:7, that humanity is an image of God, though 'not equal to and coeternal with him whose image it is'.[67] Augustine also makes some distinction between image and likeness, though holding the two close together. 'Image' specifies a relation of origin. One is an image of another if it is derived from that

---

[63] Grenz, *Social God*, 156–7; John Edward Sullivan, *The Image of God: The Doctrine of St. Augustine and Its Influence* (Dubuque, Iowa: Priory Press, 1963), 305. Nevertheless, Augustine does give primacy to the rational capacity, 'whereby he participates in God and is constituted as *imago dei*', and by which humans exercise dominion over creation; Gerald P. Boersma, *Augustine's Early Theology of Image: A Study in the Development of Pro-Nicene Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016; Oxford Scholarship Online, 2016; doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190251369.001.0001; accessed 24 July 2017), 211-2.
[64] Grenz, *Social God*, 157.
[65] Michel René Barnes, 'Rereading Augustine's Theology of the Trinity', *The Trinity: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Trinity*, ed. Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall and Gerald O'Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002; ebook, Oxford Scholarship Online, 2003; doi: 10.1093/0199246122.001.0001; accessed 7 July 2017), 37 n. 53.
[66] Boersma, *Augustine's Early Theology of Image*, 190.
[67] Augustine, *On the Literal Interpretation of Genesis*, 16.61. Boersma, *Augustine's Early Theology of Image*, 193, 221.

other. 'Likeness' specifies resemblance, and is present to some degree even before the eschaton, since there could not be an image 'in which there was no likeness. For if it was not like at all, it was certainly not an image'.[68] He affirms, contrary to Origen, that at creation, humankind possessed both the image and the likeness. But the 'full likeness to God' will be realised in the eschaton when we 'receive the full vision of Him'.[69]

Although Augustine gives primacy to the mind and its fulfilment in his view of the image, he also includes the embodied nature of the human person.[70] Augustine explicitly rejects the Alexandrian dualistic reading of the two creation accounts as referring to the creation of the soul and the body respectively. He affirms that the soul is principally the image of God and is the form of the body, the two constituting a 'harmonious unity'.[71] This, along with the other subtle balances described above, should be kept in mind as we read Augustine.

3.1.4 Thomas Aquinas

The predominant patristic insistence on Christ as the true *imago Dei* was, in Augustine, paired with an affirmation that humankind is not merely 'according to' the image, but is also rightly called the image of God.[72] This subtle anthropocentric shift was accentuated in medieval scholasticism along with an optimistic valuation of human nature. Anselm and Peter Lombard both appropriated various forms of Augustine's psychological *imago Trinitatis*.[73] Lombard

---

[68] Augustine, *Genesis*, 16.62.
[69] Augustine, *On the Trinity*, 14.18.
[70] Boersma, *Augustine's Early Theology of Image*, 213–4.
[71] Boersma, *Augustine's Early Theology of Image*, 213, 217-8; citing Augustine, *De Genesi Contra Manichaeos* 2.7.9.
[72] The Antiochene Fathers were exceptional in giving the anthropological image priority over the Christological; see below.
[73] Anselm adopted the triad: memory, knowledge and love. Lombard also used this triad, but preferred the second: memory, intellect and will. Grenz, *Social God*, 157. Note that the second triad specifies the structure of the soul, while the first alludes to the ordering of capacities.

also made use of Irenaeus' distinction between image and likeness to construct the two-tiered structure of 'nature' and 'grace', in which 'image' was associated with natural endowments, particularly reason and will, and 'likeness' with a *donum superadditum* of moral rectitude.[74] These trends culminate in Thomas Aquinas, who constructs a thoroughly anthropocentric *imago Dei*, relegating the Christological image to the periphery.[75]

Thomas Aquinas interprets the image as implying a similarity of nature.[76] He locates the image pre-eminently in the intellectual capacity, by which humans are 'most perfectly like God' and able to imitate God.[77] The imitation of God especially pertains to God's understanding and loving Himself, which, applied to humankind, refers to their understanding and loving God. Aquinas distinguishes three manifestations of the image: (1) the *ability* to understand and love God, which exists in the nature of the mind and is common to all humans; (2) one's actually and habitually knowing and loving God, which is produced by grace and is found only in the 'just'; and (3) the perfect knowing and loving of God, which 'consists in the likeness of glory', and is found only in the 'blessed'. These he also refers to as the 'threefold image of "creation", of "re-creation", and of "likeness"', corresponding to the image as universally retained, restored in believers through Christ and perfected at the eschaton.[78] Note that the first is a structural capacity, while the second and third represent

---

[74] Grenz, *Social God*, 157–8.

[75] According to Grenz, it is in Aquinas that 'the centrality of Christ as the divine image that had characterized the second-century Fathers, such as Irenaeus, fell by the wayside in favor of the idea that the human person is the *imago dei*'; Grenz, *Social God*, 158. Aquinas does acknowledge Christ as the divine image in *Summa Theologica* 1.35.2, 1.93.1.

[76] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* 1.93.2, rep. 4.

[77] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* 1.93.4; quoting Ps 38:7.

[78] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* 1.93.4. Cairns claims that Aquinas was the first in the history of the doctrine to make a clear distinction between the image as a 'power' (1) and the image as an 'activity' (2 and 3). Cairns, *Image*, 121. But we have seen that the distinction was already present in Irenaeus' expositions of 'image' and 'likeness', which differs certainly in terminology but only minimally in content. Joseph F. Hartel also

different degrees of moral virtue, and even realised relational communion, which result from a proper expression of such capacities.[79]

Therefore, although the intellect is prominent in Aquinas' thought, it is not merely the rational capacity as an isolated and independent element but includes a distinctly ethical component and is placed in relation to God, as in the case of Irenaeus and Augustine.[80] This is contrary to Gunton's assessment, that in Aquinas, the image as reason and volition are 'static possessions of the human as individual, rather than (say) characteristics implying relation'.[81] Against such a caricature, it should be affirmed that for Aquinas, (1) the mind of sinners is 'obscured and disfigured';[82] (2) the mind is created for the purpose of knowing and loving God, wherein it finds fulfilment;[83] (3) the soul is intimately related to the body;[84] (4) the restoration of reason

discusses this passage in *Femina ut Imago Dei in the Integral Feminism of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1993), 313-21. Regarding the distinction in Aquinas, Hartel writes, '*Imago* is the likeness between intellectual natures. Likeness is distinguished from image when it occurs either before or after the likeness of image. In the last sense likeness expresses the ethical perfection of the image'; p. 313 n. 13. This refers to the third level, i.e. 'glory'; p. 318.

[79] 'Human beings are image of God by reason of their intellectual nature. They image God because they can express an intellectual causality in the world, the spiritual causality of reasoning. In this article, however, Thomas says that human beings can image God more in degree when they exercise this causality in a certain way. The image can be perfected when people imitate what God does'; Hartel, *Femina ut Imago Dei*, 313; also see p. 318-20.

[80] Also Grenz, *Social God*, 159.

[81] Colin E. Gunton, 'Trinity, Ontology and Anthropology', 48–49. Gunton also complains of Aquinas' citation of John of Damascus in *Summa Theologica* 1.93.5. But the citation occurs in Aquinas' 'Objection', which he proceeds to answer by affirming that the image is not only in regards to the unity of the divine essence, but also to the Trinity of persons. In so doing, Aquinas resists the impulse to define the image purely in terms of an abstract 'essence', but includes the particularity of the concrete 'persons'.

[82] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* 1.93.8.

[83] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* 1.93.4.

[84] According to O'Meara, Aquinas opposed dualism while making the distinction between the body and the soul. 'The human being is constituted as a single being where matter and spirit (body and animating principle) are principles of one living nature'; Thomas F. O'Meara, *Thomas Aquinas Theologian* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997), 105. 'Just as the body gets its being from the soul as from its form, so too it makes a unity with this soul'; Thomas Aquinas, *De Anima* 2, 1 (Turin, 1936), p. 89; quoted in O'Meara, 105; O'Meara also cites Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles* 2.81. But other translations suggest a stronger distinction: 'so also it is united to the soul immediately, in as much as the soul is the form of the body'; Thomas Aquinas, *Commentary on Aristotle's Treatise on the Soul*, trans. R. A. Kocourek (N.p.: The College of St. Thomas, 1946), 11.

is achieved only by grace, through the work of the Spirit;[85] and (5) grace is not set in opposition to nature, but congruent with it, elevating nature to its fulfilment.[86] Assertions to the contrary may arise from Aquinas' statement elsewhere, suggesting that the faculties of the soul are unaffected by sin: 'Accordingly, the first-mentioned good of nature is neither destroyed nor diminished by sin'. But this statement is to be understood in light of his division of human nature into three aspects: (1) natural capacities, (2) inclination to virtue, and (3) original righteousness. He argues that the first is undiminished, the second is diminished, and the third is destroyed.[87]

What is diminished is the right ordering of capacities. But the capacities themselves, and the fact that humans continue to be rational and volitional beings, are fully retained. The 'good' that remains speaks of the basic value of human nature, e.g. the ability to build dwellings.[88] Such language is understandably uncomfortable for conservatively-minded protestants, who generally insist that depravity extends to every aspect of the human being. But Aquinas clearly rejects the notion that sinners can perform righteous or 'meritorious' acts apart from grace.[89] His affirmation of nature is to be understood in light of an appreciation for the power

---

[85] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* 1.93.4; O'Meara, 111.
[86] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* 1.1.8; O'Meara, 81, 111.
[87] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* 1-2.85; quotation from 1-2.85.1. 1-2.85.2 continues: 'As stated above (A[1]), the good of nature, that is diminished by sin, is the natural inclination to virtue …. Now sin cannot entirely take away from man the fact that he is a rational being, for then he would no longer be capable of sin. Wherefore it is not possible for this good of nature to be destroyed entirely'.
[88] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* 1-2.109.2.
[89] *Summa Theologica* 1.93.8, rep. 3: 'The meritorious knowledge and love of God can be in us only by grace'. This may be of little conciliation to many protestants, who generally avoid any mention of 'merit'. But compare John 6:29: 'This is the work of God, that you believe in him whom he has sent'. Also see *Summa Theologica* 1-2.85.3: 'Now this same original justice was forfeited through the sin of our first parent … so that all the powers of the soul are left, as it were, destitute of their proper order, whereby they are naturally directed to virtue; which destitution is called a wounding of nature'.

of human nature that continues to be demonstrated in such endeavours as science, art and technology despite its inclination towards sin.

3.1.5 Recent Proponents of the Structural View

The structural view is less commonly held in contemporary dialogue on the *imago Dei*, given the dominance of relational categories. Proponents such as Millard Erickson and J. P. Moreland locate the *imago Dei* in the psychological aspect of humankind, including reason and free will. Erickson posits that God's communicable attributes constitute the *imago Dei* in humans.[90] Contemporary Pentecostals tend to adopt a primarily structural view while also acknowledging relational and functional elements.[91] The AG (USA) position paper on the 'Sanctity of Human Life' defines the image mainly in terms of ontological resemblance to God, particularly as 'personal and spiritual … rational and relational'. In addition, 'It implies that humans are intended for eternal fellowship with their Creator and requires both sexes for full expression'.[92]

3.1.5.1 Hans Urs von Balthasar

The prominent Roman Catholic theologian, Hans Urs von Balthasar, holds to a multifaceted view of the image that incorporates structural, ethical, relational and functional components.[93]

---

[90] Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, Second Edition (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 533. Moreland uses a structural view of the *imago Dei* as part of his apologetic against naturalism; J. P. Moreland, *The Recalcitrant Imago Dei: Human Persons and the Failure of Naturalism* (London: SCM Press, 2009), 4–5.

[91] The Pentecostal theologian Lisa P. Stephenson holds to a functional view; see sect. 3.4.2 below.

[92] Assemblies of God position paper, 'Sanctity of Human Life: Abortion and Reproductive Issues'; http://ag.org/top/Beliefs/Position_Papers/pp_downloads/PP_Sanctity_of_Human_Life_Abortion_Reproductive_ Issues.pdf; accessed 12 April 2014, 1. The WAGF, the PAOC and the Church of God (Cleveland, TN) do not have a similar statement elaborating on the 'image of God'. This is in keeping with Edmund Rybarczyk's observation that Pentecostals acknowledge that the *imago* includes correspondence between human personality and God's being, but tend to emphasise God's purpose and intent; Edmund Rybarczyk, *Beyond Salvation*, 215, 228.

[93] Although I have chosen to include Balthasar in the present section, he could arguably have been placed into the category of 'The Trinitarian Social *Imago*'; see sect. 3.3.2.

Although he gives some treatment of protology, he gives primary emphasis to the Christological and eschatological image. He regards Genesis 1:26ff as implying an *analogia entis*, being concerned with humanity's 'distinctive essence … [which] cannot be lost'.[94] By contrast, the New Testament 'image' refers to 'Christ alone', to whose image humankind must be conformed.[95] He also supports the 'Irenaean' distinction between image and likeness, respectively denoting an essential constituent of human nature and the gift of the *Pneuma* (grace), the latter of which *can* be lost.[96] The tension in the anthropological image is construed in terms of essential being and active fulfilment.[97]

Balthasar emphasises free will as the key element in the anthropological *imago*. He makes use of the tensions between image and likeness and, more importantly, between the first and Second Adam, to arrive at his central definition of the image as finite freedom, in contrast to the infinite freedom of the archetype. The image finds fulfilment only by '[deciding] to move toward God', thereby realising the 'likeness'.[98] Balthasar acknowledges rationality as a presupposed feature, but follows Tertullian and Gregory in defining the image as freedom, with the inherent responsibility to 'choose in order to possess itself'.[99] The contrast and interplay between finite and infinite freedom facilitates placing anthropology and Christology into Balthasar's overarching dramatic framework.[100]

---

[94] Balthasar, *TD* 2:320–1. In this context he implicitly affirms both spirit and body as part of the image; pp. 322–3. But he rejects Barth's identification of the image with sexual differentiation; p. 369.
[95] Balthasar, *TD* 2:324; citing 2 Cor 4:4; Col 1:15; Rom 8:29; 2 Cor 3:18; 1 Cor 15:49.
[96] Balthasar, *TD* 2:325. In n. 33, Balthasar discusses Brunner's misguided critique of Irenaeus, noting the similarity between their positions.
[97] Balthasar, *TD* 2:326.
[98] Balthasar, *TD* 2:326–7. Also, 'The "image of God" in the creature consists decisively in its *autexousion*, in the created mirroring of uncreated freedom. This self-determination cannot be conceived as separate from spirit (rationality)'; p. 397.
[99] Balthasar, *TD* 2:327. Also see sect. 3.1.1 above and n. 22.
[100] Balthasar, *TD* 2:190–1, 194, 335, 428.

Balthasar's structural *imago* is complemented by his view of the *imago Trinitatis*, in which the reciprocity between the Christian individual and the community 'becomes a concrete metaphor of Trinitarian life within God'.[101] The individual-community tension can be maintained only by virtue of the Christian innovation of the concept of the 'person'.[102] Unlike most proponents of the relational *imago*, who disparage the notion of the isolated 'individual' in favour of the communal 'person', Balthasar begins with individuals as 'mutually exclusive centers of self-awareness and freedom' which 'excludes all participation by others'.[103] This exclusivity is the necessary condition for relationship, which requires one's recognition of the other as 'other', as well as the freedom to detach oneself from the community and to offer one's own unique self in encounter with the latter. 'In this way, beings existing for themselves simultaneously exist for one another'.[104] Not only does Balthasar maintain the individual-community tension, he also reverses the customary order, giving priority to the individual, from which the personal character of the community arises. Through Christian participation in the divine life, the community of individuals acquires a personalised character.

> The person's self-surrender to the community can so personalize the latter that it is no longer an extrapersonal principle of unity beside and above the unity of persons but is integrated out of these surrendered unities, just as God's unity of nature is not something in addition to the interplay of relations between the divine Persons. At the same time, … it does not abolish the 'great dissimilarity', … the created persons remain individual substances, each of which is an image and likeness of the Absolute Substance.[105]

In Balthasar's modified personalist account, humankind and Christ constitute the *dramatis personae*, the characters of the drama. Against the prevalent twentieth century tendency to

---

[101] Balthasar, *TD* 2:415.
[102] Balthasar, *TD* 2:387.
[103] Balthasar, *TD* 2:388.
[104] Balthasar, *TD* 2:388.
[105] Balthasar, *TD* 2:416.

define personhood in purely relational terms, Balthasar defines it in terms of mission. He cites several biblical examples in which the divinely bestowed mission 'summons [one] to put his very existence at its disposal', and so redefines one's identity according to God's design.[106] But the superlative instance is the sending of Jesus at his baptism, in which 'the imparting of *being* coincides with the imparting of *mission*'.[107] In the incarnate Son of God, person and mission are identical. In the context of the economy of salvation history, his identity is constituted by his mission and he becomes the basis for the identity and mission of all humankind.[108]

It is the purpose and meaning of the incarnation to elevate and incorporate the created image into the primal divine image.[109] But the application of Jesus' mission to humanity is understood in relation to four topics. First, because he adopts human nature as a whole, he brings all human conscious subjects into the 'acting area', rendering them 'persons' in the theological sense. 'They are not only negatively "redeemed", but positively endowed with missions ("charisms")' as they participate in his universal mission.[110] Second, in the 'wondrous exchange', Christ takes human sin upon himself and also gives back to us that human nature which is 'con-crucified and co-risen' and so reunited with God.[111] These two interrelated aspects are demonstrated and sealed in the Eucharist.[112] Third, the Pauline

---

[106] Balthasar, *TD* 3:154–5. Some examples he cites of identity-bestowing mission include Isaiah (Isa 6), Jeremiah (Jer 1:5), John the Baptist (Luke 1:15ff). In many such cases, the concurrent giving of identity and mission is reflected in the change of names: Abram-Abraham, Jacob-Israel, Simon-Peter, Saul-Paul.
[107] Balthasar, *TD* 3:155–6; alluding to Isa 42:1; Mark 1:11; par. Luke 3:22; Matt 3:17; cf. 17:5; italics original.
[108] Balthasar, *TD* 3:156–7; here Balthasar distinguishes between the 'economic' Trinity and the 'immanent' Trinity.
[109] Balthasar, *TD* 3:223.
[110] Balthasar, *TD* 3:231, 233–7.
[111] Balthasar, *TD* 3:237–40.
[112] Balthasar, *TD* 3:232, 243.

formula of 'ἐν Χριστῷ' (in Christ), designates Christ's sphere of influence that constitutes the Christian existence. Those who respond to Christ in faith participate in his death, resurrection and mission, and are incorporated into the Body of Christ.[113] They are endowed with personality and a mission that is specific to the individual and yet also a form of participation in the personality and mission of Jesus.[114] Lastly, as Christ is the mediator of creation, his mission extends to the entire cosmos in its totality. Having inaugurated a new creation, it culminates in a new heaven and a new earth.[115] All things were 'created with a view to their being perfected in the Second Adam'.[116]

3.2 The Ethical *Imago*

The advent of the Reformation brought renewed attention to the NT emphasis on Christological and soteriological themes. Most prominent among the Reformers was the association of the *imago Dei* with active moral conformity to Christ, i.e. *imago Christi*. The linking of the image to righteousness in relation to God was already present in Irenaeus, and to various degrees maintained in Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine and Aquinas. But this theme had been overshadowed by the medieval emphasis on structural ontology. By Luther's time, this humanistic trajectory had given rise to a soteriological synergism, eliciting a reaction from Luther, who recovered the Augustinian emphasis on original sin and the need for grace.[117] This soteriological impulse also shifted the focus from the OT created image to the NT restored image. Also recovered is the patristic emphasis on Christ as the true image of

---

[113] Balthasar, *TD* 3:246–8.
[114] Balthasar, *TD* 3:249.
[115] 2 Cor 5:17; Rev 21:1; Balthasar, *TD* 3:250–2.
[116] Balthasar, *TD* 3:257.
[117] A detailed study of the causes of the Protestant Reformation is beyond the scope of this thesis. But see Roger E. Olson, *The Story of Christian Theology* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1999), 365; Grenz, *Social God*, 163; Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 94.

God. Although the Reformation view is often labelled as a 'relational' image, it is significantly different from twentieth century models and warrants a separate classification. It is relational in the sense that righteousness is inconceivable apart from relationship to God, and consequently, restoration of the image is achieved only through communion with and conformity to Christ. But because the anthropological pessimism of the Reformation requires a 'loss' of the image to some degree and a radical dependence on its restoration in Christ, this model lacks the unconditional nature of the contemporary relational image, as well as its attention to the horizontal dimension.[118] Treatment will be given to Luther who originated this view, and Calvin who gave it the most significant development. Luther's emphasis on godly living and Calvin's emphasis on the display of God's glory both reflect a NT concern for conformity to the likeness of Christ. Mention can be made of Stanley Grenz and Diane Chandler as recent figures who exhibit affinities for this view and offer more developed expositions of the content of such conformity, including such aspects as spirituality, relationships, affections and vocation.[119]

---

[118] Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 94; also see my note below on Luther. This is true of Luther to a greater degree than Calvin, whose pessimism was more moderate. Yet even Luther at times speaks of a relic of the image; Cairns, *Image*, 131–2.

[119] But note that Grenz emphasises the relational view in his final constructive chapters, 7 and 8, e.g. p. 336. Although Chandler states that her view of *imago Dei* is holistic, Chandler, *Christian Spiritual Formation*, 31, her statements elsewhere indicate an emphasis on conformity to Christ in 'godly character and ethical living', p. 17, 38–40, 44, 58, 64, 259, 262. It seems that Chandler has in mind primarily (1) a holistic *ontology* entailing a set of seven integrated capacities, (2) a holistic *stewardship* and proper expression of such capacities and their respective responsibilities, and (3) a holistic *formation* process in which all of these capacities and their expressions are conformed to the likeness of Christ. Furthermore, this expression, stewardship and formation occur only by God's grace in the context of a loving spiritual *relationship* with God through Christ and the Spirit as part of the ecclesial community. This can certainly be classified as a 'holistic' view with an emphasis on the ethical (i.e. formational) aspect, though it could be strengthened with a clear statement of relational (or spiritual) *responsibility* (or vocation) rather than simply 'relational capacity'; cf. her accurate use of 'responsibility' on p. 36 for the 'dominion' perspective. Interestingly, Luther incorporates the notion of '[desiring] what God desires'; see the quote below from his commentary on Gen 5:1. Unfortunately, Chandler's work came to my attention only in the final stages of this thesis, and for that reason was not fully incorporated.

3.2.1 Martin Luther

Martin Luther's theology of the image is best understood in contrast to the structural model he rejects. He acknowledges the Augustinian definition of the image as memory, intellect and will, and holds reason in the highest regard.[120] But he considers this an inadequate definition, deriving from 'philosophy or human wisdom', consisting only of the 'material cause' of humanity and pertaining only to this life.[121] He finds a more adequate definition in theology, which considers humankind in relation to his efficient and final causes, and defines humans as creatures of God and destined to eternal life.[122] According to Weinrich, 'the distinction between man [*sic*] considered in relation to this world (philosophy) and man considered in relation to his efficient and final causes (God and eternal life: theology) was central to Luther's anthropological thinking'.[123] Consequently, the image is righteous and godly living, a right ordering and expression of one's God-given capacities.[124] 'Therefore my understanding of the image of God is this: that Adam had it in his being and that he not only knew God and believed that He was good, but that he also lived a life that was wholly godly, that is, he was without the fear of death or of any other danger, and was content with God's

---

[120] For example, he states that reason, which separates man from other creatures, is 'the inventor and mentor of all the arts, medicines, laws, and of whatever wisdom, power, virtue, and glory men possess in this life'; Martin Luther, *Disputatio de homine*, thesis 5, quoted in William C. Weinrich, '*Homo theologicus: Aspects of a Lutheran Doctrine of Man*', in *Personal Identity in Theological Perspective*, ed. Richard Lints, Michael S. Horton and Mark R. Talbot (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2006), 31.

[121] Luther, *Disputatio*, theses 1, 3, quoted in Weinrich, '*Homo theologicus*', 30–31.

[122] Luther, *Disputatio*, theses 20–21, 17; Weinrich, '*Homo theologicus*', 32.

[123] Weinrich, '*Homo theologicus*', 33.

[124] 'In all his important passages on the subject, he equates the image with man's original righteousness'; Cairns, 130. Cairns goes on to discuss Luther's comments on Gen 1:26; 1 Cor 15:48; Eph 4:21–4.

Grenz notes that the 'original righteousness' in Luther's view of the *imago* is dynamic and active, and 'entirely determined by man's response to God'; Grenz, *Social God*, 165; Cairns, *image*, 131. This is an important point given the tendency to associate 'righteousness' in Luther with forensic justification. The confusion of the 'original righteousness' view with positional righteousness is evident, for instance, in Paul Ramsey: 'The image of God, according to this view, consists of man's position before God'; Ramsey, *Basic Christian Ethics*, 255. I am indebted to Grenz for this reference.

favor'.[125] The image is a *manner* of living that reflects God's own life of 'supreme bliss' and 'freedom from fear'.[126] This naturally leads to the conclusion that sin has resulted in the loss of the image.[127]

Although Luther does not 'condemn or find fault with' Augustine's attempts to draw analogies between the Trinity and the image, he views them as unhelpful and paving the way for dangerous propositions.[128] He considers the identification of the image with memory, mind and will to be the source of the semi-Pelagian assertion that 'free will co-operated as the preceding and efficient cause of salvation'.[129] He also opposes the 'more dangerous' teaching of Pseudo-Dionysius that these natural endowments 'remained unimpaired' in fallen demons and human beings. Although we certainly possess these powers, they are 'most depraved and most seriously weakened … leprous and unclean'.[130] Clearly, Luther's concern is to guard against the optimism of medieval philosophical anthropology.[131]

Regarding the use of 'image' and 'likeness', Luther is somewhat inconsistent. In his lecture on Genesis 1:26 he notes the parallelism in the Hebrew text: 'This distinction between "image" and "similitude", which are parallels in the Hebrew text, goes back at least to

---

[125] Martin Luther, *Luther's Works, vol. 1: Lectures on Genesis Chapters 1–5*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (St. Louis: Concordia, 1958), 62–3; also p. 141.
[126] Luther, *Works*, 1:63. Weinrich describes Luther's view of the image as 'eternal life', or life 'with' and 'before' God; Weinrich, '*Homo theologicus*', 36.
[127] Luther, *Works*, 1:63; Weinrich, '*Homo theologicus*', 36, 37; Cairns 130; Douglas Hall as quoted in Grenz, *Social God*, 166.
[128] In subtle contrast to Grenz's analysis in Grenz, *Social God*, 163, which highlights Luther's negative assessment of Augustine.
[129] Luther, *Works*, 1:61.
[130] Luther, *Works*, 1:61.
[131] See Grenz, *Social God*, 163.

Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, V, ch. 6, par. 1'.[132] But the reformer does make some distinction in his comment on Genesis 5:1.

> Even though almost all interpreters take the similitude and the image of God to mean the same thing, nevertheless, … there is some difference between these two words. For [צלם] in its strict sense denotes an image or a figure … [דמות], however, which denotes likeness, refers to the accuracy of the image. … Therefore when Moses says that man was created also in the similitude of God, he indicates that man is not only like God in this respect that he has the ability to reason, or an intellect, and a will, but also that he has a likeness of God, that is, a will and an intellect by which he understands God and by which he desires what God desires, etc.[133]

In light of these statements, and their close conceptual resemblance to Irenaeus, one would expect Luther to identify 'likeness' with that which is lost and 'image' with that which is retained.[134] But Luther goes on to state that both were lost, while acknowledging that humans continue to possess a 'seriously weakened' rationality.[135] This tension between his exegetical and theological comments is, again, due to his polemical interests. It seems that in positing the loss of the image Luther seeks to affirm human depravity and to exclude any possibility of salvation as a human achievement.[136] Humankind has lost both the practice of, and the capacity for, understanding and loving God.

Grenz agrees with Douglas Hall's assessment, that Luther's theology of image is essentially relational, and that it is this understanding that leads Luther to deny the presence of the image

---

[132] Luther, *Works*, 1:60 n. 95.
[133] Luther, *Works*, 1:337. This is contrary to Bruner's categorical insistence that Luther makes no distinction between 'image' and 'likeness'; Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 94, 507.
[134] Horton also observes the parallel between the Reformation distinction between substance and 'actual endowments' (original righteousness), and the Irenaean distinction between 'image' and 'likeness'; Michael S. Horton, *Lord and Servant: A Covenant Christology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005), 101 n. 34.
[135] Luther, *Works*, 1:338; also 1:61, 63 and 34:177.
[136] Weinrich, '*Homo theologicus*', 36; cf. Cairns, 131; Cairns makes a similar comment in the context of contrasting Luther with Aquinas.

in fallen humanity.[137] Although there is certainly a relational element in Luther, it is distinct from that found in twentieth century models of the relational image. First, Luther's *imago* consists mostly of righteous living rather than of responsibility as a counterpart before God. One could call this a 'performative' relation as opposed to a 'responsible' relation.[138] Second, Luther's *imago* was lost through sin, whereas in later relational models the image is unconditional and cannot be lost.[139] Third, Luther's *imago* approximates Irenaeus' idea of 'likeness' as original righteousness.[140] There is, however, a hint of modern personalism in Luther: 'Where or with whom God speaks, whether in wrath or in grace, the same is certainly immortal. The Person of God who there speaks, and the Word, indicate that we are creatures with whom God wills to speak on into eternity, and in an immortal manner'.[141]

3.2.2 John Calvin

John Calvin shared Luther's concern for a theological anthropology that places humankind in relation to God and eternal life. He likewise defined the image, which he considers to be synonymous with likeness, in terms of a proper ordering of reason and will that is directed

---

[137] Grenz, *Social God*, 165–6; Hall, *Imaging God*, 99–100. As I suggested earlier, his anthropological pessimism in response to medieval semi-Pelagianism may be a better motive for positing the loss of the image; Cairns concurs; Cairns, *Image*, 131.

[138] Unlike 'responsibility', 'righteous living' is wholly dependent upon human response.
Note that Hall has a broader definition of the relational view that adequately accounts for Luther and Calvin. The image of God is 'an inclination or proclivity occurring within the relationship … something that "happens" as a consequence of this relationship'; Douglas J. Hall, *Imaging God: Dominion as Stewardship* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2004), 98. In order to adequately distinguish this view from modern relational views, the designation 'ethical' is preferred.

[139] Cf. Alistair McFadyen and Robert Jenson, treated later in this chapter.

[140] If one accepts the distinction between 'image' and 'likeness' in Luther's comment on Genesis 5:1 and Irenaeus *AH* 4.4.3 and 5.6.1 as representative, one could say that Luther's theology of the image is a restatement of some of the key elements in Irenaeus. But more prominent in Luther is the synonymous interpretation of the terms.

[141] Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, 43:481; translated quote in Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 97 n. 1. This is found in Luther's Lecture on Genesis 26:24–25; for the original German text, see Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe, vol. 43* (Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1912), 481.

towards the knowledge and obedience of God.[142] Calvin considered the Pauline texts on the renewal of the image through Christ to be the most definitive, yielding insight into the content of the image as originally created.[143] 'Christ is the most perfect image of God', and it is through conformity to Christ that the image is restored. 'In the first place [Paul] posits knowledge, then pure righteousness and holiness. From this we infer that, to begin with, God's image was visible in the light of the mind, in the uprightness of the heart, and in the soundness of all the parts'.[144]

Central to Calvin's theology of the image is the concept of a mirror reflecting the glory of God.[145] The entire world is an image, a mirror through which the glory and attributes of God are displayed for us to see.[146] But humankind 'is the brightest mirror in which we can behold his glory'.[147] Some have described Calvin's theology of image in relational terms.[148] As in the case of Luther, the *imago Dei* in Calvin is 'relational' in the sense that human beings image God only when the capacities of the soul are rightly oriented towards the Creator. The mirror

---

[142] T. F. Torrance, *Calvin's Doctrine of Man* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949), 31; Calvin, *Comm. on Acts* 17:27. Calvin clearly rejects the distinction between image and likeness, interpreting the terms as an instance of Hebrew parallelism; John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 1.15.3.

[143] Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.15.4.

[144] Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.15.4. Calvin draws attention to 1 Cor 15:45; Col 3:10; Eph 4:24; 2 Cor 3:18.

[145] Torrance has made the observation: 'There is no such thing in Calvin's thought as an *imago* dissociated from the act of reflecting'; Torrance, *Calvin's Doctrine of Man*, 36. Both Grenz and Blocher have reservations regarding such statements; Grenz, *Social God*, 166; Henri Blocher, 'Calvin's Theological Anthropology', *John Calvin and Evangelical Theology: Legacy and Prospect*, ed. Sung Wook Chung (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009), 72.

[146] 'The entire world is like a lively image in which God displays his power and eminence'; Calvin, S. 1 on Ez., in *Ioannis Caalvini opera*, 35:535. See Grenz, *Social God*, 167. Also: 'The world was no doubt made, that it might be the theatre of the divine glory'; John Calvin, Heb 11:3, in *Calvin's Commentaries* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979), 22:266.

[147] Calvin, Ps 8:1, in *Commentaries,* 4:93–4; Grenz, *Social God*, 167.

[148] E.g. Cairns, *Image*, 137; Grenz, *Social God*, 166, 169; David T. Williams, '"He is the Image and Glory of God, but Woman …" (1 Cor 11:7): "Unveiling" the Understanding of the *Imago Dei*', *Scriptura* 108 (2011): 318; Hall, *Imaging God*, 101, 105. But see my comment above regarding Hall's definition of the relational *imago*.

can reflect the divine glory only by beholding the glory of Christ and conforming to him.[149]

But the distinctions I have noted between Luther and later relational models apply to Calvin

as well. What needs further clarification in this context is that Calvin does not use the mirror

metaphor to refer to the interpersonal I-Thou confrontation we find in Karl Barth's view.[150]

Rather, the mirror designates the excellence of the human creature by which it resembles God

and so manifests God's glory. In this general sense, Calvin acknowledges a 'likeness' to God

in the entire person, including the body, insofar as it is superior to the animals. But he locates

the image primarily in the soul. Particularly, the image is found in the integrity of the human

soul that is rightly ordered, displaying God's glory in the excellence of its created nature:

> Accordingly, the integrity with which Adam was endowed is expressed by this word, when he had full possession of right understanding, when he had his affections kept within the bounds of reason, all his senses tempered in right order, and he truly referred his excellence to exceptional gifts bestowed upon him by his Maker. And although the primary seat of the divine image was in the mind and heart, or in the soul and its powers, yet there was no part of man, not even the body itself, in which some sparks did not glow.[151]

The metaphor of humankind as a mirror that reflects the glory of God is consistent with the

initial thought of Calvin's *Institutes* with which he frames the task of theology: that the

knowledge of self is required for the knowledge of God, and conversely, the knowledge of

---

[149] Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.15.4, 1:189–90; citing 2 Cor 3:18.

[150] Unfortunately, Cairns gives this impression in his description of Calvin: 'In both cases there is a reflection of God's glory back to himself through praise … Therefore it may be said that man is in God's image in so far as he reflects back God's glory to him in gratitude'; Cairns, *Image*, 137. Cairns cites Torrance, who correctly interprets the metaphor to mean that God is manifested in the mirror. 'Where the thought is of the mirroring of God, properly speaking the mirror is always the Word. "The Word itself, whatever be the way in which it is conveyed to us, is a kind of mirror in which faith beholds God" … It is not often that Calvin uses the expression *imago dei* except in this intimate association with mirror and word'; Torrance, *Calvin's Doctrine of Man*, 36–7. Grenz implicitly agrees with Ramsey's interpretation of the 'mirror' analogy as primarily relational; Grenz, *Social God*, 162.

[151] Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.15.3. Also: 'For although God's glory shines forth in the outer man, yet there is no doubt that the proper seat of his image is in the soul', ibid. In 1.15.4 he acknowledges that he is speaking in synecdoches; nevertheless 'what was primary in the renewing of God's image [i.e. knowledge, pure righteousness and holiness] also held the highest place in the creation itself'.

God is required for the knowledge of self. 'For, quite clearly, the mighty gifts with which we are endowed are hardly from ourselves; indeed, our very being is nothing but subsistence in the one God'.[152] But ultimately, it is only Christ who perfectly reflects the glory of God, apart from whom humans can have no knowledge of God. 'For, since "God dwells in inaccessible light" … Christ must become our intermediary. … For this purpose the Father laid up with his only-begotten Son all that he had to reveal himself in Christ so that Christ, by communicating his Father's benefits, might express the true image of his glory. … The invisible Father is to be sought solely in this image'.[153] In this passage we see that for Calvin, Christ as the image of God is sole mediator and salvific revelation of God. It is in Christ that the knowledge of the glory of God is found, and the 'Father's benefits' are communicated to humanity.[154]

3.3 The Relational *Imago*

Representatives of the relational *imago* define the *imago Dei* in terms of relationships rather than ontological structure.[155] These models draw from modern developments in philosophical personalism, adapting them for theological use.[156] They are marked by an explicit rejection of Boethius' classic definition of a person as an 'individual substance of a rational nature',[157] opting instead to define personhood in terms of relation to an 'other'. Two sub-types can be discerned among those who belong to this stream: 'the personal *imago*' denotes those models

---

[152] Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.1.1; the main thrust of the passage, however, is about how the corruption in us should '[arouse] us to seek God'.

[153] Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.2.1; citing: 1 Tim. 6:16; Heb. 1:3; John 8:12; Ps 36:9; John 14:6; Luke 10:22; 1 Cor 2:2; Acts 20:21; 26:17–18; 2 Cor 4:6.

[154] Cf. my previous comments on Origen; also Randall C. Zachman, 'Jesus Christ as the Image of God in Calvin's Theology', *Calvin Theological Journal* 25/1 (1990): 49. In contrast to Origen, Calvin also denies that Christ was the exemplar after whom Adam was conformed; Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.15.30.

[155] Some proponents would argue that the ontological structure of humans is constituted by relationships.

[156] The Eastern Orthodox theologians, Vladimir Lossky and John Zizioulas, trace their view of personhood to the innovations of the Cappadocian Fathers.

[157] Found in Boethius, *Liber de Persona et Duabus Naturis*, ch. 3, and notably quoted by Thomas Aquinas in *Summa Theologica* 1.29.1; See Boethius, 'A Treatise against Eutyches and Nestorius', ch. 3, in *The Theological Tractates*, trans. H.F. Stewart and E.K. Rand (London: Heinemann; New York: Putnam, 1609; PDF ebook, Grand Rapids: CCEL), 34; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/boethius/tracts.pdf; accessed 31 March 2017.

that locate the image primarily in the person so constituted, while 'the Trinitarian social *imago*' designates models that emphasise the analogy between the divine Trinitarian community on the one hand and human 'I-thou' relationships (Barth) or human community (Zizioulas and Grenz) on the other. In the case of the former, the image is the *person* in community; in the latter, the image is the *community* of persons.

3.3.1 The Personal Imago

The 'personal' variation of the relational view denotes those who view the image as personhood, which in turn is defined in reference to the fact that human beings exist in relationship with God and with others. The relationship that constitutes the image is usually construed as an actuality that depends not on human response, but on the prior call of God.

3.3.1.1 Emil Brunner

Emil Brunner distinguishes between the formal image and the material image. The formal image refers to the purposive structure of humanity—created with a responsibility to respond to God.[158] The material image refers to the actual positive response to God.[159] In making this distinction, Brunner is seeking to reconcile three ideas: (1) sinners remain human; (2) being human is inseparable from the *imago Dei*; and (3) the *imago Dei* has been completely lost in some sense.[160] The *formal* image refers to the OT image, and designates humanity's responsible existence before God. Human nature is defined as the fact of this existence which, unlike the material image, cannot be lost.[161]

---

[158] Emil Brunner, *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption: Dogmatics, Vol. II*, trans. Olive Wyon (London: Lutterworth Press, 1952), 57. Here Brunner seems to play on the words 'response' and 'responsibility'.
[159] Brunner, *Creation and Redemption*, 57–8.
[160] Brunner, *Creation and Redemption*, 59.
[161] Brunner, *Creation and Redemption*, 57. Also: 'God creates man's being in such a way that man knows that he is determined and conditioned by God, and in this fact is truly human. The being of man as an "I" is being from

Nevertheless, Brunner also wants to affirm that the *material* image is essential to human nature.[162] Brunner rejects as 'Greek rationalism' the structural definition of humanity as a rational being, and the analogy drawn to God as 'Infinite Reason'.[163] He is particularly concerned that such a definition makes humanity's relationship with God to be an additional 'supernatural' element external to human nature.[164] Rather, human nature is defined in terms of this relationship, which consists of existence in the love of God. In seeking to affirm this relationship as an inherent constitutive part of our nature, he appeals to the Reformation idea of 'original righteousness':

> The original nature of man is being in the love of God. … His intention for human life … [the] human character of existence consists in the very fact that it is related to God, and indeed in the reception of the divine love. … The Reformers defended this truth of man's fulfilment in God, and its responsive character when they insisted that the *Imago Dei*, which determines the nature of man, is to be understood as *justitia originalis* and not as reason, freedom or creative capacity.[165]

The material response of love, or *justitia originalis*, has been completely lost as a result of sin. The formal image is retained, though corrupted. Brunner refers to this as 'the 'theological' structure of human existence', by which he means that humankind lives in the presence of God as being responsible to God.[166] Speech regarding the 'destruction' of the image of God is to be understood figuratively, because such human existence is ineradicable. Properly

---

and in the Divine "Thou", … the Divine Word, whose claim "calls" man's being into existence. … [Thus] the heart of man's being is seen to be: responsible existence'; Emil Brunner, *Man in Revolt: A Christian Anthropology*, trans. Olive Wyon (London and Redhill: Lutterworth Press, 1939), 97.
Although Martin Buber is the best known proponent of the I-Thou philosophy, Brunner gave him limited acknowledgement, attributing the concept ultimately to Kierkegaard; Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 10, 23 n. 1, 512 and 546; see Martin Buber, *I and Thou*, a new translation (from the German) with a prologue 'I and you' and notes by Walter Kaufmann, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1970).
[162] Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 104.
[163] Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 100.
[164] Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 103.
[165] Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 104.
[166] Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 105.

speaking, the relationship with God has been 'perverted' rather than 'destroyed'.[167]

Furthermore, the fact that fallen humanity now lives in opposition to its true nature of

relational responsibility means that its present existence is characterised by 'contradiction'.[168]

Brunner's *imago Dei* is not individualistic, but communal. Alongside the first commandment

of loving God is the second of loving 'man'. 'Man … can only be man in community. For

love can only operate in community, and only in this operation of love is man human'.[169]

Brunner wants to make relation, both vertical and horizontal, the definitive feature of human

existence. The element of horizontal relation is also to be understood along the lines of the

formal-material dialectic. Therefore, the formal structure of responsibility for community is

also ineradicable. The operation of human love in true community is a reflection of the divine

Trinitarian community of love, and is part of the *material* image now corrupted by sin.[170]

In spite of Brunner's disdain for structural models, certain structural components are

presupposed in relational existence. One cannot be responsible without the basic capacities of

intellect and will. There is also a close affinity between material image—living in relationship

with God—and the goal of knowing and loving God as we find in Augustine and Aquinas. In

fact, Brunner at times seems to identify the formal image as freedom: 'but he *has* freedom;

only so *can* he be responsible. Thus the formal aspect of man's nature, as being "made in the

image of God", denotes his being as Subject, or his freedom; it is this which differentiates

---

[167] Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 105.
[168] Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 105, 114.
[169] Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 106. This point may be somewhat overstated. But in the horizontal relationship, as in the vertical, Brunner wishes to highlight the contradictory nature of human existence, even at the risk of appearing conceptually contradictory.
[170] Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 106, 138. Note that Brunner also exhibits features of the 'Trinitarian social *imago*'.

man from the lower creation; this constitutes his specifically *human* quality'.[171] Brunner has

much in common with his 'enemies'.

3.3.1.2 Vladimir Lossky

Vladimir Lossky is perhaps the most representative proponent of twentieth century Eastern

Orthodox theology, which is marked by a neo-patristic turn and the resulting model of

personhood.[172] Eastern Orthodox thought traces its theology of the *imago Dei* to the

Cappadocian contribution of the ὑπόστασις (*hypostasis*) to triadology. Since the notion of the

image presupposes personhood, an elucidation of the latter is necessary. For Lossky, 'person'

is an ontological category rooted in and derived from the divine persons, ultimately in the

person of the Father. In contrast to οὐσία, the common essence in God, the term ὑπόστασις

refers to the particularity of the persons.[173] The image is a matter of manifestation which

implies a personal relationship, and is ultimately located in the incarnation of the Son. Being

the image involves personally manifesting God, bearing witness to the nature of the Father as

one consubstantial with him.[174] What is manifested is not the *person* of the Father, but his

nature. 'It is identity of essence which is shown in the difference of persons: the Son, in his

---

[171] Brunner, *Creation and Redemption*, 57; italics original.
[172] According to Bogdan Lubardić, this turn to the Patristic sources is the horizon of all the other theological turns in contemporary Orthodox thought: the apophatic, the Trinitarian, the Eucharistic, and the ascetical. This development is best represented by four authors: Vladimir Lossky, Christos Yannaras, John Zizioulas and Sergeii Horuzhy; Bogdan Lubardić, 'Orthodox Theology of Personhood: A Critical Overview (Part 1)', *The Expository Times* 122, no. 11 (July 2011): 523–7, http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0014524611410281; accessed 30 April 2014; also Aristotle Papanikolaou, 'Contemporary Orthodox Currents on the Trinity', *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*, ed. Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011; Oxford Handbooks Online, 2012; http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199557813.003.0024; accessed 28 April 2014), 4.
[173] Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (Crestwood NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1976), 51.
[174] Vladimir Lossky, *In the Image and Likeness of God* (London & Oxford: Mowbrays, 1975), 134.

function of εἰκών (image), bears witness to the divinity of the Father'.[175] Hence, strictly

speaking, only the Logos can be the true image of God.[176]

As with the divine persons, human beings are understood not merely in terms of a generic

nature, but as ontologically irreducible persons. 'Personhood belongs to every human being

by virtue of a singular and unique relation to God who created him "in His image"'.[177] But

given the infinite distance between the created and the uncreated natures, the application of

the term 'image' to humankind can only be analogical. Human beings are inherently

incapable of manifesting God. The image is attained only by grace, through the process of

deification.[178]

> Man created 'in the image' is the person capable of manifesting God in the extent to which his nature allows itself to be penetrated by deifying grace. Thus the image—which is inalienable—can become similar or dissimilar, to the extreme limits: that of union with God, when deified man shows in himself by grace what God is by nature, according to the expression of St. Maximus; or indeed that of the extremity of falling-away.[179]

Deification and transformation into the *imago Dei* is achieved through the divine energies,

which are communicated by the Holy Spirit. Lossky famously popularised the distinction

between God's essence and his energies, which express his transcendence and immanence

respectively.[180] God's essence is unknowable, while his energies are communicated through

---

[175] Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 135.
[176] Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 138; the anglicised term is in the original.
[177] Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 137.
[178] Cf. John Behr: 'We have yet to become human, in the stature of Christ—who is the image of God'; Thomas Albert Howard, ed., *Imago Dei: Human Dignity in Ecumenical Perspective* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013), 35.
[179] Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 139; hyphenation original.
[180] The distinction between essence and energies was first explicitly formulated by Gregory of Palamas; Saint Gregory Palamas, *The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters*, ed. and trans. Robert E. Sinkewicz (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1988), chaps. 136–138. Lossky sees an implicit distinction in earlier writings of Eastern theology, including Basil, Cyril of Alexandria, the Macarian Homilies, Dionysius the Areopagite, and

the Holy Spirit and are the basis for human participation in the uncreated life of God. [181]

Papanikolaou identifies a tension between Lossky's affirmation of participation through the energies and his Trinitarian theology. If participation is through the uncreated energies of God, his being as Trinity seems superfluous to the God-world relation.[182] This stands in contrast to Bulgakov and Zizioulas, for whom the divine-human communion is grounded in Trinitarian doctrine.[183] It seems that Lossky's use of the essence-energy distinction serves to preserve the absolute transcendence of the Son and the Spirit, even in their economic missions.

3.3.1.3 Alistair I. McFadyen

Alistair McFadyen is a British theologian specialising in anthropology in dialogue with secular social theory. He understands the image as an ontological structure of persons in dialogical relation first to the Triune God, then to other human beings, which he designates as the vertical and the horizontal images respectively. The former consists of human beings as addressed by God and so constituted as relational and responsible. The human person is structurally determined by God's offer of dialogue-partnership, the material response of which is 'being-in-gratitude', which 'involves a recognition of the incapacity to live' apart

---

Maximus the Confessor; Lossky, *The Vision of God* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1983), passim; Vasquez, *The Mystical Theology of Vladimir Lossky*, 12–13; Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 46–7.

[181] Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 97, 99; Gregory Palamas, *Chapters*, chaps. 144–145; Papanikolaou, 'Contemporary Orthodox Currents', 4. Lubardić classifies Lossky as representing the 'energological' strand of Eastern Orthodoxy, which emphasises the doctrine of 'hypostatic transformational energies of God'. By contrast, Zizioulas represents the 'prosopological' strand, which focusses on the prosopon in ecclesial context; Lubardić, 'Orthodox Theology of Personhood', 575.

[182] Papanikolaou, 'Contemporary Orthodox Currents', 4.

[183] Papanikolaou, 'Contemporary Orthodox Currents', 4; John D. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985), 80–83.

from divine resources, resulting in a 'turning towards God' and an openness to God's word.[184] Hence, the freedom expressed in the thankful response corresponds to and reciprocates God's intention in communicating the offer. The image can be distorted by non-reciprocation, but cannot be lost because it is located in God's communication and intent.[185] The horizontal image is a social mediation of the vertical, and consists of responsible dialogical relation to other human beings.[186] It is modelled after the mutual relations of the persons of the Trinity. For McFadyen, persons are defined by the form of their relations, though not reducible to them:[187]

> Persons … are structures of response sedimented from past relations in which they have been addressed, have been responded to and have communicated themselves in particular forms. The image exists in its fullness where undistorted, dialogical address meets a formally reciprocal response; where the invitation to dialogue is accepted. It is through the experience of being called into dialogue that a structure of personal responsibility before and for others may be sedimented, in which one becomes a true subject in the divine image.[188]

In short, McFadyen combines the gift of interpersonal address, and therefore the givenness of responsibility, with the contingency of the response. Among the fruitful insights for a theology of the *imago Dei* is McFadyen's assertion that the vertical relation, though primary, can be mediated by the horizontal.

---

[184] Alistair I. McFadyen, *The Call to Personhood: A Christian Theory of the Individual in Social Relationships* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 20–21.
[185] 'The image denotes the creation of all human beings for a life of dialogue-partnership with God and others'; McFadyen, *Call to Personhood*, 21–22, 41.
[186] McFadyen, *Call to Personhood*, 39.
[187] McFadyen, *Call to Personhood*, 40. McFadyen could be classified under the 'Trinitarian Social *Imago*' in the next section. But he tends to locate the image more explicitly in the relational *person* than in the *community* of persons.
[188] McFadyen, *Call to Personhood*, 41.

3.3.1.4 Robert W. Jenson

In a manner similar to McFadyen, American Lutheran Robert Jenson locates the image of God, the unique feature of humanity, in the fact that humans are addressed by God and so enabled to respond. He rejects as unbiblical the notion that the elevated status of humans consists in superior capacity or achievement.[189] Rather, it is the divine address that creates us as human and places us in relation to God. 'God initiates humanity by speaking *to* a group of creatures, to make them a community'.[190] God's word to the community of believers simultaneously summons them and creates them as human.[191] It is not that God first creates, then calls. Jenson insists that these are one act. The response to divine address, however appropriate or perverse, is *prayer*—'we are the praying animals'.[192] Furthermore, this conception of the image is not an individual matter. 'The word that creates us human itself establishes our connectedness, and therefore … prayer is foundationally corporate'.[193] Therefore, prayer involves 'converse' with one another, which in turn requires *embodiment*. Jenson is insistent that our embodiment is our availability, or self-presentation, to one another. 'And that is why prayer cannot but be extravagantly embodied, for here we speak to the Creator, whose identity can be acknowledged only by utter availability to him'.[194] He also

---

[189] Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2:55; also p. 58.
[190] Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2:61.
[191] Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2:61–2. Regarding the initial address by which God created humanity, Jenson reminds us that he makes no distinction between God's creative address to us and our mutual speech, and continues, 'There must indeed have been a first address of God by which he initiated our discourse … We may think rather of an unpredictable event of initial linguistic community, of the initial exchange of "law", of obligating address … [that] can only be understood within the narrative harmony of "the whole series of [God's] acts and designs from eternity to eternity"'; p. 63.
[192] Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2:58–9.
[193] Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2:59.
[194] Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2:60.

appropriates the notion of sacrifice: 'Sacrifice is embodied prayer, and just so sacrifice is self-surrender to another'.[195]

Jenson's thought on the image exhibits a contrast between the image as given and the image as fulfilment. He insists that the divine address that creates us as human is unconditional. Yet he also suggests a conditional aspect of this relation. It is faith in Christ that constitutes the unitive and transforming relation to God.[196] We are counterparts to God as we believe in the resurrection, as we find ourselves in the Son, and as we fulfil the great commandment of love.[197]

3.3.2 The Trinitarian Social Imago

Like the 'personal' *imago*, the Trinitarian social *imago* is a relational type because it locates the *imago Dei* in the relational aspect of human existence. But what sets this subtype apart from the former is that it tends to emphasise human relationships as an imitation of intra-Trinitarian relationships. Human community, and particularly ecclesial community, is the *imago Dei* which analogically refers to the communion of the divine persons.

3.3.2.1 Karl Barth

It is well known that Karl Barth and Emil Brunner were interlocutors on the related subjects of anthropology and natural theology. Like Brunner, Barth rejects the traditional structural *imago* as well as the Reformers' ethical *imago* in favour of the notion of the I-Thou

---

[195] Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2:60.
[196] Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 71.
[197] Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 72. Interestingly, he makes no mention of the Spirit here. This may be because he is reflecting on John, primarily 14:10–12; p. 70.

relationship between God and his human creature.[198] The latter is unique among creatures in being a 'real other, a true counterpart to God', capable of action and responsibility in relation to God.[199] But he rejects altogether the identification of 'image' with the original state of integrity, as well as any assertion that the image has been partially or completely lost.[200] He also rejects Brunner's idea of a 'formal image' which is merely a capacity or 'potentiality'. If the human identity is determined by the Word of God, it must consist in a realised relationship, a covenant that is 'actualised' in Jesus Christ, through whom all humanity is a true covenant partner.[201] For Barth, the humanity of Jesus is the image of God, and in uniting humanity to himself he has actualised the image in all humanity.[202] Barth's locating the image in Christ's humanity is not to be missed. For Barth, 'image' is not a matter of ontological identity, or even ontological resemblance as it was for Origen. Rather, the Christological image is economic, '[belonging] intrinsically to the creaturely world, … to the outer sphere of the work of God'.[203]

---

[198] Karl Barth, *CD*, III/1:184–5, 190, 194, 200. Barth's apparent dependence on Buber's I-Thou philosophy is well noted; e.g. Hans Vium Mikkelsen, *Reconciled Humanity: Karl Barth in Dialogue* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 97–99. Mikkelsen cites *CD* III/2, 246–7 as evidence of influence. But Barth was reluctant to acknowledge the influence, and in fact, seemed to attribute similarity to coincidence; *CD* III/2, 277–78; see Mikkelsen, 98; cf. Blocher's contrasting assessment in 'Karl Barth's Anthropology', in *Karl Barth and Evangelical Theology*, ed. Sung Wook Chung (Bletchley: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 114–5.

[199] Karl Barth, *CD* III/1, 184, 194; also pp. 186–7.

[200] Barth, *CD* III/1, 200. This is related to the context of the covenant in which Barth places his anthropology; see below. Barth's discussions of the image in *CD* III/1 and III/2 occur in the larger context of his dispute with Brunner. Barth thinks it inconsistent that Brunner should insist that the 'material image' is part of human nature, yet can be left unrealised without a right response to God; *CD* III/2, 128–32.

[201] Barth, *CD* III/1, 132ff; this contrast of 'actuality' vs. 'potentiality' also reflects Barth's consistently Reformed emphasis on the freedom of God over against Brunner's emphasis on the freedom of humanity. This stands in contrast to Hoekema's description of Barth's view of the image as a mere capacity for confrontation and encounter; Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 51–2.

[202] 'The man Jesus is man for God. As the Son of God He is this in a unique way. But as He is for God, the reality of each and every other man is decided'; Barth, *CD* III/2, 205; also see pp. 140–1, 211.

[203] He continues, 'It does not present God in Himself and in His relation to Himself, but in His relation to the reality distinct from Himself. In it we have to do with God and man [*sic*] rather than God and God'; Barth, *CD* III/2, 219.

Barth conceives of the image as an analogy between God and humanity not of ontology (*analogia entis*), but of relationship (*analogia relationis*). He reads the 'Let us' of Genesis 1:26 as a reference to the existence of an I-Thou confrontation and reciprocity within God's Triune being. This I-Thou co-existence finds correspondence in the I-Thou of the divine-human relationship as well as the I-Thou between fellow human beings.[204] Hence the reality of intra-Trinitarian relationship becomes the model for all human relationships. The fact that God created human beings not to be alone but to exist in relationship with fellow human beings is reflective of the reality of God who exists not alone but in fellowship.

> In God's own being and sphere there is a counterpart: a genuine but harmonious self-encounter and self-discovery; … an open confrontation and reciprocity. Man is the repetition of this divine form of life; its copy and reflection. He is this first in the fact that he is the counterpart of God. … But he is it also in the fact that he is himself the counterpart of his fellows and has in them a counterpart.[205]

Not only is there an analogy of relation, but the original is the source of the imitation. The love between the Father and the Son 'is also the love which is addressed by God to man'.[206] In this respect Barth makes use of John 17 to show that the original relationship between the Father and the Son is copied and 'played out in the cosmos, in the man Jesus, in His fellow-humanity, in His relationship to His disciples'.[207] The mutual indwelling between the Father and the Son is repeated as Christ is in the disciples and they are in him. As the Father sent the Son into the world, so he sends them, so that the outward extension of intra-Trinitarian

---

[204] Barth, *CD* III/1, 185; also see p. 192 and *CD* III/2, 220. He supports the patristic Trinitarian reading of Genesis 1. *CD* III/1, 192; cf. Irenaeus, *AH* 4.20.1 for example.
[205] Barth, *CD* III/1, 185.
[206] Barth, *CD* III/2, 220.
[207] Barth, *CD* III/2, 221.

community that would ultimately include the whole world. [208] In the human person of Jesus, a way is made for human participation in the community that exists within God.[209]

Barth's most noted contribution regarding the *imago Dei* is his insistence on the centrality of man and woman as counterparts, an insight he gained from Dietrich Bonhoeffer.[210] In reference to the narrative of Genesis 2:18–25, he observes that man needed a partner 'in which he can recognise himself, and yet not himself but another … not only like him but also different from him', a need that is met only in the creation of the woman. Only in the duality of male and female is the human creature made complete and declared good.[211] Barth considers this sexually differentiated existence and confrontation to be 'the original and proper form of this fellow-humanity. … All other relationships are involved in this as the original relationship. All other humanity is included in this centre'.[212] But what is often missed in expositions of Barth's theology of the *imago Dei* is that while the male-female relationship is given a central place, it is not ultimate. The deepest significance of the relationship of man and woman is that it rests upon and points to the covenant between God and his people Israel.[213] This covenant stands at the centre of the Old Testament and is the

---

[208] John 17:23; 14:20; 17:18. Barth, *CD* III/2, 221.

[209] Barth's reading of Genesis 1 and John 17 appears to be the origin of the relational *imago Trinitatis* that has become popular near the turn of the twenty-first century; Grenz, *Social God*, 299. Barth does tend to give minimal attention to pneumatology, as is evident here in his 'binitarian' treatment of John 17. But in this passage he is following John 17 closely, which does not explicitly mention the Spirit. For explicit but brief mentions of the Trinity in connection with the image, see *CD* III/1, 192 and III/2, 324. But note that in this context, human participation means that the Father-Son community is extended into the Christ-disciples community. Absent here is any mention of humanity's horizontal relationships in general.

[210] Barth, *CD* III/1, 186–7. It was also Bonhoeffer who first expressed the preference for *analogia relationis* over *analogia entis*; see Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Creation and Fall: A Theological Interpretation of Genesis 1–3*, trans. John C. Fletcher, First English edition (London: SCM Press, 1959), 36–7, 62; for Barth's acknowledgement of Bonhoeffer, see *CD* III/1, 195–6.

[211] Barth, *CD* III/2, 291.

[212] Barth, *CD* III/2, 292; citing Gen 2:18f.

[213] Barth, *CD* III/2, 298.

'original' of which human existence as man and woman is merely a copy.[214] But behind the OT covenant is the covenant between Christ and the church, which is the foundation for the other two. 'The covenant between Jesus Christ and His community … is the original of the Old Testament original, the relationship between Yahweh and Israel, and therefore the original of the relationship between man and woman'.[215]

3.3.2.2 John D. Zizioulas

John Zizioulas is an Eastern Orthodox theologian emerging a generation later than Lossky who also identified with the neo-patristic movement. His *Being as Communion* continues the trajectory of Lossky's ontology of personhood, being rooted in the Greek Patristic contribution of ὑπόστασις but taking an ecclesiological turn. He also departs from Lossky in rejecting apophaticism as well as the distinction between divine essence and divine energies, locating the divine-human communion instead in the ὑπόστασις of Christ.[216] Zizioulas highlights the revolutionary ontology of the Cappadocians in their use of ὑπόστασις to construct Trinitarian doctrine. 'What is significant is that this history includes a philosophical landmark, a revolution in Greek philosophy. This revolution is expressed historically through … *the identification of the "hypostasis" with the "person"*'.[217] Previously, ὑπόστασις was synonymous with οὐσία (being, nature, substance), while πρόσωπον ('person') referred only to

---

[214] Barth, *CD* III/2, 297–8.
[215] Barth, *CD* III/2, 299; also p. 301.
[216] Papanikolaou, 'Contemporary Orthodox Currents', 4. Although my typology has placed them in different camps, it should be said that Zizioulas and Lossky have much in common that would separate them from all the other theologians I have treated in this chapter. Not least is their use of the divine *hypostases* in constructing personal ontologies that integrates ontology and relationality in a way that exceeds their western counterparts.
[217] Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 36; the anglicised term is in the original, and so in the quotation below.

a role in social or legal relationship.[218] But neither term was adequate for the work of conceptualising personhood as both free and substantial, because οὐσία in Greek thought implied ontological necessity while πρόσωπον was devoid of ontological content. With the Cappadocian wedding of the two concepts, an ontology of personhood becomes possible.[219] The inherent relationality of πρόσωπον places ontology in the particularity of persons in relation. 'To *be* and *to be in relation* becomes identical'.[220] For Zizioulas, true being requires both communion and freedom, i.e. the free person. 'True being comes only from the free person, from the person who loves freely—that is, who freely affirms his being, his identity, by means of an event of communion with other persons'.[221] Communion is God's mode of being. And it is to this mode of being that the image of God refers by way of analogy.[222]

The image of God in humanity is derived from participation in the Trinitarian communion of persons. At the personal level, to be the image is to become an 'ecclesial being' through baptism and incorporation into the church. It is to take on God's way of being as free persons in communion.[223] According to Zizioulas, Patristic theology views humankind in light of two

---

[218] This was the meaning of the Latin term *persona* in Roman usage. But it always implied the earlier Greek usage of *prosopon* for a mask or theatrical role; Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 33–34, 37. Hence the term 'person' naturally led to Sabellianism.

[219] 'In other words, from an adjunct to a being (a kind of mask) the person becomes the being itself and is simultaneously—a most significant point—*the constitutive element* (the 'principle' or 'cause') of beings'; Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 39. The consequence for Eastern Trinitarian doctrine is that God's ultimate being is grounded not in the *ousia* of God, but in the *hypostasis* of the Father, p. 88.

[220] Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 88. Elsewhere he writes, 'Being means life, and life means *communion*'; p. 16.

[221] Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 18; also p. 101. Note that for Zizioulas, 'event' does not imply time, as he holds to the traditional notion of divine atemporality. And although he does not engage contemporary philosophical dialogue on whether human freedom is 'libertarian' or 'compatibilist', he is implicitly incompatibilist (i.e. libertarian) in his outlook.

[222] In Eastern Orthodox thought, ontology and relation are inseparable. What Bonhoeffer and Barth distinguish as *analogia entis* and *analogia relationis*, the Eastern theologians hold together, since God is a relational communion of Persons (*hypostases*).

[223] Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 15.

modes of existence: the *hypostasis of biological existence* and the *hypostasis of ecclesial existence*. Biological existence is constituted by conception and birth, and is subject to two 'passions': ontological necessity and individualism.[224] Ecclesial existence is constituted by the new birth of baptism by which one becomes identified with the hypostasis of the Son, is adopted into an existence based on a relationship with God and thereby attains to authentic personhood. 'In the Church a birth is brought about; man [*sic*] is born as "hypostasis", as person'.[225] The ecclesial hypostasis is characterised by freedom from the constraints of nature and the capacity to love without exclusiveness. It is humanity's participation in God's own mode of existence, one in which 'the nature does not determine the person; the person enables the nature to exist; freedom is identified with the being of man'.[226] The ecclesial existence of the church as free persons in communion makes it to be the image of the Triune God.[227]

Due to its communal nature, the 'image of God' is properly a corporate designation for the church, which Zizioulas defines as a Eucharistic community. According to Zizioulas, the Eucharist was not merely one sacrament among many, but as the gathering of the people of God it was 'both the manifestation and the realization of the Church. … The Eucharist *constituted* the Church's being'.[228] It holds together the often detached historical and eschatological dimensions of the church.[229] The Eucharist manifests the church as a historical

---

[224] Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 50–1.
[225] Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 56. This comment is made in reference to the idea of the church as 'mother'.
[226] Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 56–7. Lubardić writes, 'The human image is an ontological analogy of the image of God. What God pre-eternally is in His being – man is invited to become by grace'; Lubardić, 'Orthodox Theology of Personhood', 529.
[227] Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 19.
[228] Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 21.
[229] Zizioulas observes that the West tends to historicise the church and lose the *eschata* while the East risks historically disincarnating the church. He contends that the Eucharist helps to maintain 'the dialectic of this age and the age to come, the uncreated and the created, the being of God and that of man and the world'; Zizioulas,

reality, an *institution*, by linking it to the first apostolic communities and to the historical Christ. But it also *constitutes* the church as an eschatological community which transcends the ontological necessity and social exclusiveness of the biological hypostasis, giving it a taste of 'eternal life as love and communion, as the image of the being of God'.[230]

3.3.2.3 Evangelical Perspective: Stanley J. Grenz

Reaping the fruits of many who have gone before him, Stanley Grenz assembles one of the most holistic and learned recent constructive proposals of the *imago Dei*. Exegetically, he acknowledges that the primary meaning in the OT *imago Dei* texts is that of representation.[231] But noting the centrality of the image to the theology of the NT, he gives primacy to its emphasis on Christ as the image of God and the destiny of humankind to be recreated as the new humanity through conformity to the *imago Christi*.[232] Indeed the creation of humankind anticipates the story of Jesus and is to be understood in that light.[233] Jesus is the *imago Dei* because he fully manifests God and fully redeems humanity.[234] As such, he is the fulfilment of the human vocation to be the *imago Dei*, and in him true humanity is also manifested.[235] This Irenaean notion of a prelapsarian destiny for which humankind is created is the overarching framework of Grenz's *telic* model. The *imago Dei* is fully realised

---

Being as Communion, 20. This may be an allusion to the dual temporal reference of the Eucharist as remembrance and hope in 1 Cor 11:26.

[230] Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 22.

[231] Grenz, *Social God*, 200. He also acknowledges the views of the image as similarity, counterpart, and dominion; pp. 193–7, 202.

[232] Grenz, *Social God*, 18, 203, 212, 224.

[233] Grenz, *Social God*, 202–3, 217.

[234] Grenz, *Social God*, 209–222.

[235] Stanley J. Grenz, 'Jesus Christ as the *Imago Dei*: Image-of-God Christology and the Non-Linear Linearity of Theology', *JETS* 47.4 (December 2004): 627; this is in keeping with Irenaeus; *AH* 5.16.2.

eschatologically in the person of Christ and through his redemptive history for all

humanity.[236]

Within this framework, Grenz follows Barth in constructing a relational model of the *imago*

Dei by drawing an analogy between the social Trinity and the human community.[237] The

relationality of human persons in community reflects the relational life of the Triune God.[238]

He also follows Barth in highlighting human sexuality, naming it 'among his greatest

contributions to theological anthropology'.[239] But Grenz diverges from Barth in two

significant ways. First, he criticises Barth for failing to follow through on the sexual nature of

the male-female relationship, opting instead to utilise primarily the I-Thou concept.[240] The

sexually generic I-Thou is inadequate because it misses the important elements of

embodiment and incompleteness which, 'coupled with the drive for completeness … lead to

bonding. Sexuality, therefore, is the dynamic that draws human beings out of their individual

isolation into relationships with others'.[241] For Grenz sexuality, which is to be understood not

merely in terms of marriage and genital sexual expression, but rather as male-female

differentiation and the incompleteness that drives the dynamic of bonding, is indispensable to

the ultimate goal of the eternal ecclesial community.[242] In this respect Grenz distinguishes

between 'relational', which designates the I-Thou relationship between two persons, and

'communal', which presumably involves more than two persons. Hence human community is

---

[236] Grenz, *Social God*, 177–8; see also Stanley J. Grenz, 'Jesus Christ as the *Imago Dei*', 617–28. In this article, Grenz argues that anthropology, and indeed every theological locus, must be informed by Christology; pp. 626–7.
[237] Grenz, *Social God*, xi, 303, 305.
[238] Grenz, *Social God*, 305.
[239] Grenz, *Social God*, 300.
[240] Grenz, *Social God*, 300.
[241] Grenz, *Social God*, 301.
[242] Grenz, *Social God*, 301–2.

a fuller representation of the Trinitarian community than the I-Thou relationship prominent in Barth's proposal.[243]

Second, Grenz follows Zizioulas in utilising the concept of perichoresis as a description of the mutual indwelling of the divine persons. The members of the Trinity are ontologically constituted as 'persons' by virtue of their reciprocal relations.[244] Thus conceived, 'communion does not threaten personal particularity';[245] the integrity of both the 'one' and the 'many' are preserved.[246] Within this Trinitarian communal ontology Grenz identifies love, particularly *agape*, as the essential attribute that characterises both the immanent Triune community and God's relation to the world.[247] This exposition of the Trinitarian ontology of personhood becomes the basis for what Grenz considers the ultimate fulfilment of the *imago Dei*: the ecclesial self.

The concept of the 'ecclesial self', by which he means the eschatological human community, is Grenz's response to the problem of the loss of the individual 'centred self' in postmodernity.[248] He proposes that human identity is to be recovered by reconceptualising the self as a person-in-community, which is constituted through assimilation into the new humanity in Christ. 'The image of God does not lie in the individual per se but in the

---

[243] Grenz, *Social God*, 303.
[244] Grenz, *Social God*, 317, 332.
[245] Grenz, *Social God*, 317; also see John D. Zizioulas, 'Human Capacity and Human Incapacity: A Theological Exploration of Personhood', *Scottish Journal of Theology* 28 (1975), 409.
[246] Colin E. Gunton, *The One, the Three and the Many: God, Creation and the Culture of Modernity*, The Brampton Lectures 1992 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 163–4; Grenz, *Social God*, 317.
[247] Grenz, *Social God*, 317–8. Utilising C. S. Lewis' characterisation of *agape* as 'Gift-love' and *philia*, *storge* and *eros* as 'Need-loves', Grenz acknowledges the place of the latter within the divine life, but maintains the primacy of *agape*; pp. 318–20.
[248] See chap. 3 of his book for an account of the demise of the 'centred self'; Grenz, *Social God*, 137.

relationality of persons in community'.[249] But the ecclesial self is constituted not merely by participation in human relationships, but by participation in the perichoretic life of the Triune God through the Spirit.[250] It is the Spirit who incorporates the self into Christ and both comprises and transforms the church after the pattern of the Triune community of love, thus '[constituting] the church ontologically to be the prolepsis of the *imago dei* … In short, the indwelling Spirit leads and empowers the church to fulfill its divinely mandated calling to be a sacrament of trinitarian communion, a temporal, visible sign of the eternal, dynamic life of the triune God'.[251]

3.4 The Functional *Imago*

The functional *imago* refers to the interpretation of the image of God as an occupation divinely assigned to humankind at creation. This view originates from a particular reading of Genesis 1:26–28 that identifies the *imago Dei* with the vocation to exercise dominion over the rest of creation. Historically, it has been developed and modified in various ways that reflect the intellectual and social contexts of its proponents. It was prevalent among the Antiochene Fathers of the fourth century and was present as a minority view in Reformed orthodoxy, but has never gained widespread popularity as a constructive theological model. [252] It received considerable attention among twentieth century OT scholars but never reached the status of a consensus. Its reception among exegetically-minded contemporary theologians is largely due to the influence of OT scholarship, and stands remotely in the tradition of the literal hermeneutics of the Antiochenes.

---

[249] Grenz, *Social God*, 305.
[250] Grenz, *Social God*, 322, 332.
[251] Grenz, *Social God*, 334–6.
[252] E.g. Peter Martyr Vermigli; see Michael S. Horton, 'Post-Reformation Reformed Anthropology', in Lints, Horton, and Talbot, *Personal Identity*, 63 and n. 49. Note that there is a functional element in the views of several proponents of other models: Irenaeus, Calvin, Lossky and Grenz.

3.4.1 Antiochene Fathers

Although John Chrysostom was the most eloquent preacher among the Antiochene Fathers, Theodore of Mopsuestia was the pre-eminent theologian. He rejected the ontological interpretation of the image, arguing that if the 'image' pertained to an ability to rule or reason, it would follow that spiritual entities such as angels and demons, and even the heavenly luminaries would be 'images of God'.[253] He conceived the image instead as functional roles that Adam plays. The Antiochenes differed on how the image pertains to the whole human person. Diodore, Chrysostom, and Theodoret saw the image as the power and right, delegated to man (male), to rule over the universe.[254] Theodore, followed by Nestorius, also interpreted the image in functional terms, but rejected its association with the power to rule.[255] Instead he explained the image in terms of a threefold role that humans ought to faithfully exercise as types of Christ in creation: unitive, revelatory, and cultic.[256] The unitive role meant that humankind, being composed of body and soul, bonds together the spiritual and material worlds. Hence the visible aspect of humanity is essential to the image. In contrast to Diodore, Theodore held that these roles apply to men and women alike, who all share the same human nature.[257] The revelatory and cultic roles are illustrated with the analogy of a king who founds

---

[253] Theodore was referring to Col 1:16, Eph 3:10, 6:12, Dan 10:21 and Ps 136:8–9: 'How therefore was it possible according to any of these [ideas] for man to be called an "image" along with many other beings with whom he shared [this honor] when he alone is said to have been created according to the image of God? In light of [all] this it is clear that there is fittingly only one reason for man alone to be called [the image]—a reason he does not share with those not sharing this designation'; Frederick G. McLeod, *The Image of God in the Antiochene Tradition* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1999), 63–4.
[254] McLeod, *Antiochene*, 59, 61, 79.
[255] McLeod, *Antiochene*, 64.
[256] McLeod, *Antiochene*, 82.
[257] 'For (God) fashioned Adam with an invisible, rational, and immortal soul and a visible and mortal body. By the former, he is like unto invisible natures; and by the latter, he is akin to visible beings. For God willed to gather the whole of creation into one, so that, although constituted of diverse natures, it might be joined together by one bond. He [then] created this living being which is related by its nature to the whole of creation. He created Adam to be this bond'; McLeod, *Antiochene*, 65.

a city and sets up an image of himself to receive veneration and thanks. The visible human nature manifests the existence of God the Creator, and acts 'like a shrine wherein other creatures can fulfil their duties to God and honor Him by caring for human needs'.[258] The image, which is tied to living voluntarily according to God's will, was lost through sin. But it is ultimately fulfilled in Christ, through whom it is also restored to humanity.[259] We observe that the cultic role bears some resemblance to the notion of passive representation, which we find in Matthew 25:31–46 and James 3:9.[260] The revelatory role finds corresponding elements in both the structural and ethical models, notably in Calvin's concept of the image as a mirror reflecting the glory of God.

3.4.2 Contemporary Feminist Perspective: Lisa P. Stephenson

Pentecostal feminist theologian Lisa Stephenson makes use of the *imago Dei* in advocating gender equality in church ministry. She constructs a model that is essentially functional but Trinitarian in structure, proposing in addition to *imago Dei* and *imago Christi* the gender-neutral *imago Spiritus* as a third way to advocate women's equality in ministry.[261] Noting the parallel use of the language of 'image' in the ancient Near East to designate royal persons as sons and representatives of the gods, she similarly interprets the *imago Dei* in Genesis as a vocation to represent God. More than a mere status or privilege, this calling is accompanied by a 'dynamic power or agency … signified by the functions of "ruling" and "subduing"'.[262]

---

[258] McLeod, *Antiochene*, 66.
[259] McLeod, *Antiochene*, 67.
[260] See sect. 4.1.8.
[261] Stephenson, *Dismantling*, 6. Michael Horton is another contemporary theologian who has adopted a functional view of the *imago Dei*; Horton, *Lord and Servant*; Horton, 'Image and Office: Human Personhood and the Covenant', in Lints, Horton, and Talbot, *Personal Identity*, 178–203. I have chosen to include Stephenson because she represents both the Pentecostal and the feminist streams.
[262] Stephenson, *Dismantling*, 118, 121.

This agency appears to be a reference to human capacity and suggests a structural component in her model.

The application of the terms image and likeness to the Adam-Seth relationship suggests that the *imago Dei* also indicates 'a particular relationship with [God] from which their representative role emerges: sonship'.[263] Stephenson observes that there is a close unity between the ANE image and the corresponding god that was 'effected by the divine spirit that indwelled the idol'. This makes way for a pneumatological understanding of the *imago Dei* based on Genesis 1:2 and 2:7.[264] What sets the Genesis account apart from its ANE counterparts is the democratising affirmation that the designation as divine image-bearer belongs not only to kings, but to every man and woman.[265] 'Because male and female are made in the image of God there is an egalitarianism present that situates both of them on level ground'. Any dualism, oppression, subordination or supremacy is a perversion of creation brought about by sin and deviates from God's original intent.[266]

Her treatment of the *imago Christi* focusses on Galatians 3:26–28 as the primary text, from which she understands that faith and baptism 'into Christ', as means of 'putting on Christ', make one to be the image of Christ. She does not define the image in this context, but implies that it means moral conformity.[267] Central to her project is the affirmation that 'through Christ the ethnic, social, and sexual schisms and divisions had been healed'.[268] Inclusion in Christ is

---

[263] in Genesis 5:1–3; Stephenson, *Dismantling*, 119.
[264] Stephenson, *Dismantling*, 120–1; Kenneth A. Mathews, *Genesis 1–11:26*, New American Commentary, vol. 1a (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1996), 196–7.
[265] This is the main thesis of J. Richard Middleton, *The Liberating Image: The* Imago Dei *in Genesis 1* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2005).
[266] Stephenson, *Dismantling*, 122.
[267] Stephenson, *Dismantling*, 123–4; cf. p. 119.
[268] Stephenson, *Dismantling*, 124.

not a matter of sexual similarity, but '[living] a life that is consistent with Jesus' compassionate and liberating life in the world'.[269] As Christ's mission was pneumatological, so imaging Christ is possible only through the power and presence of the Spirit.[270] Note that she also incorporates an element of missional conformity to Christ.

The *imago Spiritus* is the key component of Stephenson's proposal,[271] with Spirit baptism as the point of entry and the book of Acts as the central text. She establishes continuity between the Christological and pneumatological approaches in three ways. First, the metaphor of being clothed (ἐνδύω) is used for Spirit baptism as it was for water baptism.[272] Therefore, 'those who have been baptised in the Spirit are *imago Spiritus* because they have "put on" the Spirit'.[273] Second, water baptism in Paul and Spirit baptism in Luke both function as means of the participation of all believers without distinction in the new creation.[274] Third, the new creation in both Paul and Luke entails new ethical imperatives. For Paul, baptismal identification with Christ nullifies all status-based value and privilege. For Luke, Spirit baptism abolishes all dualisms, creating a renewed, inclusive social order for the restored Israel.[275]

Stephenson identifies two advantages afforded by the pneumatological approach. First, whereas the *Father* and the *Son* are associated with male imagery, the *Spirit* is not. Second,

---

[269] Stephenson, *Dismantling*, 125.
[270] Stephenson, *Dismantling*, 126.
[271] Mark Medley also proposes the designation *imago Spiritus*; Mark S. Medley, *Imago Trinitatis: Toward a Relational Understanding of Becoming Human* (Lanham, MD and Oxford: University Press of America, 2002), 123.
[272] Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4–5, 8.
[273] Stephenson, *Dismantling*, 129.
[274] Stephenson, *Dismantling*, 129–30.
[275] Stephenson, *Dismantling*, 131.

because the Spirit is not incarnate in a particular physical form, 'a person's particular

embodiment is preserved as the Spirit works in and through those distinctives'.[276] Although

the exact meaning of *imago Spiritus* is unspecified, it seems to incorporate the ideas of moral

conformity and embodied representation.[277] Stephenson's aim is not to construct a theology of

the image, but to address the problem of gender-based inequality in church ministry using the

threefold exposition of *imago Dei*, *imago Christi*, and most importantly, *imago Spiritus*. But

in the process, she has provided a fine example of the functional *imago* in contemporary

application.

3.5 Analysis

Our survey of theologies of the *imago Dei* has taken us through four basic types of

constructive proposals that emerged over three discernible periods of historical development.

The structural *imago* was primarily developed in the pre-Reformation period, the ethical

imago in the post-Reformation and the relational in the twentieth century. The functional type

had a minority representation throughout. Although the primary development of these types

can be associated with historical periods, they continue to evolve over time. And although

each type is distinct in emphasising its particular theme, proponents often incorporate

elements of other types to varying degrees. They also locate the image along the

anthropological-Christological axis as well as the protological-eschatological axis. Note that

most of the themes can be incorporated somewhat independently of these axes. For instance,

'rationality' can be employed in reference to the image in Adam (protological-

---

[276] Stephenson, *Dismantling*, 134–5.
[277] Stephenson, *Dismantling*, 134.

anthropological), in Christ (Christological) or in redeemed humanity (eschatological-anthropological); 'function' can be applied to the tasks of each of these players in the drama.

Eastern theology contributed the seeds of social Trinitarianism, which over time evolved and was adapted into social personalism.[278] But its negative contribution was found in Origen's anti-corporeal tendencies. By contrast, Western theology was in constant danger of individualism due to Augustine's psychological *imago Trinitatis*. The broadly conceived structuralism in Irenaeus was often fragmented into its volitional and rational components which dominated the pre-Reformation period. The Reformers recovered the emphasis on moral conformity to Christ, with a heightened relationality. The modern period developed and incorporated relational personalism along philosophical lines and also recovered the dignity of the human body, a theme that was inherently a part of the functional view but otherwise largely neglected during the medieval period. Clearly, the trends of anthropological thought are perennially influenced by the philosophical fashions of their times. Rather than judging the theologies of previous eras by the standards of our day, we can best handle this contextually conditioned material by taking a contextually sensitive approach. Reading these sources within their native thought world, we can seek a broader perspective, avoid the pitfalls, retrieve what is valuable, and adapt the gleanings for our own context.

---

[278] The interpretation of Cappadocian Trinitarianism as 'social Trinitarianism', and Zizioulas' reading of Gregory in particular, have been subject to considerable critique; e.g. John L. Gresham, Jr, 'The Social Model of the Trinity and Its Critics', *SJT* 46.3 (1993): 332; Morwenna Ludlow, *Gregory of Nyssa, Ancient and (Post)modern* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007; Oxford Scholarship Online, 2008; doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199280766.001.0001; accessed 15 Nov 2016), 2; Karen Kilby, 'Perichoresis and Projection: Problems with Social Doctrines of the Trinity', *New Blackfriars* 81 (2000): 432–45. But regardless of the validity of their interpretations, the resulting positions of Lossky and Zizioulas certainly qualify.

3.5.1 Symmetry among the Models

Although the structural and the relational models may appear to be unrelated, each is often conceived in a way closely connected with the other. Pre-Reformation theologians tended to think in terms of structural capacity, specifically of the image as rationality and/or volitionality. But Augustine and Aquinas particularly emphasised the proper ordering of such capacities towards God the Creator: reason is properly expressed in the knowledge of God; will is properly expressed in the love of God; being is expressed in relation.[279] Contemporary models tend to emphasise the ontology of personhood: the image is found in *persons-in-relation*, which is conceived as an ontological category, an irreducible essence. Being is found in relation and is defined by relation. The two models are certainly distinct, representing a shift from a structural ontology to a relational one, but not wholly antithetical. Despite the subtle distinctions to be made, righteous living before God (Irenaeus) and knowing and loving God (Augustine) both approximate the loving response to God emphasised by Brunner.[280] Furthermore, although Luther minimises the association between ontology and image, his notion of righteousness and conformity to Christ also echoes Irenaeus' attention to righteous living.

Not only are these models related in content, but some are also symmetrical in form. For instance, Brunner's distinction between the formal and material image is similar to that between Irenaeus' image and likeness, where he makes the distinction. The language of

---

[279] In contrast, Gregory of Nyssa values free will because it is the basis for virtue. Thomas Aquinas closely combines the knowledge and love of God with the cultivation of virtue as the proper fulfilment of the mind and will; see discussion above.

[280] Cf. John 14:15; 15:12, 14. This relationship between Irenaeus and the modern personal *imago* is striking when read against the background of the Farewell Discourse in John's gospel, especially when we consider that John's influence is often traced to Irenaeus through Polycarp.

rationality has been replaced with the language of relation. But the basic shape of their models is otherwise the same: ontology and destiny.[281] For both, humanity is fulfilled only when rightly oriented towards God. Fallen humanity, deprived of divine relation, is corrupted. The content with which they fill this basic shape is surely significant: rationality for Irenaeus and relation for Brunner. Both of these themes reflect their particular historical and intellectual contexts. But the continuity should be recognised.

3.5.2 Collective Coherence of the Models

The inseparability of personhood and communion is an insight that originated from Trinitarian theology, but has some analogical applicability to anthropology. There is a consensus that humankind is created for communion with God, and is significantly subnormal apart from such communion. Human personhood and identity is primarily dependent on the Creator. There is also widespread agreement, particularly in later periods, that humans are created for horizontal relationships and are therefore rightly interdependent. Especially helpful is McFadyen's proposal that horizontal human relationships can mediate the vertical, a notion reminiscent of Barth, for whom humans in mutual address can 'render mutual assistance in the act of being', in correspondence to Jesus' being and action.[282] Although McFadyen and Barth exhibit distinctively relational interpretations of the *imago Dei*, an element of relational *mission* can be discerned in their thoughts. Human persons can mediate divine love and grace by means of relational actions. Hence, the boundary between 'relation' and 'function' can be softened. The vocation to relate in particular Christlike ways as a representative of Christ is broadly *functional* in *form* insofar as it is a responsibility. But the

---

[281] One could also say structure and fulfilment, capacity and expression, or to borrow Aristotelian categories, potential and actualisation.

[282] McFadyen, *Call to Personhood*, 39; Barth, *CD* III/2, 260–2.

content of such a vocation and its fulfilment is certainly *relational*. Consider also the parable of the Good Samaritan. The particular actions of the Samaritan—the binding up of wounds, the transportation to the inn—are *functional*. Yet they are the performance of his compassionate love for a neighbour, which is clearly a *relational* notion.[283] Furthermore, the actions involved in these examples also qualify as instances of moral righteousness, and demonstrate that the fulfilment of divine will is inseparable from the ethic of love. Although narrowly structural interpretations of the image as rationality and volitionality do not fit well here, such capacities are presuppositions of, and properly expressed in, these activities. The *telos* of the capacities points to relationship and righteousness. This demonstrates that these various elements—ontology, relationship, function and ethics—are complementary rather than competitive, and can be combined to various degrees. We may also observe that Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox theologians have generally done better at maintaining multiple aspects of the image. The problem lies in how these can be coherently integrated into a multifaceted model in a way that is more organic than eclectic. I will address this problem in the next chapter as I begin to construct such a model of the *imago Dei*.

3.5.3 Analogy and Destiny

An additional observation may help to move us further along in this quest. In the various models examined in this chapter, much attention has been given to defining the *conceptual relationship* between God and humanity that is implied in the designation '*image of* God'. The 'image' is often interpreted in terms of analogy, whether of *analogia entis* or *analogia relationis*. An insight to be retrieved from this study is that the more significant question has to do with the *material relationship* between God and humanity: What would it mean to be

---

[283] Luke 10:25–37.

the image *of God*, that is, to fulfil the creaturely purpose of the image, insofar as it is discernible? This impulse, present in most of the types, is well exemplified in Grenz's Irenaean concept of a 'telic' *imago Dei*. The primary significance of the image is found in its *destiny* rather than its *analogy*, in the vocation to be 'of God' rather than in the concept of 'image'.[284] Viewed from this perspective, the relational type yields the insight that one is materially 'of God' by virtue of one's fitting relational response that fulfils the goal of communion between God and humanity. Correspondingly, the ethical type supplies the insight that one is materially 'of God' by virtue of one's righteousness of character and action.[285] Finally, the functional type contributes the insight that one is materially 'of God' by virtue of one's faithful fulfilment of a representative mission. Relationship is the foundational reality for being 'of God'. Righteousness is conditional for, and specifies the manner of being 'of God'. Functional representation is teleological, and specifies the mission in being 'of God'.

3.5.4 Critical Concerns

Finally, this study raises some critical concerns. First, most proponents affirm that all human beings are created in the image of God, regardless of gender, ethnicity or socioeconomic status. The *imago Dei* serves as the basis for human dignity and its universality is to be affirmed.[286] Second, the conceptual relationships along the protological-eschatological axis, as well as the anthropological-Christological axis, need to be defined. How does the image in Adam relate to the image in Christ? And how do these relate to the image in the church? Third, the status of the *imago Dei* after the fall—the balance of dignity and depravity—should

---

[284] Note that the analogy-destiny dialectic is distinct from the vocation-fulfilment dialectic. The latter is a feature of the orientation towards *destiny*, rather than analogy.

[285] We should note the Reformation qualifier: by grace through faith.

[286] Gen 1:27 and Jas 3:9–10. Diodore is an exception in restricting the image to males. See sect. 3.4.1.

be addressed. The relationship between the image retained and the image recovered, the latter of which implies some loss or corruption, creates a point of tension that needs to be given account. To this end, the concept of vocation and fulfilment, which we find first in Irenaeus, to be followed by Augustine, Brunner, McFadyen and others, provides a natural way to satisfy both criteria. That is, an irrevocable divine intent, whether relational or functional, can be the basis of universal dignity, while a failure and inability to fulfil such intent can be the cause and content of depravity. Note that there is an inherent movement, and even a drama, in these themes and tensions surrounding the problem of the *imago Dei*. The 'plot' moves from the protological to the eschatological, from the anthropological to the Christological, and from the image corrupted, yet retained, to the image restored. It will be my contention that a dramatic approach to the *imago Dei* can successfully incorporate the insights from previous models as well as clarify these issues.

3.6 Summary

In this chapter, I have described and analysed four basic theological interpretations of the *imago Dei*, which were offered in various historical contexts and addressed particular anthropological concerns. I noted that these models, while distinct, are inherently complex and overlapping. They emphasise different elements that are organically related and mutually complementary. Such complexity and complementarity suggests that a multifaceted model will be achievable and useful. Furthermore, I observed that these models share the formal dialectic between vocation and fulfilment, though they may be invested with different content. I proposed that the material fulfilment of creaturely purpose is more important than the conceptual analogy drawn. Therefore, the key contributions of these models can be brought together in a multifaceted model that emphasises the human vocation and its fulfilment, which

consists of relational communion, characteristic righteousness and missional assignment. The development of such a model will be the task of the next three chapters.

CHAPTER 4

ACTS 1 AND 2: A COVENANTAL *IMAGO DEI* SPIRIT ANTHROPOLOGY

Christian theological tradition has sought to discern in the *imago Dei* motif an answer to the question of what it means to be human and what sets us apart from other creatures. In the absence of a clear definition in the relevant texts, attempts to supply one has yielded such interpretations as reason, free will, righteousness, relationship and dominion, as we have seen in Chapter 3. In this chapter, I seek to construct a view of the place of humankind in the story of God's creation by proposing a theological interpretation of the *imago Dei* as a dramatic role. I will use the covenant as a means of developing this concept, highlighting three basic components of sonship, shaping and sending.[1] By means of these three aspects of the covenant, I will integrate the relational, ethical and functional views of the *imago Dei* in one multifaceted model. Although ontological structure is not an inherent part of the covenant, it is a necessary presupposition to each of these aspects and is consequently implied in my covenantal-dramatic model. The covenant motif provides a fruitful way of developing the *imago Dei* concept not only because of their common connection with kingship themes, but

---

[1] For the sake of gender inclusivity, the use of 'daughters' for women is certainly preferred. But where ancient Near Eastern conventions grant inheritance, royal and otherwise, to sons and not daughters, the biblical term 'sonship' is appropriate for affirming the equal status of all humans, male and female. For Paul's emphatically gender inclusive use of 'son' (υἱοὶ), see Gal 3:26–29. It is for this reason, and for the sake of simplicity, that 'sonship' is often used in the present work. Also note the similar use of 'sonship' by feminist Pentecostal theologian Lisa P. Stephenson, *Dismantling the Dualisms for American Pentecostal Women in Ministry: A Feminist-Pneumatological Approach* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 119, 128.

Although ANE covenants were used to regulate legal and political obligations, it has become increasingly acknowledged among biblical scholars that familial/kinship bonds took priority; Scott Hahn, 'Covenant', *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*, ed. John D. Barry et al. (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), Logos Bible Software ebook.

The term and concept of being 'shaped' by the Spirit is indebted to the title of the work by Andy Lord, *Spirit-Shaped Mission: A Holistic Charismatic Missiology* (Bletchley: Paternoster, 2005); cf. the Church of England report, *Mission-Shaped Church: Church Planting and Fresh Expressions of Church in a Changing Context* (London: Church House Publishing, 2004; https://www.chpublishing.co.uk/uploads/documents/0715140132.pdf; accessed 18 January 2017).

also because dramatic identity is composed of roles and relationships, both of which are inherent in covenants in the Bible.[2] I will also argue that the Spirit's presence plays a constitutive role in both the *imago Dei* and the covenant, mediating covenantal sonship, shaping and sending. This will prepare the way for locating Spirit baptism in the context of the *imago Dei* theodrama.

Karl Barth is an obvious choice as an interlocutor in this chapter, being one of the leading twentieth century theological contributors on the *imago Dei*, and placing his anthropology in the framework of creation and covenant. For Barth, creation sets the stage for the covenant, and humankind is created for covenant partnership with God. This coheres well with my aim to use the covenant theme as a framework for viewing the *imago Dei*, even though I would supplement the relational component with those of formation and mission. Kevin Vanhoozer is one of the more sophisticated evangelical theologians in current practice and has provided a useful example of the dramatic method I wish to appropriate. Although he is yet to develop an anthropology according to his dramatic method, his work on divine communicative action and authorship presents insights that can be fruitfully applied to anthropology.[3] I will follow his trajectory by construing the *imago Dei* as a dramatic role and by seeking a corresponding human ontology. Lutheran theologian Robert Jenson is a stimulating dialogue partner due to

---

[2] Although 'role' and 'identity' are closely related and at times interchangeable, I will use 'role' to designate a function within the drama that can be served by various characters, and 'identity' to designate the unique place of a particular character within the drama. Hence, the *imago Dei* is a role in the theodrama, but when applied to a particular character it can designate a specific identity: Adam as the protological *imago Dei*, Christ as the paradigmatic *imago Dei*, the church as the restored *imago Dei*. Also note that 'function' in this dramatic context is not to be confused with the 'functional view' of the *imago Dei*, the latter of which can sometimes be conceived in a more restricted manner, e.g. dominion.

[3] Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology: Divine Action, Passion, and Authorship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

his insightful and provocative proposals. His thoughts on calling, creation and human identity provide both support and contrast for my own position, aiding in its fuller development.

The chapter begins with an examination of the original creation of humankind—i.e. protology—and concludes with a brief application of the *imago Dei* as an interpretive lens for viewing Israel as the covenant people of God. This prepares the way for further application to Christ and the church in subsequent chapters.[4] Karl Barth and Stanley Grenz have argued for Christology as the starting point of theological anthropology, each for slightly different reasons.[5] But in keeping with my theodramatic method and its concern for the narrative and the plot, it is advantageous to maintain the canonical order, moving from protology to eschatology. The concern for a Christologically informed anthropology is accommodated by remembering that the present chapter is not a complete anthropology, but only a beginning. This is because protological anthropology awaits complement by the fulfilment of the *imago Dei* in Christ and the church, which in this context can be viewed as 'eschatological anthropology'.[6] The drama of the *imago Dei* flows from Adam through Christ as the centre and foundation, and onward to the incorporation and perfecting of the church as the 'new humanity' in Christ through the Spirit. What ties Adam, Israel, Christ and the church together

---

[4] Cf. N.T. Wright, who outlines three subplots in Paul's narrative: humankind, Israel, Jesus. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (London: SPCK; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013), 485; hereafter *PFG*.

[5] For Barth, Jesus is the 'ontological determination of humanity', and constitutes true humanity; Barth, *CD*, III/2:132ff. Grenz agrees that Jesus embodies God's purpose for humankind. But he argues for the broader thesis that Christology takes priority over and informs all other theological loci; Stanley J. Grenz, 'Jesus as the *Imago Dei*: Image-of-God Christology and the Non-Linear Linearity of Theology', *JETS* 47.4 (December 2004): 626–7. While I agree that Jesus is the true humanity—i.e. the ultimate fulfilment of human purpose and destiny—and the 'ontological determination' for the *new* humanity recreated in him, there is no biblical basis for extending this principle back to the original creation. Also see my discussion of Christology in chap. 5, which addresses the ontological question.

[6] Certainly both Christology and ecclesiology are broader than this designation. But I am referring to the *imago Dei* anthropological context.

through the drama is their common role as embodied mediators of God's communicative action on the world stage.

4.1 Act 1: *Imago Dei* Spirit Anthropology

The first major section of this chapter provides an exposition of Act 1 of the drama, in which humankind is appointed to its role as the *imago Dei*, the Spirit-bearing embodied agent of God's kingdom on earth. This role will be developed along the three Spirit-mediated covenantal aspects of sonship, shaping and sending. Such an exposition lays the foundation for the subsequent acts. Upon the failure of the first humans, the role would be reassigned conditionally to Israel, paradigmatically to Christ and the derivatively to the church. My attention in this section to the Spirit's indwelling, which constitutes the human creature as the *imago Dei*, prepares the way for my final argument in chapter 7 that the event of Pentecost and the experience of Spirit baptism signals the sending of the Holy Spirit to recreate the church as the new humanity and the restored *imago Dei*.

4.1.1 The Dramatic Orientation

In Chapter 1 we noted that the biblical drama serves as a storied context that provides identity and purpose for human beings and for the church.[7] We can now begin to explore this drama in search of insight into the human identity. According to Vanhoozer, the biblical '*mythos*' presents the identity of an actor in terms of his roles and relations within the drama of creation and redemption, from which identity the implicit 'metaphysics' can be inferred.[8] Vanhoozer is

---

[7] Cf. Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, Third Edition (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), 216–8.

[8] Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology*, 183. Vanhoozer uses Aristotle's term '*mythos*', which refers to dramatic plot, in contradistinction to 'myth', which refers to sacred explanatory stories. The former differs from the latter in (1) pertaining to this-worldly rather than other-worldly events, and (2) linking form and content so that the dramatic action is indispensable to the meaning and truth thereby conveyed; p. 5.

speaking in this context of theology proper, but his method is applicable to anthropology as a plausible way of reading the *imago Dei* texts of Genesis, in which the 'image' and the 'likeness' of God is presented not in terms of metaphysical substances,[9] but in terms of a story of origin and the accompanying relationships, roles, and tasks conferred upon the image. One can certainly make ontological inferences regarding human nature from these relationships and roles. But such inferences must, at least initially, remain secondary to the explicit statements we find in the text.

I propose viewing the *imago Dei* as a role in the biblical drama. In Chapter 1, I suggested that the Triune God may be conceived as Author and Primary Actor. To be the image of God in the world is to be the primary embodied actor on the stage of creation. An actor's part is to embody the communication that originates from the author, to bodily actualise the script.[10] To be the image of God is to represent him by mediating the acts and speech of God bodily in the world. But in order to adequately represent the author's intent for the role, the player must stand in some communicative relationship with the author, even if indirectly through a director. Vanhoozer's metaphor of the Spirit as Director is useful in this regard,[11] to which I would add that of a Coach who prepares human actors to play their roles. It is the Spirit's life-giving action that enables the actor to communicate, creating dialogue.[12] As Director and

---

[9] One may be tempted to read Gen 2:7 this way. But neither 'dust' nor 'breath' are meant to itemise particular constituent parts of the human creature. Rather, they seem to designate the creature's 'status' (or 'non-status') before the divine act of creation and the conferral of life and being; cf. Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis Chapters 1–17*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 158.

[10] Note that Vanhoozer conceives of persons as 'communicative agents in relation'; Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology*, 226–7, 230; cf. Oliver Davies, who describes the incarnation as God's 'becoming an embodied speech agent among other speech agents'; Oliver Davies, *The Creativity of God: World, Eucharist, Reason* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 84.

[11] Vanhoozer, *Drama of Doctrine*, 106–7.

[12] Gen 2:7.

Coach, he continues to mediate the divine-human dialogue as one who according to the intent of the divine Author inspires speech, directs action, shapes character, provides wisdom and skill, and empowers for extraordinary deeds.[13]

The drama begins with the creation of the stage and the actors, moving from darkness to light, from the chaotic 'deep' to an ordered world, from 'formless and void' to ordered places filled with life, from non-being to a living existence under divine blessing. The creation story initiates the plot with an act of deliverance,[14] culminating in the creation of humankind as the *imago Dei* and moving on to the *telos* of divine 'rest'.[15] By virtue of its position in the book and the canon, the introduction of the *imago Dei* signals a primary character in the divine drama.[16] The first act of the drama places the original human couple, together with their descendants, into the role of *imago Dei* and outlines their place in the world. It proceeds to trace their story as God's embodied representatives through the initial conflict of temptation and fall, which transitions into Act 2.

4.1.1.1 The Language of *Imago Dei*

In his 1968 lecture, James Barr outlined the significant difficulties with using terminological studies in interpretation, and claims that there is no referential meaning to be found for the phrase 'image of God'. 'There is no reason to believe that this writer had in his mind any

---

[13] E.g. Gen 41:38; Exod 31:3; Num 11:25–29; Isa 11:2; 42:1; 61:1; Ezek 36:26–27; Joel 2:28; Acts 1:8.

[14] Walter Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997), 147–8. The traditional theme of 'combat' and 'victory' over the chaotic waters, combined with parallels with the Exodus, suggest that the theme of deliverance is in the background of the narrative; see below.

[15] Barth, *CD* III/1, 181–2; cf. Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984), 171–2.

[16] G. K. Beale, *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 33ff; hereafter *NTBT*.

definite idea about the content or the location of the image of God'.[17] Brevard Childs, while agreeing with Barr, betrays a hint of optimism: 'Nevertheless, in spite of this difficulty, there are certain tensions within the text which have important theological significance even when not fully resolved'.[18] Other scholars, undeterred by Barr's pessimism and in light of relevant ANE texts subsequently unearthed, have continued to explore various approaches to reading the enigmatic anthropological statements in the opening of the canonical drama. Granting that ANE comparative studies may not yield a definitive exegetical meaning for the phrase, we can still proceed to reflect on insights from the ongoing scholarly work with a view towards useful theological constructions.

The term 'image' (צלם) is etymologically uncertain but most often used to designate a physical, or at least visible, representation, such as a statue or model.[19] The second term, 'likeness' (דמות), also used of statues, has a broader usage and etymologically indicates

---

[17] James Barr, 'The Image of God in the Book of Genesis: A Study of Terminology', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 51.1 (1968): 12–13, 18, 25. His conclusion is due to various factors both internal and external to the data: the lack of Hebrew attestation to etymology; the ambiguity of Hebrew usage in the OT (Gen 1:26–27; 5:3; Num 33:52; Pss 39:6; 73:20); his own rejection of the relevant Aramaic parallels; and his reading of Gen 1 according to his reconstruction of the theology of the P document.

[18] Childs, *Biblical Theology*, 568.

[19] Middleton, *The Liberating Image: The* Imago Dei *in Genesis 1* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2005), 45–6; Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 146; Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis*, The Old Testament Library, Revised Edition (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1972), 57; Randall W. Garr, *In His Own Image and Likeness: Humanity, Divinity, and Monotheism* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 134; Raymond C. Van Leeuwen, 'Form, Image', in the *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology & Exegesis*, gen. ed. Willem A. VanGemeren (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), 4:644; hereafter *NIDOTTE*; D. J. A. Clines, 'The Image of God in Man', *TynBul* 19 (1968): 74–5. See Num 33:52; 2 Kings 11:18; 2 Chr 23:17; Ezek 7:20; Amos 5:26; Ezek 16:17; 23:14; 1 Sam 6:5, 11. Regarding the non-concrete use of the term in Pss 39:6 and 73:20, Middleton writes, 'If we were to reach for a [common feature], perhaps we would settle on (visible) "form" (whether solid or insubstantial)'; Middleton, *Liberating Image*, 46.

The only two occurrences of צלם in which a tangible object is not denoted, Psalms 39:6 and 73:20, use the term in reference to intangible visual appearances.

resemblance.[20] Hence some distinction could be made between the terms. Their parallel and

apparently interchangeable usage in Genesis 1:26 and 5:1, 3 suggests a semantic overlap. This

is further supported by the apparently synonymous use of the Aramaic equivalents of the

terms in the bilingual inscription on a statue from Tell Fakhariyah.[21] According to August

Konkel, 'Their application to the physical form of the statue indicates that the physical human

form is a critical aspect of the function of the image. It would seem that Gen [*sic*] makes a

transfer of the concept of representation by a statue to that of a living being'.[22] Randall Garr

argues from the Fakhariyah inscription that the Aramaic terms for 'image' and 'likeness' are

distinct, connoting dominion and dependence respectively.[23] If his distinction is valid, these

terms could suggest function and relationship. But such conjectures should be held loosely

since their usage in Genesis 1 is not strictly analogous.[24] The point to be taken from the

---

[20] Von Rad, *Genesis*, 58; Clines, 90–91; Middleton, *Liberating Image*, 46; A. H. Konkel, '1948 דמה', *NIDOTTE*, 1:969; Anthony A. Hoekema *Created in God's Image* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 13. Hoekema gives a somewhat ambiguous account of the relationship between the two terms.

[21] The Aramaic inscription refers to the statue on which it is found as דמות as well as צלם; Middleton, *Liberating Image*, 47; also Karel van der Toorn, ed., *The Image and the Book: Iconic Cults, Aniconism, and the Rise of Book Religion in Israel and the Ancient Near East.* (Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 93; A. H. Konkel, '1948 דמה (*dmh* I)', 969; A. R. Millard and P. Bordreuil, 'A Statue from Syria with Assyrian and Aramaic Inscriptions', *The Biblical Archaeologist*, 45.3 (1982), 140.

[22] A. H. Konkel, '1948 דמה (*dmh* I)', 969.

[23] W. Randall Garr, '"Image" and "Likeness" in the Inscription from Tell Fakhariyeh', *Israel Exploration Journal* 50.3/4 (2000): 231, 233–4. According to Garr, 'likeness' is used to express the referent's dependent role in petitionary prayer, while 'image' is used to express the referent's majesty and power. He makes a distinction based on the fact that 'likeness' introduces the first section of the inscription (lines 1–12) while 'image' introduces the second (lines 12–23). His case is plausible but ambiguous, since the correspondence of usage is only partial. See lines 15–16 for discrepant uses of both terms; Edward Lipiński, *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics*, vol. II (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1994; https://books.google.ca/books?id=ra0QmH4np4kC; accessed 1 June 2015), 49.

[24] Garr's distinction, even if valid, is not directly transferable to the Genesis text. Genesis speaks of humankind not as the image and likeness of a human king, but the image and likeness of God. While the notion of an *image* who represents God's sovereignty is plausible, that of a *likeness* who represents God in petitionary prayer clearly is not, since God does not have a superior to whom prayer should be directed on his behalf. The scheme in the Fakhariyah inscription is image-king (prototype)-deity, and in Genesis either human (image)-God (prototype) or alternatively, human (according to the image)-Christ (image)-God (prototype). Even inserting Christ into the scheme, it is Christ who becomes the 'image' or 'likeness' in place of the statue. Although Christ represents God's rule, he does not make intercession on behalf of God to a third party.

inscriptions is that both terms are applied to the concrete statue, and imply a broadly conceived representative function.[25] While the etymology of the terms suggest some distinction, there is a significant overlap in usage, in both biblical and extra-biblical occurrences. The key idea expressed by 'image' and 'likeness' is that of a physical representative function, and perhaps some resemblance that supports such function. In translating this into the dramatic metaphor, we can tentatively imagine the living *imago Dei* as an embodied agent of the divine kingdom.

4.1.1.2 A Covenantal Dramatic Reading

It is observed that nowhere in the Bible is the image of God clearly defined.[26] Comparative studies in ANE parallel texts have yielded widespread agreement on plausible readings, but discrepancies persist.[27] In light of interpretive difficulties, Richard Briggs suggests that a canonical reading of Genesis may be more appropriate, even if it will not yield a clear definition.[28] He also cites Daniel Treier's doubt that a historical reading of Genesis 1:26–27 can be reconciled with a Christological one, implying that ANE-informed 'historical' and Christological readings are mutually exclusive.[29] But in reading further in Treier, we see that canonically subsequent readings can supplement rather than supplant the historically informed reading arising from the narrower literary context.[30] It is true that a reference to Christ is not

---

[25] Middleton, The Liberating Image, 47.

[26] Brevard S. Childs, *Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 97–98.

[27] Gunnlaugur A. Jónsson refers to a 'broad consensus'; *The Image of God: Genesis 1:26–28 in a Century of Old Testament Research*, trans. Lorraine Svendsen (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1988), 133, 219–25; also Middleton, *The Liberating Image*, 93–4. On the difficulty of interpretation and lack of lasting consensus, see Childs, *Biblical Theology*, 567.

[28] Richard S. Briggs, 'Humans in the Image of God and Other Things Genesis Does Not Make Clear', *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 4.1 (2010): 117–8, 123–4.

[29] Briggs states that historical and canonical readings need not conflict, but quickly shades the meaning of 'historical' in terms of the development of the canon; Briggs, 'Humans in the Image', 118. Whatever his true position, his burden is to downplay the ANE context in favour of the canonical. However, I would argue that these two contexts make compatible contributions to the interpretation of the Genesis text.

[30] Daniel J. Treier, Introducing Theological Interpretation of Scripture: Recovering a Christian Practice (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 153–4.

to be found in the text of Genesis 1:26–27. But I suggest that a historically sensitive reading of Genesis 1 can be brought into conversation with the NT Christological image texts, and indeed serve as a concordant prelude. Hence, we need not rush forward to the Christological texts before we can invest meaning into the designation of 'the image of God'. A covenantal dramatic reading attends to the present OT action with a view to the upcoming NT climax.

I will therefore attempt to read the Genesis texts on the *imago Dei* as functioning to introduce and develop the theme in the covenantal drama. Barth posits, and Grenz concurs, that Genesis 1 serves as a prologue to the narrative of human existence as God's covenant partner.[31] For Barth, covenant—the divine-human relationship—is the goal and purpose of creation.[32] Scot McKnight also views the theme of covenant as a fruitful way of understanding theological anthropology and the place of humans on the earth as God's image.[33] Michael Horton refers to the creation account as 'the historical prologue of the creation treaty … of the covenant itself', noting that the statements regarding Yahweh's summoning creation into being is 'unmistakably covenantal language'.[34] Historical prologues in the suzerain-vassal treaties of the ANE recount events of deliverance or bestowal of benefit, and function to establish the authority and dependability of the suzerain.[35] In the case of the Mosaic covenant, deliverance

---

[31] Barth, *CD* III/1, 181–2; Grenz, *Social God*, 202. For the general idea of a creation covenant, also see J. Rodman Williams, *Renewal Theology: Systematic Theology from a Charismatic Perspective*, Three Volumes in One (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 1:276–7; and Henri Blocher, *In the Beginning: The Opening Chapters of Genesis*, trans. David G. Preston (Leicester and Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1984), 111–2.

[32] Barth, *CD* III/1, 94ff, passim; supported by Childs, *Biblical Theology*, 386; also Colin Gunton, *The Triune Creator*, 26.

[33] Scot McKnight, 'Covenant', *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*, ed. Kevin J. Vanhoozer (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic; London: SPCK, 2005), 142–3.

[34] Michael S. Horton, *Lord and Servant: A Covenant Christology* (Louisville: WJK, 2005), 68, 70. Ps 33:6–9; 50:1.

[35] J. Arthur Thompson, 'Covenant (OT)', *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, Fully Revised (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979–88), 1:790–3; hereafter *ISBE*; Peter C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 82–3, 94.

from Egypt was the key historical event that grounds the continuing covenant relationship and the call to obedience in light of Yahweh's faithfulness.[36] The theme of divine combat and victory over the sea serpent, a mythical symbol of the life-destroying watery chaos, has traditionally been applied both to the Exodus and to creation, often with a view towards reinforcing Israel's faith in the context of the exile.[37] The creation account could plausibly be read as an act of divine deliverance which is patterned after the Exodus and functions as the historical prologue to the divine-human covenant relationship.[38]

Richard Middleton has identified the analogy between creation and covenant, noting implicit parallels with regard to God's providential care for each in Psalms 33 and 148, and the explicit analogy in Psalm 147. 'This analogy also underlies Genesis 9, which boldly uses the term *covenant* (*bĕrît*) not only for God's relationship with Noah and his family, but also for

---

[36] Exod 20:2; Deut 4:20; 7:8–9. Gordon J. McConville, '1382 בְּרִית', *NIDOTTE*, 1:749; J. A. Thompson, *Deuteronomy: An Introduction & Commentary*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (Leicester/Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1974), 70–1.

[37] Job 26:7–13; Ps 74:12–17; 89:9–13; 104:5–9; Isa 27:1; 51:9–10. Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 147–51; Beale, *NTBT*, 796; Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology*, 36–7. Brueggemann also notes the parallel verbs *yld* (beget) and *ḥll* (birth, pierce), both used in Deut 32:18 in reference to the Exodus and in Ps 90:2 in reference to creation. The verb *ḥll* 'testifies to the motif of combat' in Job 26:13 and Isa 51:9; Brueggemann, 147–8; transliterations original. Westermann had argued that the theme of Yahweh's victory over Chaos occurs in various contexts, some of which link the struggle with creation and others do not. Although he downplays the link, he does admit that there is a 'clear echo' of this in the OT, including 'the faintest trace' in Gen 1:2 and 'clearly heard in a number of Psalms'; Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 29, 33. He also claims wrongly that 'the name תְּהוֹם does not appear at all in any of [the Chaos monster] passages'; see Isa 51:10; cf. Gen 1:2. Note the combat theme in Isa 51:9, the creation references in vv. 13 and 16, and the clear covenant statement in v. 16c, 'You are my people'.

[38] Regarding primeval history as covenant prologue, see Briggs, 'Humans in the Image', 112, 123–4 and Seth D. Postell, *Adam as Israel: Genesis 1–3 as the Introduction to the Torah and Tanakh* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2011). The prologue reminds us that there is a universal scope to salvation history.

Whether we date the text to the time of the Exodus according to tradition, or to the exile according to modern scholarship, it still stands that the Exodus theme is in the historical background of the Genesis text, since the Exodus theme is prominent in the return from exile; e.g. Isa 40:1–5. It should therefore not be surprising to find covenantal elements in the creation accounts.

For appeals to God's sovereignty in creation as reason for Israel's confidence in his deliverance from the exile, also see Isa 40:26; 42:5; 45:1–13; 65:17–18. The Exodus theme appears also in Rev 12:3–17.

God's relationship with the earth itself … and with every living thing'.[39] The threefold pattern in Genesis 1 of fiat ('Let there be x'), execution ('and it was so') and evaluation ('and God saw that it was good') echoes the covenantal structure of stipulations, obedience and blessing.[40] Seth Postell notes that the tenfold use of 'and God said' in Genesis 1 parallels the 'Ten Words' of the Decalogue.[41] Furthermore, the covenantal blessings of offspring and land found in key covenantal texts occupy a central place in the creation accounts.[42] Daniel Block has identified the God-people-land triad as a key to national identity.[43] Viewing Genesis 1–3 through these lenses, the analogy between creation and Israel can be further elucidated. Humankind was appointed as vice-regents to rule and steward the land, which constituted a divine grant.[44] The relationship of people and land was governed by guidelines, the contingent observance of which was the basis for blessings and curses.[45] In the creation story, the corresponding blessings and curses listed by Block can be best seen in the aftermath of disobedience: an unproductive land (i.e. 'thorns and thistles', 3:17–19), disease (i.e. pain in

---

[39] Middleton, *The Liberating Image*, 67–8; he cites Gen 9:11–13, 15–17; transliteration original.

[40] Middleton, *The Liberating Image*, 67–70. Also Jer 8:7. Beale discerns the analogy between creation and subsequent covenant narratives in the canon by means of a new creational kingdom motif; Beale, *NTBT*, 169–70. McKnight elucidates the connection Jesus makes between 'kingdom' and 'covenant' at the Last Supper, noting the continuity with Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses and David. McKnight, 'Covenant', 142.

[41] Postell, *Adam as Israel*, 12. One could also see a parallel to the ten plagues of Egypt, as each is a set of divine acts of rulership. A further parallel is potentially found in the eschatological plagues of Revelation 8–9 and 16, which are patterned after those in the exodus. But these plagues, rather than acts of creation, were acts of 'de-creation'; G. K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1999), 465, 486–7.

[42] See Genesis 12:1–3; 15:5, 19–20; 17:2–8; 26:3–4, 22, 24; 28:3–4, 13–14.

[43] Daniel I. Block, *The God of the Nations: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern National Theology*, ETS Monograph Series (Jackson, MS: Evangelical Theological Society, 1988), 5–6, passim.

[44] Gen 1:26, 28; 2:15; 1:29–30. The king was appointed as Yahweh's 'means of ensuring peace and prosperity in his estate'; Block, *God of the Nations*, 92–96. The land was a grant to provide prosperity for the people, p. 102.

[45] Gen 2:16–17. Block, *God of the Nations*, 106, 110–1.

childbearing, v. 16), the threat of wild beasts and foreign enemies (i.e. enmity with the

serpent, v. 15), and finally exile from the land (i.e. the garden v. 23–24).[46]

The canonical idea of covenant provides a context in which the image motif takes on

significant meaning. As in the ANE, the image in Genesis can be seen to symbolise what the

covenant formalises: the ruler-subject relationship. Covenant is essentially a relational

concept, entailing a dialogue of divine initiative and human response, and bearing

implications for ethics, mission, soteriology and eschatology.[47] It fits easily into dramatic

form: it begins with a historical prologue, setting the stage for an ongoing dialogical

relationship, and proceeds with a mission that propels the plot forward. This is an attempt to

read the texts constructively in a way that not only takes ANE comparative readings into

account, but also accords with the rest of the canon.[48] The test for such a constructive reading

will be its ability to give coherence to the larger narrative of the Bible, as well as yielding

plausible readings of the particular texts.[49]

Note also that covenant in these contexts are primarily corporate in nature, though not without

implications for individuals. The *imago Dei* text of Genesis 1 seems to use the term 'אדם'

(*'ādām*) generically in referring to the human race. In Genesis 2–3 'Adam' becomes a

personal name, but continues to have corporate implications by virtue of Adam's position as

---

[46] For blessings, see: economic prosperity (Lev 26:4–5; Deut 28:8, 11b-12), increase of population (Lev 26:9; Deut 28:11a), security against external threats (Lev 26:6–8), continuation of the relationship with Yahweh (Lev 26:11–12; Deut 28:9–10). For curses, see: unproductiveness of the land (Deut 28:22; Lev 26:16), disease (Lev 26:16b; Deut 28:22a, 29, 34–35, 58–62), increase in wild beasts (Lev 26:22), oppression by foreign enemies, and finally exile (Lev 26:33; Deut 28:36–37); Block, *God of the Nations*, 113.

[47] McKnight, 'Covenant', 142–3. The choice of the Hittite vassal-treaty form suggests that 'covenant in the OT is conceived essentially as relationship'; McConville, '1382 בְּרִית', 1:748.

[48] My working assumption is that the ANE context supplies the *language* and *basic concepts*, into which the OT writers invest a distinct *theology*, which would be received by the OT community as well as the Jews of later periods.

[49] Cf. Robert W. Jenson, *Systematic Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 1:33.

representative head of humanity. The protological covenant is corporate, but includes individual participation. In the NT, Christ singularly takes on the *imago Dei* role in a recapitulation of Adam and his race. But as the new covenant head he makes the way for the church to become the restored *imago Dei* and the new humanity, and for each believer to be a participant. Hence, the corporate-individual tension remains.

4.1.1.3 Summary of the Covenantal Reading

Covenantal elements found in Genesis 1–3 may be summed up as follows: (1) calling into an identity-forming relationship/sonship; (2) stipulations outlining a way of life; (3) commission to a task that extends the rule of God; (4) God's covenant presence and deliverance; (5) formation of a people or community; (6) provision of land for sustenance and blessing.[50] For our purposes, these could be further reduced to three key aspects of human covenantal life: (1) covenant sonship (calling into relational existence), (2) covenant shaping (conformity to God's character and ways) and (3) covenant sending (commission to a task). Covenant presence and deliverance is both prologue and promise corresponding to covenant sonship. Peoplehood or community could be viewed both as the horizontal aspect of a relational existence and as the extension of God's kingdom through the multiplication of his image-

---

[50] Supporting biblical references: (1) calling (humanity: implicit; Abraham: Gen 12:1–3; 15:1; 17:7–8; Israel: Exod 6:7; 29:45–46; Lev 26:12; Deut 7:6–8; 14:1–2; etc.); sonship (humanity: implicit in Gen, notably 5:3; explicit in Luke 3:38; Israel: Exod 4:22–23; Deut 14:1; Jer 31:9; Hos 11:1; Davidic king: 2 Sam 7:14; 1 Chr 22:10; Ps 2:7–12; 89:26–27); (2) stipulations (humanity: Gen 2:16–17; Abraham: Gen 17:1, 9–14; Israel: Exod 12, 13; 19:5–6; 20–23; Lev passim, notably 19:2; Deut passim, notably 5–6; etc.); (3) commission (humanity: Gen 1:28; 2:15; Abraham, blessing: Gen 12:2c, 3c; Israel, conquest: Deut 7:1–5; 8:1; Josh 1:2; testimony: Exod 12:25–27; 13:14–15; Deut 6:7–9, 20–25; Ps 18:49; 22:27–31; 45:17; 47:7–9; 57:9; Pss 67, 96, 98, etc.); (4) presence/deliverance (humanity: Gen 1:2, 27; 2:7, 18; 3:21; Abraham: Gen 12:3; 15:1, 14; 17:7; Israel, deliverance: Exod 6:1, 5–6; 12:29–51; 14:1–28; 20:2; Deut 5:6; covenant presence: Exod 13:21–22; 14:19–20; 16:10; 29:42–46); (5) people/community (humanity: Gen 1:28; 2:18, 21–25; Abraham: Gen 12:2; 15:4–5; 17:4–6; Exod 6:7; etc.); (6) land/sustenance (humanity: Gen 1:29–30; Abraham: Gen 12:7; 15:7, 18–21; 17:8; Exod 6:8; etc.).

bearers. The provision of land is both a blessing of sonship and a divine charge to be stewarded. This affords us a simplified covenantal structure to trace through the subsequent acts of the drama.[51] But we must keep in mind that these are not disparate elements but aspects of the one coherent reality of the covenant.

The basic role of humanity on the stage of creation is to bodily represent God in the context of a physical creation, mediating his speech and actions in the world. This presupposes a fitting ontology, including embodiment as well as capacities required for human agency.[52] Faithful representation presupposes a relationship with the one represented,[53] as well as ethical conformity to his character and will. Representation is a mission: to be an embodied agent of God's kingdom by imitatively mediating his providential care and blessing to the world,[54] participating in his order-creating, life-giving performative speech and communicative action in dialogical relationship with God and his creatures upon the stage of the physical creation. The dramatic view of the *imago Dei* as a role to which we have been divinely appointed incorporates the entire range of proposals outlined in the previous chapter: structural, ethical, relational and functional. Each of these four aspects will be addressed in the following sections.

---

[51] All six elements could certainly be traced through the biblical canon to the eschaton, and the three elements I have subsumed will not be neglected in the subsequent chapters. But the simpler threefold structure increases their visibility and manageability throughout the plot. It also consciously mirrors the Holiness-Pentecostal three-stage model of conversion, sanctification and Spirit baptism, as well as the threefold process of charismatic spirituality described by Mark Cartledge as encounter, transformation and missionary purpose; Mark J. Cartledge, *Practical Theology: Charismatic and Empirical Perspectives* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2003), 24–30.

[52] Vanhoozer, Remythologizing Theology, 234.

[53] Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Theo-Drama: Theological Dramatic Theory, volume III, Dramatis Personae: Persons in Christ*, trans. Graham Harrison (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1992), 168.

[54] Blocher, *In the Beginning*, 90.

4.1.2 Covenant Sonship: Called into Relational Existence

Corresponding approximately to the relational view of the *imago Dei* is the notion of covenant sonship, that human beings, both male and female, have been divinely called into an existence determined primarily by relationship with God and with fellow human beings. This concurs with Barth who places his discussion of creation in general, and of the image in particular, in the context of the covenant. According to Barth, creation is the external basis—the necessary presupposition—for the covenant. Conversely, covenant is the internal basis—the purpose—for creation.[55] For Barth, the essence of humanity is found in being 'determined by God for life with God … the covenant-partner of God'.[56] To be human is to live in covenant partnership with God, a partnership made possible not by the creature's essence, but by the Creator's call.[57] Creation sets the stage for the drama, which is 'the story of the covenant of grace'.[58] Barth's discussion of creation and covenant opens a way for a distinction I wish to make between created nature and covenantal dramatic identity.[59]

Robert Jenson likewise locates human uniqueness and the image of God in our relation to God as 'the ones addressed by God's moral word and so enabled to respond'.[60] Humankind's particular identity is constituted by the divine call. But he repudiates the distinction between creation and calling, insisting that the divine address simultaneously creates us as human and

[55] Barth, *CD* III/1, 43–4, passim.
[56] Barth, *CD* III/2, 203. Also Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 158.
[57] Barth, *CD* III/2, 224.
[58] Barth, *CD* III/1, 44.
[59] Barth may not share this distinction, because he locates the covenant in the man Jesus, who is the 'ontological determination of humanity', and for this reason his ontology is exactly covenantal; Barth, *CD* III/2, 132; cf. Bruce McCormack, 'Grace and Being: The Role of God's Gracious Election in Karl Barth's Theological Ontology', *The Cambridge Companion to Karl Barth*, ed. John Webster (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 98–9.
[60] Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2:58–9; also McFadyen, *Call to Personhood*, 22–23; Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 97.

calls us into participation in dramatic discourse.[61] An exegetical caution is in order here. The notion that God creates the non-human creatures by speech can be discerned in the text if we read the jussives of Genesis 1 as a kind of third person address, i.e. creation by 'command'.[62] But the depiction of creation by calling is conspicuously absent in the case of humans. Instead, there is deliberation and a generic narration: '"Let us" … So God created'. *How* God created is not specified. God's address to humanity seems to *follow* the act of creation, though it could be read as part of the creation process.[63] Moreover, precisely in the case of the human, Genesis 2:7 narrates in detail what Genesis 1 leaves generic: 'then the LORD God formed the man [אדם] of dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life'. Where the text apparently gives specifics regarding the *how*, the action is depicted not in terms of calling, but of forming and breathing. Nevertheless, one could conceivably hold that the divine address brings humans into ontological existence by including them in one's reading of passages referring to creation by divine command.[64] We can infer from these texts that God not only *forms* human beings from the dust, but also *calls* and *breathes* them into relational existence by the Word and the Spirit in a Trinitarian act of creation.[65]

---

[61] Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2:61–63, 68.

[62] Gen 1:3, 9, etc.; cf. Ps 33:6, 9; Rom 4:17; Heb 11:3; 2 Pet 3:5. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 110–1; Bruce K. Waltke, *Genesis: A Commentary*, with Cathi J. Fredricks (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 56, 60–1, 69; Hamilton, *Genesis*, 119.

[63] Gen 1:26–28; the cohortative in v. 26 suggests deliberation. Victor Hamilton observed that the only item in Genesis 1 created by fiat is light; Hamilton, *Genesis*, 119. Note that man (האדם) is not gender specific and therefore means 'the human'.

[64] E.g. Ps 33:6. Irenaeus reflects this variation in the biblical texts, at times depicting creation as an act of divine summons (*AH* 2.2.5, 2.10.4; Pss 33:9; 148:5), and at other times as a work of divine 'hands' (e.g. *AH* 3.10.3; 5.6.1; 5.28.4; Pss 95:4; 102:25–28. Middleton has also noted the two kinds of creative action in Genesis 1; Middleton, *The Liberating Image*, 65–6. Regarding Ps 33:9 as an allusion to Gen 1, see John Goldingay, *Psalms: Volume 1: Psalms 1–41* (Baker Academic, 2006), 467; Allen P. Ross, *A Commentary on the Psalms: Volume 1(1–41)* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2011), 732; Peter C. Craigie, *Word Biblical Commentary vol. 19: Psalms 1–50* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), 273.

[65] Irenaeus, *AH* 4.pref.4; 5.1.3; 5.6.1; 5.28.4; Jürgen Moltmann, *The Spirit of Life: A Universal Affirmation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 41–3.

For my own appropriation, I would distinguish conceptually, though not temporally, between

creation and the initial calling. Creation confers ontological existence—*what* we are—while

calling confers dramatic identity—*who* we are.[66] While dramatic identity is composed of roles

and relationships, ontological existence has to do with nature, which we associate with

attributes and capacities. Identity presupposes, but is distinct from, ontology. We could

potentially read God's *forming* of Adam from the dust as an act of creating his *nature*, and his

breathing as the conferral of life and relationship—hence *identity*.[67] The gift of divine breath

functions to confer a unique identity upon humankind. Consider also that the 'breath of God'

and 'spirit of God' are used in parallel fashion to denote in human persons both the life

principle and 'understanding', and that Paul considers the Spirit to be the identity marker for

the 'sons of God'.[68] There is certainly reason to think of the divine breath in Genesis 2:7 as

the conferral of a unique identity characterised at least by filial relationship with God. The

divine breath seems to function in Genesis 2 as an equivalent to the divine word of address in

Genesis 1:28.

With these caveats in place, we can affirm that humankind has been called into relational

existence by the word and the breath of God. It is well noted that the creation of humans is

uniquely marked by a statement of divine deliberation.[69] The divine act of creating human

---

[66] Cf. Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology*, 182–7. Vanhoozer makes the distinction between the divine identity and the divine nature. I am adapting his distinction to my treatment of anthropology. Note that Vanhoozer accuses Jenson of conflating God's identity with God's nature; p. 184–5.

[67] E.g. 2 Sam 22:16; 1 Kgs 17:17. Victor Hamilton observed that the word for 'breath' (נשמה), unlike 'spirit' (רוח), is used only of Yahweh and humans in the OT; Hamilton, *Genesis*, 159. Also see the discussion below in 4.1.4.2.

[68] Job 27:3; 33:4; Isa 42:5; Job 32:8; Rom 8:14–16; Gal 4:6–7. In Job 32:8, 'understanding' refers not to a human capacity, but to divinely inspired insight; John E. Hartley, *The Book of Job*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 434.

[69] Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 145; Waltke, *Genesis*, 64; Blocher, *In the Beginning*, 84.

nature is accompanied by the conferral of human *identity* in an expression of divine intent. The divine Author assigns a dramatic role to humanity marked by the terms 'image' and 'dominion', an assignment we can refer to as a *calling*.[70] The notion of being called into relational existence coheres well with the canonical pattern of covenant I previously described.[71] In light of the parallels earlier noted between creation and the Exodus, Hosea 11:1 is especially suggestive: 'out of Egypt I called my son'. The text alludes to Exodus 4:22, in which Yahweh declares, 'Israel is my firstborn son'. The act of deliverance is simultaneously a call into the privilege of sonship. In addition to being the wager in the contest between Yahweh and Pharaoh, the designation of 'firstborn' is significant in conferring dominion and blessing.[72] To be the firstborn son is to exist in a covenant of blessing by which Israel would occupy a position of honour and privilege among the nations.[73] In a similar fashion, humankind would be blessed to exercise dominion over all other creatures.[74] Given the covenantal privileges conferred upon humankind, one could plausibly apply the metaphor to Adam as 'firstborn' among the creatures, in anticipation of Christ who is the 'firstborn of all creation'.[75]

---

[70] Gen 1:26–28. Middleton, *The Liberating Image*, 27; Balthasar, *TD*, 3:263–71; Grenz, 'Jesus as the *Imago Dei*', 622, passim; Grenz, *Social God*, 15; James K. A. Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom: Worship, Worldview, and Cultural Formation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009), 163–4; Stephenson, *Dismantling the Dualisms*, 121.

[71] E.g. Gen 12:1–3; Hos 11:1.

[72] Ps 89:26–29; Heb 12:16–17; Gen 25:31; 27:1–40; 2 Chr 21:3. Stephen Dempster understands the conquest of Canaan as Israel's exercise of dominion as God's son 'in fulfilment of the function of the image of God'; Stephen G. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty: A Theology of the Hebrew Bible* (Leicester / Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 2003), 127. Gen 1:28; Josh 18:1. Bill T. Arnold, '1144 בכר', *NIDOTTE*, 1:658–9.

[73] Beale, *NTBT*, 402; Waltke, *Genesis*, 363–4, 377; Arnold, 1:659.

[74] Gen 1:28; cf. 9:1–2. According to Beale, Israel's sonship was inherited from Adam's; Beale, *NTBT*, 402; citing *Jub.* 22:13. For the close association between blessing, multiplication and dominion also see Gen 17:6; 22:17; and *Jub* 22:11–13. Westermann does not make the connection between blessing and dominion, but restricts the blessing to the fertility shared with animals; Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 160. But see Waltke, *Genesis*, 67; Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty*, 61–2; John H. Walton, *Genesis*, *NIVAC* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 132.

[75] Col 1:15. Cf. Beale, *NTBT*, 447–8.

Regarding the absence of the term 'son' in this context, we note that Luke's designation of

Adam as 'the son of God' likely alludes to the direct creation of Adam in God's own image.[76]

The language of sonship is used elsewhere in close association with both image and kingship.

Kings are referred to in the ANE both as the *image* of God, and as the *son* of God.[77] God's

promise to David is that he will be like a father to David's descendants, the kings.[78] 'Image'

and 'likeness' are used in Genesis 5:3 to describe the relationship between Adam and his son

Seth. Regarding this passage, Edward Curtis emphasises relationship as the primary idea. But

he also suggests that 'the son is the image of his father because he functions both like his

father and on behalf of his father'.[79] Beale infers from Genesis 5 that Adam's being in God's

'image' meant that he was God's 'son', citing the equivalence in the Jewish pseudepigraphal

Life of Adam and Eve.[80] Meredith Kline also observes that image of God and son of God are

'twin concepts'.[81] The association of sonship with image and kingship may be due to the

understanding that God is the true King and human kings are merely representative rulers.[82]

---

[76] Luke 3:38; Norval Geldenhuys, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 153.

[77] Rameses II describes his relationship to his god both as 'son' and 'likeness': 'I am thy son whom thou hast placed upon thy throne. Thou hast assigned to me thy kingdom, thou hast fashioned me in thy likeness and thy form, which thou hast assigned to me and has created'; James Henry Breasted (trans. and ed.), *Ancient Records of Egypt, vol. 3: The Nineteenth Dynasty* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2001), 181 §411; I am indebted to Gregory Beale for this reference; G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity; Leicester: Apollos, 2004), 89. Also see Breasted, *Ancient Records*, 2:361, 364, in which Horus refers to Nibmare as his 'son' and his 'image'.

[78] 2 Sam 7:14; Pss 2:7; 89:26f.

[79] Edward M. Curtis, 'Image of God (OT)', *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman et al. (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 3:390.

[80] Beale, 'Colossians', *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker; Nottingham: Apollos, 2007), 851–2. In this account, Adam is referred to in angelic intercession as 'Thine image' and Eve speaks of God as 'the Invisible Father'; *The Apocalypse of Moses*, 35; http://wesley.nnu.edu/sermons-essays-books/noncanonical-literature/noncanonical-literature-ot-pseudepigrapha/the-apocalypse-of-moses/; accessed 25 May 2015.

[81] Meredith G. Kline, *Images of the Spirit* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1999), 23 n. 34. He cites Rom 8:29; cf. vv. 14–17; Heb 1:2f; James 3:9; 1 John 3:2; cf. Luke 20:36. Also see Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty*, 58; and Westermann's citation of T.C. Vriezen: 'The human being stands apart from other living beings because of a special relationship to God … that of the child toward the father'; Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 151.

[82] Deut 33:5; 1 Sam 8:7; 1 Chr 28:5; Blocher, *In the Beginning*, 90.

To be a representative presupposes a special relationship with the one represented. The theme of sonship testifies to the close association between various aspects of the image—relationship, resemblance, and function. I propose that the divine-human relationship that designates Adam and his kind as children of God is the primary relationship contributing to the human identity as the *imago Dei*, which encompasses sonship, shaping and sending.[83]

4.1.3 Covenant Shaping: Conformed to Spirit-Dependent Righteousness

We have said that the *imago Dei* is an identity-conferring role in the divine drama to which humankind has been appointed, which includes relationships, morality and mission. The divine-human relationship in particular is crucial to the human identity and is presupposed in the human mission to be embodied representatives of God. To this should be added the need for an appropriate shaping of the character as a prerequisite to missional fulfilment and a necessary accompaniment to the identity-forming relationship with God. This aspect of the covenant corresponds to the ethical view of the *imago Dei* held by Luther and Calvin, which takes its cues from NT texts regarding the renewal of the image in Christ.[84] Central to this interpretation is the idea that a covenant with God obligates his people to be conformed to his character and will.[85] Divine command corresponds to the stipulations imposed by ANE suzerains upon their vassals.[86] In the case of Yahweh's covenant with Israel, the law outlines

---

[83] Furthermore, the notion of a 'historical prologue', that we have a history in being created and called by God, coheres with McFadyen's proposal that persons 'are structures of response sedimented from past relations in which they have been addressed'; McFadyen, *Call to Personhood*, 41. Our identity is constituted and shaped primarily by the divine call and by our continuing responses to his call, and secondarily by the addresses of others and our responses to them.

[84] Rom 8:29; 2 Cor 3:18; Col 3:8–10.

[85] Brueggemann, Theology of the Old Testament, 420.

[86] Thompson, *Deuteronomy*, 75.

a way of life characterised by holiness and justice according to the character of Yahweh.[87]

Closely associated with the requirement of conformity is the notion that human subjects are dependent on the Creator rather than being autonomous. In varying degrees, dependency is the reason, the means and the content of moral conformity. Humans are morally obligated to their Creator and giver of life, dependent on him to fulfil such obligation and called to such dependent living.[88]

In the original creation, God commissions humanity to cultivate and protect life in the garden because he is a God who favours life. The sacredness of life would be affirmed throughout the Bible. God also imposes one prohibition: 'of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat'.[89] We may proceed by exploring the hypothesis that this prohibition is in some way linked with a stipulation of moral conformity. This also requires an examination of the tree of life, which stands as a counterpart to the forbidden tree.

The tree of life seems to signify the availability of an escalated blessing, a fullness of life, that was not present in the original state. Following the conferral of the divine Spirit as the agent and gift of life to the creature, the tree of life is given as a sacrament for the complete realisation of the blessings of that gift.[90] The tree signifies the perfection of life that is attained

---

[87] Lev 11:45; 19:2; Deut 24:17; cf. 10:17–19. These could be also summarised as love for God and neighbour respectively.
[88] Brueggemann, Theology of the Old Testament, 454.
[89] Gen 2:15–17; cf. Gen 1.
[90] For the identification of the 'breath of life' with the divine Spirit, see sect. 4.1.5.
Sacramental readings are found in Bruce K. Waltke, *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach*, with Charles Yu (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 257; Beale, *NTBT*, 38–9; cf. 33–43; Marguerite Shuster, *The Fall and Sin: What We Have Become as Sinners* (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004), 18–19, 27. Blocher interprets the trees as symbolic rather than literal and sacramental; Blocher, *In the Beginning*, 125. But this yields no plausible reading of Gen 3:22, which prohibits further eating from the tree of life on the grounds that humans would then 'live forever'. Such eating of the tree symbolises 'communion with God, the inexhaustible source of life', which should certainly be encouraged rather than prohibited. In the subsequent narratives, it seems that significant degrees of communion are enjoyed by Abel and

only in communion with God through the Spirit.[91] The eating of the fruit would not 'magically' confer eternal life. But a faithful 'eating', as an external complement of an internal faith, would constitute a gesture of dependent submission by which one receives eternal life. In terms of the Irenaean destiny for a mature humanity, the tree could be a sacrament of that fully developed humanity characterised by moral perfection and realised only in union with the Word and the Spirit.[92] In terms of the NT category of glorification through the Spirit, the tree would be a sacrament of that gift, anticipating and realising the perfection of the human creature by the Spirit.[93] Note that in both the Bible and Irenaeus, human flourishing is inseparably linked with relational communion with God and moral conformity to God.[94] The book of Proverbs refers to personified wisdom as a 'tree of life' which seems to designate the wellbeing and flourishing that results from righteous living according to divinely revealed wisdom.[95] Ezekiel shifts the focus to the life-giving river that flows from the temple but also mentions the closely associated trees that provide food and

---

especially Enoch (Gen 4:4; 5:21–24). Within the sacramental reading, the prohibition is apparently intended to guard against a sacrilegious eating, perhaps comparable to Paul's warning in 1 Cor 11:27, the result of which is that they would be confirmed in their state of rebellion. Just as the serpent's 'promise' of being like God and knowing good and evil were fulfilled in an unpropitious manner, so the unauthorised eating of the tree of life may have the similar effect of conferring a state of perpetual fallen existence; Waltke, *Genesis*, 96; also Hamilton, *Genesis*, 208. It seems likely that both trees carry some form of sacramental effect, in that as they hold out their respective promises, the external act of eating corresponds to the internal state of the heart. Eating from the tree of life constitutes an act of dependent submission to the Life-Giver, while eating from the forbidden tree constitutes an act of autonomy and idolatry. The trees may be antithetical, so that 'Eating of the one precluded eating of the other'; G. Charles Alders, *The Book of Genesis*, trans. William Heynen (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 1:114.

[91] Cf. Hamilton, *Genesis*, 163.

[92] Irenaeus, *AH* 4.4.3; 5.1.3; 5.8.1; 5.16.2; *Dem.* 31; Matthew C. Steenberg, *Of God and Man: Theology as Anthropology from Irenaeus to Athanasius* (London: T & T Clark, 2009), 37, 43, 52. As I argued in Chapter 3, Irenaeus closely associates reason with morality.

[93] Rom 5:1–5; 8:9–30; 2 Cor 3:8, 17–18; 5:5; Gal 3:3; Eph 1:13; Irenaeus, *AH* 5.1.3; 5.8.1–2; John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, ed. John T. McNeill, vol. 21, The Library of Christian Classics (London: SCM, 1960), 4.14.9.

[94] E.g. in Proverbs, 'the fear of the LORD' unites communion and conformity as the essence of wisdom and the source of life.

[95] Prov 3:18; 11:30; 13:12; 15:4. Blocher, *In the Beginning*, 124.

healing.[96] The emphasis seems to be on God as the source of life,[97] which is reinforced by the NT identification of the Spirit as living water and Christ as the source.[98] Finally, the vision of the final state in Revelation promises to the redeemed people of God the water of life which flows from God's throne, and the tree of life with its fruit for food and its leaves for healing.[99] As in Ezekiel, God is the source of abundant life, which includes provision, wholeness and peace. The biblical portrait of the tree of life may be summarised as a symbol of the blessings of the kingdom of God, wherein submission to divine authority and conformity to the divine vision for human living results in the blessing of eternal life in communion with God.

The tree of the knowledge of good and evil may signify the privilege of decision in moral and consequential matters,[100] of which the antithesis between divine lordship and human autonomy is fundamental. One could argue that since moral and sapiential judgment properly belong to the divine King, humans are rightly dependent upon revelation for such knowledge and disobedient eating is a grasping for the divine prerogative.[101] 'Good' and 'evil' are best understood in terms of that which advances or hinders life respectively.[102] The creation narrative depicts God as the judge of what is 'good'. The temptation narrative suggests that what is required is dependent submission to God regarding the valuation and provision of life

---

[96] Ezek 47:1, 9, 12; cf. Gen 2:10–14.
[97] Cf. Hamilton, *Genesis*, 163.
[98] John 7:37; cf. 1:4; 4:14.
[99] Rev 22:1–2, 17; cf. 2:7.
[100] Hamilton, *Genesis*, 165–6; Waltke, *Old Testament Theology*, 257–8; Blocher, *In the Beginning*, 126–34. Beale interprets the tree as symbolising the place of judgment, 'suggestive of his magisterial duty. … So Adam should have discerned that the serpent was evil and should have judged the serpent in the name of God at the place of the judgment tree'; Beale, *NTBT*, 35; also pp. 69, 360. But this reading seems to run counter to the text: the sin is that of non-participation in the tree. Beale apparently meant that Adam was supposed to judge the serpent *at* the tree *instead* of *eating from* the tree. Unfortunately, this is poorly stated and poorly supported.
[101] Waltke, *Genesis*, 86; Blocher, *In the Beginning*, 132–3; William J. Dumbrell, *Covenant and Creation: A Theology of Old Testament Covenants* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1984), 38.
[102] Cf. Deut 30:15; Waltke, *Genesis*, 86; also see other biblical uses of the terms: 2 Sam 14:17; 1 Kgs 3:9; Deut 1:39; Isa 7:15.

(food), enjoyment (beauty) and power (wisdom), a submission that would ultimately have yielded the good desired.[103] We find here a harmony of duty with desire, what is *right* with what is *good*. A theology of divine goodness would affirm that there is not a conflict but a full integration of trusting obedience with the satisfaction of desires. The God who created human desire claims the prerogative to fulfil them, the promise of which perhaps lies in the Tree of Life.[104] In light of the representation in Proverbs of wisdom as a tree of life, the tree of knowledge of good and evil could fittingly be described as the tree of folly.[105] This also approximates the meaning of the Pauline dialectic of flesh and Spirit, in which the flesh refers to human existence apart from God characterised by self-determination, self-reliance and self-justification.[106] Biblical ethics, for all its diversity, is ultimately a matter of loving loyalty to the one God and dependent conformity to his will.[107] Covenant conformity to God is not immediately a matter of knowing good and evil, but is first a matter of knowing God who is the giver of all goods and the source of all knowledge.[108] Consider Proverbs 9:10: 'The fear of the LORD is the beginning of wisdom, and the knowledge of the Holy One is insight'. The shaping of human life according to the divine will is an indispensable element of the covenant.

---

[103] Gen 1:4, etc.; Gen 3:6; 'The temptation played upon the whole range of human desire. … Evil is not in the good that God has created, but in the rejection of the order that God has instituted for the enjoyment of the world'; Blocher, *In the Beginning*, 140. One could view the tree of life as provision and the tree of knowledge as valuation.

[104] Cf. Ps 145:15–20.

[105] Blocher, *In the Beginning*, 133. Note that wisdom in Proverbs also integrates morality with desirability.

[106] A. C. Thiselton, 'Flesh', *NIDNTT*, 1:675–6; F. B. Knutson, 'Flesh', *ISBE*, 2:314.

[107] Allen Verhey, 'Ethics in Scripture', *Dictionary of Scripture and Ethics*, ed. Joel B. Green (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 5.

[108] For the priority of knowing God, see for example Exod 6:7; 1 Kgs 8:60; Isa 43:10; Jer 24:7. For God as the source of good, consider Gen 1; Ps 16:2; Jas 1:17.

4.1.4 Covenant Sending: Commissioned to Embodied Mediation

In addition to the covenant relationship and its way of life, humans are also commissioned with a covenantal task. I have stated earlier that the *imago Dei* is primarily a dramatic role conferred upon humankind to mediate divine action and speech bodily on the stage of creation. Specifically, the human creature is sent to be an embodied agent of God's kingdom, communicating his blessing to the world. It has been well observed that a key component in the human mission in Genesis 1 takes the form of the royal metaphor of 'dominion'.[109] As representative rulers, the human creature imitates the Creator's acts of dominion:[110] God subdued and ruled (Days 1–3) … humans are to subdue and rule; God created and filled (Days 4–6) … humans are to procreate and fill;[111] God spoke … Adam spoke in naming the animals.[112] The human task of ruling and filling is a continuation of the creative life-giving acts of God. The representative-imitative mission of humanity moves the narrative towards consummation, until the earth is 'subdued' under the kingly rule of God and 'filled' with the

---

[109] Middleton, *The Liberating Image*, 27, 50; Hamilton, *Genesis*, 138; Waltke, *Genesis*, 66; Blocher, *In the Beginning*, 90; Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty*, 59; von Rad, *Genesis*, 59–60.

[110] Middleton, *The Liberating Image*, 59–60. Middleton poses an insightful question: 'One way … to focus our question about whether the image refers to rule is to ask whether God, in whose image humanity is created, is portrayed as a ruler in the Genesis 1 creation story'; *The Liberating Image*, 60. But note that while rulership seems to be the primary activity of God in Genesis 1, it entails other kinds of associated activities such as speech, separating/ordering, interpersonal address, blessing and commissioning. A multifaceted view of 'dominion' is needed.

Horton confirms that 'Intrinsic to humanness, particularly the *imago*, is a covenantal office or commission into which every person is born; … The covenant of creation renders every person a dignified and therefore accountable image-bearer of God'; Horton, *Lord and Servant*, 94.

[111] Gen 1:26–28; Paul Niskanen, 'The Poetics of Adam: The Creation of אדם in the Image of אלהים', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128.3 (2009): 432–3. Niskanen also points out the connection with Gen 4:1 and 5:1–3 – Eve creates new life with God's help, and Adam begets new life in his likeness, according to his image; p. 431. Ruling (ordering) and filling (with life) may also correspond to the activities of the Word and the Spirit respectively; cf. Ps 33:6. The Word gives form while the Spirit gives life; cf. Moltmann, *Spirit of Life*, 41–2. We should add that 'Adam' refers to humankind in Gen 1, but becomes a proper name in Gen 2.

[112] Gen 2:19–20; Beale, *NTBT*, 776–7. Beale argues that the divine rest entails a mandate for human observance of Sabbath rest. On this also see Waltke, *Genesis*, 67; Walter Brueggemann, *Genesis* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982), 36. On procreation as imitation of creation, see Blocher, *In the Beginning*, 93.

glory of God.[113] Human dominion is an extension of the kingdom of God in the world. This suggests that the Irenaean idea of progress towards an eschatological goal has been sown into the creation narrative, already present before the fall: a prelapsarian eschatology.

This representative mission, along with the covenant relationship it presupposes, forms the core of the human identity in the divine drama. Balthasar insightfully coupled mission with relation as co-constitutive of personhood.[114] Covenantal relationship and mission are distinct, yet integrated and properly belonging together: we are relational-missional beings. Mission, or sending, requires a sender, a sent one and a relationship between the two. Therefore, to be sent is to serve another in the execution of a task. This is reflected in the biblical pattern of covenants, which usually entails mission. God's covenant with Noah repeats both the blessing and the mission originally given to humankind.[115] Abram's blessing includes the promise of multiplication, along with an implicit mission to extend blessing to the nations. Israel's deliverance from Egypt is accompanied by the commission to take possession of the land of Canaan. God's address to Jeremiah indicates that he was covenantally known, consecrated and appointed to prophetic office. Similarly, there is a mission in the creation drama that moves the plot forward: 'Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it, and have dominion'.[116]

---

[113] Beale, *Temple*, 82,86, 93. Cf. Rev 13:14–15, in which an 'image of the beast' is endowed with 'breath' in order to speak and act on behalf of the beast; see sect. 4.1.4.2 below.

[114] Balthasar, *TD* 1:481–643; *TD* 3:230–59; *TD* 4:62; also *TD* 3:154–7. My proposal differs from Balthasar's in two respects. First, Balthasar frames his discussions of mission and personhood in terms of participation in Christ's 'personality' (*sic.*) and mission; *TD* 3:248–9. Although I would ultimately construe the *imago Dei* Christologically, my concern here is with the OT context. Second, Balthasar views personhood sometimes as universal and unconditional (3:231) and at other times as individual and conditional (3:263). I am concerned with defining a human vocation that is universal and unconditional, but the fulfilment of which is conditional.

[115] Gen 9:1–2. Dominion is implicit in v. 2.

[116] Gen 12:1–3; Jer 1:5; Gen 1:28. The verb 'to know' (Heb. ידע) is used frequently to designate both intimate relation and covenant (e.g. Gen 4:1, 17; Exod 6:7; Jer 9:6, 24; Amos 3:2). One could also cite the baptism of

Contrary to those who assert that dominion is merely a *consequence* of being created in God's image,[117] Middleton points out that the syntax of Genesis 1:26 indicates that 'rule' is the intended *purpose* of the *imago Dei*. 'A Hebrew jussive with unconverted *wāw* (*wĕyirdû*, and let them rule) that follows a cohortative (*naʿăśeh*, let us make) always expresses the intention or aim of the first-person perspective (singular or plural) represented by the cohortative. The syntax, in other words, points to "rule" as the *purpose*, not simply the consequence … of the *imago Dei*'.[118] Note also that the dominant categories in the creation account are purpose and function rather than ontology. Purpose is attached to the creation of humankind as well as the creation of luminaries.[119] While it should not be supposed that the ancient Hebrew authors were unable to think in abstract terms, both the immediate text of Genesis 1–2 and the broader Hebrew canon reveals an overriding concern for concrete actions as opposed to abstract attributes. This is analogous to Gunton's argument for the priority of divine action over divine being as the mode of God's self-revelation, and as the preferred mode of discourse about God.[120] Yahweh is described not as the omnipotent first cause but the God 'who brought [Israel] out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery'.[121] Similarly, Yahweh's self-revelation to Moses on Mount Sinai emphasises divine action and covenantal relation as the

Jesus (Matt 3:13–17; Mark 1:9–11; Luke 3:21–22; John 1:32–34) and later statements regarding the church (1 Pet 2:9–10; 2 Cor 5:17–21; Eph 2:8–10).

[117] E.g. von Rad, *Genesis*, 59; Childs, *Biblical Theology*, 568.

[118] Middleton, *The Liberating Image*, 53; italics original. But note that some commentators use these terms loosely, equating 'purpose' with 'consequence'; e.g. Blocher, *In the Beginning*, 90.

[119] Gen 1:14–18, 26, 28; 2:5, 15; Elmer A. Martens, *God's Design: A Focus on Old Testament Theology*, Second Edition (Grand Rapids: Baker; Leicester: Apollos, 1994), 31; also Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 156.

[120] Colin E. Gunton, *Act and Being* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 112–3; also Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 145.

[121] Exod 20:2.

form and basis for human knowledge of God.[122] A functional reading of Genesis 1:26 is consistent with this action orientation and is amenable to the form of theodrama.

4.1.4.1 The Content of the Mission

In ANE cultures, images of various kinds were used to represent both gods and kings. Assyrian kings set up their statues in the territories they conquered in order to represent their sovereignty. They also set up statues of themselves in temples to represent them in making supplication to their deity.[123] In both Egypt and Mesopotamia, the king is referred to as the image of God, meaning that he is the representative of the god in question.[124] It is widely believed that the Genesis account uses royal language to designate humankind as the representative ruler of God in creation.[125] Hamilton observes that even the mention of dust in Genesis 2:7 complies with the theme of royalty, since the notion of being 'raised from the dust' can refer to an elevation from poverty and death to royal office and life.[126] This, in combination with the ANE use of the 'image of god' to designate royalty and the mandate to rule in 1:28 strongly suggest that the primary function of these texts is to designate humankind as divinely appointed kings of creation.

---

[122] Exod 34:6–7.
[123] Clines, 83. See the previous discussion on the inscription from Tell Fakhariyah.
[124] Clines, 83–85; Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, 3:181.
[125] Middleton, *The Liberating Image*, 121; also pp. 60, 145; Von Rad, *Genesis*, 60; Hamilton, *Genesis*, 135, 138; Van Leeuwen, 645; Gordon J. Wenham, *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1–15* (Waco: Word, 1987), 31–32; Clines 93; Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom*, 163. Middleton goes on to criticise Westermann, whose prior construct of priestly theology would not allow him to consider this interpretation; Middleton, *Liberating Image*, 121–2.
[126] 1 Kgs 16:2; 1 Sam 2:8; Ps 113:7–8; cf. Isa 26:19; Dan 12:2; Hamilton, *Genesis*, 158.

Genesis 1 depicts the creation of the world as an act of deliverance from the primeval chaos, foreshadowing Israel's exodus from Egypt.[127] God is portrayed as deliverer and ruler, who gives the land as a covenantal provision for his subjects. Humankind is placed in this land as a vice-regent to represent God's dominion and to extend his rule by subduing and filling the earth in a manner similar to Israel's task of conquering (subduing) and settling in (filling) the promised land. The violent language of Genesis 1:26–28 (רדה, 'rule'; כבש, 'subdue') reflects the underlying Exodus-conquest narrative, and points to the human mission to extend the rule of God by imitating his acts. But two features of the narrative mitigate the violent connotations of the terms. First, although the Genesis 1 creation account makes use of language from the violent narratives of its ANE counterparts, its own narrative is devoid of violence. Indeed, the kingly actions of God in the text are creative and life-giving.[128] Elsewhere in the Bible, the reign of God constitutes good news for his people because it furnishes deliverance from enemies as well as blessing and peace.[129] According to Stephen Dempster, the terms רדה and כבש indicate a human dominion that reflects the divine rule and extends divine blessing. It also points to an eschatological messianic king who will defeat all

---

[127] The traditional ascription of the Pentateuch to Mosaic authorship would make this link natural and obvious. But even with a later date for the document, the Exodus is well established as the foundational narrative for Israel's national identity. The connection between the creation event and the exodus (and later, the return from the exile) is further reinforced in the Psalms and later OT; e.g. Ps 74:12–17, 89:10; Isa 27:1; 51:9–10; Job 9; cf. Gen 1:2, 6–7. Against the background of ANE cosmogonies, e.g. The *Enuma Elish*, in which creation results from a conflict between the divine creator and the primordial sea serpent (symbolising the destructive chaotic forces of the sea), the creation account in Genesis depicts a sovereign God who creates by command. The conflict has been removed to highlight God's absolute sovereignty in Israel's worldview-transforming narrative. But the language of ANE cosmogonies are retained to bring out the contrast: e.g. darkness and light, the spirit hovers over the waters/deep, God divides the waters to create the sky (cutting of the serpent and use of his carcass for the firmament), the sun, moon and stars as God's appointed rulers (and sacred objects).
[128] See Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 36–7.
[129] E.g. Isa 52:7–10; Matt 10:7–8.

enemies and rule from the right hand of God.[130] Walton suggests that the mission includes extending the garden, and thereby extending both food supply and sacred space, by subduing and ruling.[131] It is a rule that extends God's kingdom of blessing and rest. Second, the mission to 'rule' and 'subdue' is elaborated in Genesis 2:15, in which the role of the human creature is to 'work' (עבד, 'serve') and to 'keep' (שמר, 'watch, guard') the garden.[132] 'Dominion' in the creation narrative, far from giving licence to exploit the earth, is a conferral of stewardship, a commission to serve the garden by cultivating it and to protect the garden from intruders.[133] Nevertheless, it may be better to speak of mediating God's creative, life-giving providential care for the world.[134]

Although I have previously discussed Genesis 5:1–3 in regard to the relational aspect of the *imago Dei*, the text is also relevant to the human mission. Dempster outlines the similarities between the genealogy in Genesis 5 and the *Sumerian King List*, which confirm a royal interpretation of the *imago Dei*.[135] Sons in the ANE were a means by which the parents could

---

[130] Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty*, 59–62.

[131] Walton, *Genesis*, 186. If we were taking a scientific approach to this material, this could be used as a biblical comment on the fossil evidence of pre-human animal violence and the gradual domestication of the world after the advent of the human race. Such a reading shares with my interpretation the idea that a righteous 'subduing' of that which is destructive can foster life and peace.

[132] Beale, *Temple*, 84; Walton, *Genesis*, 174. In Num 32:22, the term כבש is used for the conquest of Canaan. Although it certainly entails violence, note that the conquest effectively delivered the land from the sins of the Canaanites, extending Yahweh's kingdom and restoring rest; Beale, *Temple*, 114; N.T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991), 23. Dempster views Gen 2 as a commentary and further development of the task of dominion and the sexual differentiation of humankind in Gen 1; Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty*, 64–6.

[133] Beale, *Temple*, 85. Regarding the popular claim that Genesis 1 is responsible for the ecological crisis, see Middleton, *The Liberating Image*, 272–3. Note also that whatever meaning or definition one attaches to creation 'in the image of God', the human mission to 'rule' is inextricable from this and other related texts, e.g. Ps 8.

[134] Both Blocher and Dempster describe Adam's role as a priest-king in the temple, noting that the king acts as mediator of blessing for his country; Blocher, *In the Beginning*, 90; Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty*, 62; also Beale, *NTBT*, 32–3; Beale, *Temple*, 66–70.

[135] Middleton, *Liberating Image*, 133.

live on through their posterity. 'Because he was an extension of the family, a son could bring either honor or shame to his parents'.[136] This representative function is further confirmed by the designation of the genealogy as the 'generations [תולדות] of Adam', which according to Dempster speaks of representation through progeny.[137] Dempster understands the passage as the transmission of the image to Adam's descendants in order to extend human dominion, which reflects divine rule, throughout the earth.[138] Human reproduction, as a fulfilment of the command to 'be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth', serves to propagate the image as an extension of the divine kingdom.

4.1.4.2 The Relational Mission

A helpful complement to the notion of kingdom mediation can be found in Barth's covenant anthropology, which contains a subtle missional component, albeit complicated by his insistence on approaching anthropology through Christology. Jesus' humanity consists exclusively in his being the 'man for others', by which is meant his mission to save humanity.[139] But in moving from Christology to anthropology, Barth diminishes the missional element. This is due to the fact that Jesus' role as Saviour and Deliverer is unique.[140] He reduces the essence of humanity in general to 'a being *with* the other', by which he indicates a

---

[136] Prov. 10:1; 15:20; 17:25; etc.; L. D. Hawk, 'Son', *ISBE*, 4:570.
[137] Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty*, 55, 63.
[138] Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty*, 58–62; 'for the kingdom needs a king, the dominion a dynasty', p. 62.
[139] Barth, *CD* III/2, 208–9. He writes, 'Other men are the object of the saving work *in the accomplishment of which He Himself exists*'; p. 208, italics mine; also, 'It is to them that the Word and grace of God apply, and therefore His mission, which is not laid upon Him, or added to His human reality, but *to which He exclusively owes His human reality* as He breathes and lives—the will of God which it is His meat to do … He is sent and ordained by God to be their Deliverer. … For whatever else the humanity of Jesus may be, can be reduced to this denominator and find here its key and explanation'; p. 209. This mission-driven definition of Jesus' humanity suggests a postlapsarian Christology, in which the incarnation is the divine response to sin. But see Edwin Chr. van Driel, *Incarnation Anyway: Arguments for Supralapsarian Christology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), chaps. 4–5.
[140] Barth, *CD* III/2, 222.

reciprocity not found in Jesus' relation with humanity.[141] He goes on to explicate this idea in almost exclusively relational terms. But a trace of a human mission can be found in his elaboration of 'being in encounter'. Humankind is by nature dependent on the help of others, and as we call for assistance, we 'summon each other to action' and 'render mutual assistance in the act of being'.[142] Our relational engagement with one another is an affirmation of the humanity of the other, offering the human contact we all need, the contact that humanises and enriches us.[143] In human relationships there can be a self-giving that benefits the other. For Barth, the human mission is relational in content.

This missional element of Barth's ontology we can certainly retrieve and incorporate into our construal of mission. The human mission, besides exercising dominion over the world, also includes a vocation to encounter other human beings in ways that extend blessing and promote life. The early chapters of Genesis provide no explicit statement of such a mission. But the stated reason for creating the woman was that she should be a 'helper'. This could mean that she is to help the man in his stewardship of the garden. But the descriptions of intimate relationship in Genesis 2:24–25 and of the relational consequences of sin in 3:16 suggest a significant relational element in the woman's mission as a 'helper'.[144] We can also reasonably infer that there is a mutuality in the relationship both from these same texts and from the positive depictions of marriage later in the canon.[145] In the account of Cain's murder of Abel, we can discern an inherent mutual responsibility that is at once implied by God's

---

[141] Barth, *CD* III/2, 243.
[142] Barth, *CD* III/2, 260–1.
[143] Barth, *CD* III/2, 251, 253–6.
[144] The term 'helper' (עזר) need not imply subordination or inferiority, since it is elsewhere applied to God; e.g. Pss 10:14; 30:10; 54:4; cf. Gen 49:25; Exod 18:4.
[145] E.g. Eph 5:22–33.

question to Cain and denied by Cain's response.[146] Against the mission to humanise one

another, Cain's envy and murder constitute an ultimate denial of Abel's personhood. The

command to love one's neighbour as oneself summarises the human mission to impart

blessing and life to one another. Christ in his love and service exemplifies and fulfils this

mission, which is to be continued by the Christian community.[147] The reference to the renewal

of the image in Colossians 3:10 takes place in the context of Paul's exhortations regarding

such community relationships, which manifest the 'new self' and are pattern after the

resurrection life of Christ. Christians are called to 'put on love' and to address one another

wisely with the 'word of Christ', repudiating false forms of mutual address.[148]

4.1.5 The Spirit and the Image

Closely linked with the preceding covenantal components of sonship, shaping and sending is

the idea that the image is constituted by the indwelling divine Spirit. We have already seen

this association in Irenaeus, but can further support it with reference to ANE and canonical

sources. According to Ian Hart and David Clines, ANE statues of gods were believed to be

inhabited by the spirits of the particular gods they represent.[149] Regardless of a statue's

physical form, its possession of the divine spirit qualifies the image as a representative which

mediates the presence of the deity.[150] Thus the idols were ridiculed by Israel's prophets as

having no breath (רוח, spirit) in them.[151] In contrast, Adam is given the divine breath of life

---

[146] Gen 4:9; note the use of השמר ('keeper'); cf. Gen 2:15.

[147] Lev 19:18; Matt 22:39; Mark 10:43–45; John 15:12–13. Also compare his role as 'the good shepherd' (John 10:10–11) with the mission to 'serve' and to 'keep' (Gen 2:15).

[148] Col 3:1–4; 14–16; 8–9 respectively.

[149] I. Hart, 'Genesis 1:1–2:3 As a Prologue to the Book of Genesis', *TynBul* 46 (1995): 318; Clines, 'The Image of God in Man', 81; Waltke, *Genesis*, 66.

[150] Clines, 'The Image of God in Man', 82.

[151] Hab 2:19; Jer 10:14; 51:17; Clines, 'The Image of God in Man', 81.

(נשמה).[152] Blocher affirms that 'The gift of the *nəšāmâ* acts as an equivalent to the formula "in the image of God"'.[153] Hamilton notes that while רוח appears nearly 500 times in the OT and is applied to God, humans, animals, and false gods, נשמה is used only 25 times and is reserved for application to Yahweh and humans, 'except in the oblique reference in 7:22'.[154] Matthews gives more weight to 7:22, stating that human and animal life both possess the 'breath of life'. Yet he cites the 'language of "image" (1:26–27)' and 'the metaphor of a shared "breath"' as markers of the unique correspondence between humanity and its maker.[155]

Although the text of Genesis 2:7 uses נשמה rather than רוח, I would argue that the parallel use of the two terms in Isaiah and Job strongly suggest a semantic overlap.[156] Studebaker also argues for the identifying the 'Spirit' in Genesis 1:2 as the Holy Spirit, as well as associating 'breath' in Genesis 2:7 with spirit in Ecclesiastes 12:7 and Ezekiel 37:9. Ezekiel 37:14 identifies it as the Spirit of Yahweh.[157] Matthews affirms the parallel between Genesis 2:7 and Ezekiel 37:9–14, in which רוח is substituted for נשמת חיים.[158] We also find the parallel use of 'breath' and 'spirit' in Isaiah 42:5, which is pertinent because the reference is to creation.

---

[152] Gen 2:7; also see Middleton, *Liberating Image*, 127–9, regarding Gen 2 and the Mesopotamian mouth-opening ritual for consecrating cult statues.

[153] Blocher, *In the Beginning*, 87; transliteration in the original.

[154] Hamilton, *Genesis*, 159.

[155] Kenneth A. Matthews, *Genesis 1–11:26*, vol. 1a, New American Commentary (Nashville: B & H, 1996), 196–7.

[156] E.g. Isa 57:16; Job 32:8; 33:4; 34:14. Matthews both makes a distinction between the terms and notes that they are '*at times*' used synonymously. He also makes a connection between the image and the breath of life, lending some support to the thesis that the divine breath could be a marker of the image; Matthews, *Genesis,* 196, 198. Also Stephenson, *Dismantling the Dualisms*, 121.

[157] Steven M. Studebaker, *From Pentecost to the Triune God: A Pentecostal Trinitarian Theology* (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2012), 58–59; cf. Hamilton, *Genesis*, 114, 158. See Studebaker, 55–67 for an extended discussion on Gen 1:2 and 2:7.

[158] I.e. 'spirit' for 'breath of life'; Matthews, *Genesis*, 197.

These considerations suggest that God's Holy Spirit is the divine gift of life, which creates

and constitutes humans as the *imago Dei*, enabling them to fulfil their role as embodied

mediators of God's kingdom.[159]

This proposal is also confirmed by the association of the glory motif with the image and the

Spirit. Psalm 8 clearly alludes to Genesis 1, but the reference to the image is replaced with

'glory and honour'.[160] This association is prominent in Calvin, who held that the entire world

is God's image, a mirror through which the glory and attributes of God are displayed for all to

see. 'The world was no doubt made, that it might be the theatre of the divine glory'.[161] In his

commentary on Psalm 8, Calvin declares that humankind 'is the brightest mirror in which we

can behold his glory'.[162] Calvin's legacy is reflected in the Westminster Shorter Catechism:

'Man's chief end is to glorify God, and to enjoy him forever'.[163] Torrance follows Calvin in

affirming that the purpose of the image of God was to '[reflect] the glory of God in a life of

obedient thankfulness'.[164] According to Beale, Psalm 8 'indicates that the ultimate goal of

---

[159] Cf. Irenaeus, for whom the indwelling Spirit renders humans the image and likeness of God. *AH* 5.6.1; cf. 5.8.1; Steenberg, *Of God and Man*, 53.
For the association of the Spirit with the kingdom also see Gregory of Nyssa, who names the Holy Spirit as the kingdom anointing upon Christ the King; *On the Holy Spirit*, *NPNF* 2–05:321. Irenaeus distinguishes between the 'breath of life', which animates humans, and the 'vivifying Spirit, which makes one 'spiritual'; *AH* 5.12.2; also Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 2.9. But Irenaeus appeals to Isa 42:5 and 57:16, in which they are likely synonymous. The conceptual distinction can be made in terms of different modes of the Spirit's activity in the human. See sect. 7.3.1.
Also compare Rev 13:14–15, and see my comment in n. 112 above.
[160] Ps 8:5–8; cf. 1 Cor 11:7. Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, '1 Corinthians', in *New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. Beale and Carson, 733.
[161] John Calvin, Heb 11:3, in *Calvin's Commentaries* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979), 22:266.
[162] Calvin, *Commentary on Psalms – Volume 1*, trans. James Anderson (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1845; PDF ebook; Grand Rapids: CCEL; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom08.html; accessed 16 June 2014), Ps 8:1, p. 118.
[163] The Westminster Shorter Catechism, Q1 A1.
[164] Thomas F. Torrance, *Incarnation: The Person and Life of Christ*, ed. Robert T. Walker (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2008), 115.

humanity' as God's image was to 'fill the whole earth with God's glory'.[165] Regarding

Israel's role as 'God's firstborn son', Dempster remarks, 'Through obedience to the "Father",

the divine nature is to be displayed to the world'.[166] Here we see that conformity to the

covenantal way of life manifests God's glory, and is closely related to Israel's sonship and

representative function. Likewise, as the *imago Dei* is conformed to the God of the covenant,

it is able to manifest his glory and extend his kingdom in the world.[167] Note as well that glory

is a covenantal theme. God's glory dwells with Israel as a sign of his covenant presence and

promise of deliverance.[168] As the covenant beneficiary, Israel was commissioned to declare

God's glory among the nations.[169]

The association of glory with the image becomes more pronounced in the NT.[170] Beale

testifies that '"glory" and "image" are virtually synonymous in [both 1 Cor 11:7 and 2 Cor

3:18]'.[171] These twin themes are also associated with that of the Spirit. In the OT the Shekinah

glory that dwells first in the tabernacle and later in the temple is the sign of Yahweh's

presence with his covenant people. But in the NT, this is largely replaced by the Spirit.

According to Paul, the new covenant people of God is a holy temple in which the Spirit

dwells.[172] Isaiah 63:9–14 and Haggai 2:5 identify the saving presence of God as his 'Holy

Spirit', an identification Paul confirms in Ephesians 4:30 in the context of the ethical re-

---

[165] Beale, *Temple*, 86. Dempster also affirms Ps 8 as an exposition of Gen 1. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty*, 60.
[166] Dempster, Dominion and Dynasty, 59.
[167] Beale, *NTBT*, 32, 36; Middleton, *Liberating Image*, 108–11.
[168] E.g. Exod 3:1–10; 13:21, 22; 14:24; 24:16; 40:34–38; 1 Kgs 8:10–11; Ezek 43:2–5.
[169] E.g. 1 Chr 16:24; Ps 96:3; Isa 66:18–19.
[170] 1 Cor 11:7; 2 Cor 3:18; 4:4–6; Rom 8:29–30; cf. vv. 17–19; Col 3:10ff; cf. 1:15, 27. Also see Beale, *NTBT*, 455–7. These NT developments will be treated in a later chapter.
[171] Beale, *NTBT*, 455.
[172] Eph 2:21–22; 1 Cor 3:16–17; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16.

creation of the church 'according to God'.[173] The Spirit is the seal of eschatological glory as

well as the Spirit of adoption, a theme Paul closely associates with the hope of glory.[174] The

Gospel of John also links the OT Shekinah glory with the Spirit. Christ is identified with the

tabernacle as well as the temple, and is the revelation of God's glory. But it is the Holy Spirit

that first descends and rests upon him, then indwells his disciples.[175] Moltmann interprets the

descent of the Spirit upon Jesus as God's *Shekinah*.[176] John 20:22 switches the metaphor to

the creation of Adam in Genesis 2:7, in which the Spirit is now the divine breath that recreates

them as the new humanity.[177] The role of the Spirit is to 'glorify [the Son], for he will take

what is [his] and declare it to [his disciples]'.[178] The title of 'Helper' (παράκλητος, 'advocate')

also suggests the covenant presence of God. The Spirit is the empowering presence of God

who both reveals and saves, just as Christ is the salvific revelation of God.[179] 2 Corinthians

3:17–18 provides a summary of the thematic triad of glory, image and Spirit. Perhaps we can

clarify the relationships by suggesting that as the Spirit recreates believers in the image of

Christ he becomes God's saving glory in them and manifests God's glory through them. We

---

[173] Gk. κατὰ θεόν; Eph 4:23–24; Gordon D. Fee, *To What End Exegesis?: Essays Textual, Exegetical, and Theological* (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans; Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 2001), 264–5. Moltmann notes the OT identification of רוח and 'Holy Spirit' with the Shekinah, but denies that the OT use of 'Holy Spirit' should be simply identified with 'the Holy Spirit' of Christian theology; Moltmann, *Spirit of Life*, 47. He considers the Shekinah to be the earthly presence of God, 'at once identical with God and distinct from him'; p. 48. While this may be true from the perspective of OT exegesis, the identification of Shekinah with the Holy Spirit has certainly been made in the NT; e.g. 1 Cor 6:19; Eph 2:21–22; Acts 2:3–4.

[174] Eph 1:13–14; 2 Cor 1:21–22; Rom 8:15–23.

[175] John 1:14, 18; 2:19–21; 1:32–34; cf. 19:30; 14:17; 20:22. Note that 'dwelt' (Gk. σκηνόω, lit. 'tented') in 1:14 is the verbal cognate of 'tabernacle'. 'Shekinah' is derived from the Heb. שכן (to dwell), from which משכן (tabernacle) is also derived.

[176] Moltmann, The Spirit of Life, 61.

[177] For the association of spirit with image in the ANE, see sect. 4.1.4.2 and the sources listed there. Also Douglas Farrow, *Ascension and Ecclesia: On the Significance of the Doctrine of the Ascension for Ecclesiology and Christian Cosmology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 59–60, who cites Irenaeus, *AH* 5.6.1.

[178] John 16:13–14; cf. 14:26; 15:26.

[179] 2 Cor 3–5. I am indebted to Gordon Fee for the term and concept of God's empowering presence; Gordon D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994).

shall return to some of these texts and themes in subsequent chapters. But for now they help to confirm the association of the themes of glory, breath and Spirit with those of image, covenant and sonship.[180] The indwelling Spirit gives life to the human image, bringing the creature into filial relationship, conforming them to the righteousness of God, and enabling the actors to fulfil their divinely appointed role. It is the Spirit's mission to mediate the sonship, the shaping and the sending of the *imago Dei*.[181]

4.1.6 Implicit Ontology

Although the creation story gives priority to the human mission, there is nevertheless an implicit ontological element.[182] A purposeful creation presupposes a fitting ontology that makes the human mission possible. The inherent connection between the functional and ontological aspects have been observed by Walton and Beale, both of whom give emphasis to the functional.[183] This is analogous to the relationship Barth outlines between creation as the external basis (i.e. presupposition and preparation) of the covenant, and covenant as the internal basis (i.e. purpose and meaning) of creation. He states, 'The creature does not [merely] exist causally … but exists meaningfully. … It realises a purpose and plan and order. … The act of creation as such is the revelation of the glory of God by which He gives to the creature meaning and necessity'.[184] The question of ontology addresses the nature of our being—the *what*, while the question of covenantal relation and mission addresses the meaning of our being—the *why*. The two are related, yet distinct. In a theodramatic context, human

---

[180] Kline posits that humankind was created in the likeness of the 'Glory-Spirit'; Kline, *Images of the Spirit*, 20–1. Also Horton, *Lord and Servant*, 108. Also consider Rom 8:14–30.
[181] See subsequent chapters, particularly chaps. 6 and 7, for further support and application.
[182] Cf. Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology*, 182–7.
[183] Walton, *Genesis*, 131; Beale, *Temple*, 83.
[184] Barth, *CD* III/1, 229–30.

purpose and meaning is found in our role as the *imago Dei*. But there is a human ontology

that corresponds to and serves that end.

In this respect Jenson provides a contrasting perspective to my own. In rejecting the impulse

to locate the *imago Dei* in the structural constitution of humans, he severs the connection

between the two. He appeals to the psalmist's question, 'What are humans that you are

mindful of them?'[185] and concludes that 'humanity's coronation to "dominion over the works

of your hands" appears in the psalm as a gift not predictable from a survey of humanity's

characteristics'.[186] In fact, he suggests that particular communicative capacities, while

presupposed, constitute neither human uniqueness nor human nature.[187] Rather, it is 'strictly'

the divine address that renders us morally responsible participants in conversation and thereby

'creates' us as human.[188] Jenson's reading of Psalm 8 appears to place capacities logically

before election, as if human constitution were an accidental product of evolution and election

were an afterthought.[189] It seems more coherent with the creation narrative to give logical

priority to purpose over ontology.[190] God designs and creates human nature to suit his prior

purpose for humankind. Psalm 8:4 is better read as referring to the material smallness of

---

[185] Ps 8:4, quoted in Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2:55.

[186] Jenson, Systematic Theology, 2:55.

[187] 'That we have the dispositional property of being apt to hear and speak is of course required for the occurrence of this converse but should not be regarded as itself the human specificity—and indeed, who knows how many sorts of things possess it?'; Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2:59.

[188] Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2:58, 63. Jenson's disjunction between capacities and humanness is symptomatic of his purely relational ontology. Note the contrast with Zizioulas. For Zizioulas, personal ontology is located in the uniqueness of the *person* in relation. For Jenson, personal ontology seems to be located in the *relation itself*. See his discussion of human nature in Christological context as well as Vanhoozer's critique of his view of God's ontology; Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 1: 138, 221; Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology*, 184–5.

[189] While I am open to the possibility that evolutionary processes may have occurred, any such occurrences should be understood theistically as part of God's purposeful creative act, lest we fall into deistic or naturalistic thinking.

[190] Gen 1:26.

humans compared to the vastness of the universe, and contrasting it with the dignity-conferring endowment of 'glory and honour'.[191] What is highlighted in Psalm 8 and implied in Genesis 2:7 is that humans attain to their honoured status in creation only by divine gift.

Against Jenson, I contend that particular features such as communicative capacity may be shared with other creatures, yet be an essential defining feature of humanity, as long as humanness entails a *unique combination* of various attributes and roles. For instance, humans apparently share the general attributes of communicative agency with angels and of embodiment with animals. But these attributes take forms particular to the human creature and both are presupposed in our unique identity and role in the world. I want to suggest that dramatic identity and ontological nature are distinct, and *together constitute us as human*. Divine intent and divine calling together confer the identity of *imago Dei* upon the human creature, which identity entails covenantal relationship and mission.[192] Human-defining relationality can be further expanded to include the horizontal dimension.[193] From this set of roles and relationships one can infer the kinds of capacities belonging to human nature.[194] While I agree with Jenson that capacities do not constitute the image, I would suggest that human capacities are nevertheless significant and unique, since such structural uniqueness fittingly corresponds to the unique identity and role assigned to humankind. Being human entails *both* our God-given structural make-up *and* our divinely appointed role as *imago Dei*.[195] To separate nature and identity as if he could have created ontologically identical

---

[191] Cf. Gen 2:7; Goldingay, *Psalms*, 159, 161.
[192] Gen 1:26, 28 respectively; cf. Balthasar, *TD* 3:207, 231, 263.
[193] Gen 1:27; 2:18–25.
[194] Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology*, 182, 186.
[195] Cf. Colin Gunton: 'To be in the image of God is at once to be created as a particular kind of being—a person—and to be called to realise a certain destiny. The shape of that destiny is to be found in God-given forms

creatures without conferring the role, or that he could have conferred the role upon an

ontologically different creature, is to lapse into insoluble speculation. We can affirm that the

works of the supremely wise God are 'very good' and that human nature and human identity

together form a perfect complement.[196]

4.1.6.1 Embodied Communicative Agency

Given the close relationship between purpose and ontology, we may raise the question of

what kind of ontology is required for the *imago Dei* role. The answer is that such a role seems

to require creatures who are embodied morally responsible communicative agents,

particularly designed to fulfil their unique role as covenant partners. The covenantal

relationship and accompanying mission to mediate God's speech and actions to the world

implies first that human beings are communicative agents, capable of speaking and acting in

the dramatic context. Vanhoozer declares that 'Communicative agency is the prime mode of

personal existence. To be a person is to be the subject of communicative action'.[197] The

notion of speech-acts, or illocution, shows us that speech and actions are not to be sharply

distinguished from each other. One performs intentional actions through speech, and likewise

communicates through actions.[198] This is true of both divine and human speech-acts, though

the correspondence is to be understood analogically.[199] Divine address initiates human

---

of human community and of human responsibility to the universe'; Gunton, 'Trinity, Ontology and Anthropology', 61.

[196] Gen 1:31.

[197] Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology*, 148; 'Persons have capacities commensurate with name-bearers about whom narratives can be told. Persons can say and do things, call and respond, enter into multifarious moral and communicative relations'; p. 234.

[198] Vanhoozer, *Drama of Doctrine*, 44, 63, 65; J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962, 1975, Oxford Scholarship Online, October 2011, doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198245537.001.0001), 4–6.

[199] Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology*, 149.

communicative agency, so that all human communicative action is a response to God.[200] Such

communicative action is evident in the Genesis creation accounts as Adam is seen naming

both the animals and the woman and given the task of serving and keeping the garden.[201]

While the illocutionary nature of the act of *naming* is transparent, that of serving and keeping

the garden is less so. Yet the temptation narrative of Genesis 3 is clearly dialogical. Eve's

failure to communicate resistance and Adam's failure to speak God's prohibition, along with

their eating of the fruit, communicated disregard for God's command not to eat, God's charge

to protect and God's creation itself. By contrast, the bruising of the serpent's head by the

woman's offspring would communicate God's sovereign rule and kingdom blessing to all

creation through his ultimate victory over Satan and his kingdom of darkness and death.[202]

Christ's proclamation of the kingdom, followed by that of his disciples, represented a perfect

integration of words and works.[203] Communicative agency is an ontological presupposition

implicit in the relational and missional aspects of the *imago Dei*, and is a requirement for

both.

Second, because human communicative agency is meant to mediate God's kingdom blessing

it is specifically a covenantal agency, which implies a morally significant manner of

communication.[204] While communicative action indicates the *form* of human mediation,

'blessing' indicates the *content* and requires conformity to God's will and character. Being a

---

[200] Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2:58–9; also Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology*, 318–9. This is a critical affirmation of Jenson's proposal of creation by divine calling that is supported by my previous reading of Gen 2:7. Note that my critique of Jenson above concerns not the notion of creation by calling, but his separation of election from human capacity.
[201] Gen 2:19–20, 23; 2:15; cf. 1:28.
[202] Gen 3:1–6, 17; cf. 2:15–17; 3:15; cf. Luke 11:20; Rev 12; 20:2–3, 10; Rev 21–22.
[203] Matt 4:23; 10:7–8; Acts 1:1, 3.
[204] Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology*, 231, 234.

recipient of divine address, especially in the form of command, renders human persons responsible before God.[205] And the content of audible and visible human response to God may be aptly described as 'prayer' and 'sacrifice'.[206] The criteria for faithful prayer and sacrifice is that they be Spirit-shaped covenantal speech and action.

Third, the *imago Dei* mission to mediate the divine kingdom requires that human beings be embodied creatures. Irenaeus, in his polemic against the Gnostics, stressed that the body is essential to the human person as the image-bearer.[207] As the image of God, humankind is called to be the embodied representative of the non-embodied God, mediating his providential care for the physical world. The serving and keeping of a physical garden seems to require an equally physical gardener. We have learned from our study of the terminology that 'image' implies visibility and physicality. Images of gods and kings in the ANE usually consist of a concrete statue or figure.[208] It is precisely because the gods are not visibly present that there is a need for a physical representation. But in contrast to mute and passive idols, humans are living, Spirit-bearing embodied images capable not only of representing God's presence and authority, but also of speaking and acting on his behalf in the physical realm. The combination of embodiment and communicative agency is essential to God's design for human nature and function.[209] Beyond the functional role, the relational aspect of the *imago*

---

[205] E.g. Gen 2:16–17. Brunner, *Man in Revolt*, 57–58, 97; McFadyen, *Call to Personhood*, 22; Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 58.

[206] Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 58–60. Jenson describes all human responses as 'prayer'. be they appropriate or perverse.

[207] Irenaeus, *AH* 5.6.1; cf. Frederick G. McLeod, *The Image of God in the Antiochene Tradition* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1999), 51, 65–8.

[208] Von Rad, *Genesis*, 57–8; Middleton, *The Liberating Image*, 25.

[209] Irenaeus affirmed that body, soul and the Spirit of God are essential components of the image and likeness of God; *AH* 5.6.1.

Dei also demands embodied communicative agency.[210] Being mindful of Colin Gunton's caution that locating the image in interpersonal address can potentially minimise our physicality,[211] we can observe with McFadyen that embodiment plays a vital role in human communication.[212] Furthermore, the revelation of divine glory requires embodiment, that humankind be a *visible* image of the invisible God.[213] It is by being 'made flesh' that the Word has 'made [God] known'.[214] Embodied communicative agency is a gift and a vocation to offer one's body as a living sacrifice for the service of God in conformity to his will through the faithful performance of covenantal communicative action. Such embodiment of divine will constitutes the main purpose and destiny of the *imago Dei*.[215]

Fourth, presupposed in responsible communicative action are the structural components of reason and freedom traditionally ascribed to humanity, as well as desire. The long lineage of revered theologians who held to the structural *imago*—from Irenaeus to Thomas Aquinas— testify to the validity of the inference that without the capacity for rational and volitional agency, the human vocation would be unattainable. Their affirmation of the knowledge of

---

[210] Colin Gunton: 'This being in the image of God will embrace both what we have been used to call spiritual and our bodiliness. … Relations are of the whole person, not of minds or bodies alone'; Gunton, 'Trinity, Ontology and Anthropology', 59.

[211] Gunton, *The Triune Creator*, 206.

[212] McFadyen, *Personhood*, 77. Jenson concurs: 'Persons are *embodied* for each other … If you are to address me, you must be able to find me. … There can be no drama without embodiment of the roles'; Jenson, 'Anima Ecclesiastica', *God and Human Dignity*, ed. R. Kendall Soulen & Linda Woodhead (Eerdmans, 2006), 65; also Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 60; Gunton, *Triune Creator*, 206. The development of telecommunications, and particularly the advent of the internet, has certainly made communication possible apart from embodied presence. But to the extent that our communication is disembodied, it potentially becomes less personal and less human.

[213] Cf. Col 1:15. On Christ as the *visible* image, see F. F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 57–8; Grenz, *Social God*, 214.

[214] John 1:14, 18; cf. 2 Cor 3:3, 14–18; 4:10–11. For Irenaeus, the Son reveals the Father by being 'made visible and palpable', Irenaeus, *AH* 4.6.6; also 3.18.7; Bruce, *Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians*, 57–8. Technically, this is not a separate category from the preceding points. Such mediation of divine glory occurs through functional and relational activity. These are all aspects of our communicative role.

[215] Rom 12:1–2, cf. vv. 3–21; Irenaeus, *AH* 5.8.1; Steenberg, *Of God and Man*, 34–5.

God and love for God as part of the image also suggest that righteousness can be analysed as the proper God-intended use of these capacities, of which we are stewards.[216] In this we follow Bonhoeffer in construing the freedom of the *imago Dei* not as a freedom *from*, but a freedom *for* God.[217] We may add that right stewardship of reason and volition, along with other endowments, also includes loving relation to other persons and faithful care of creation.[218] Humans are designed not for mere thinking and willing, but for specifically *covenantal* thinking and willing. But in order for thinking and willing to be teleological, it also implies a structural capacity for desires and longings that motivate human action.[219] The conflict of desires described by Paul between the Spirit and the flesh confirms that humans are not only thinking and willing beings, but also—and perhaps primarily—desiring beings.[220] Indeed, the direction of desire, reflecting the orientation of the heart before God, exerts a determining influence on the manner of one's thought, belief and action. The appeal to human desires in the temptation narrative suggests that they are basic to human nature.[221] Hence the capacities for desire, thought and choice are implied in the *imago Dei* identity.

Before leaving the question of ontology, a comment should be made regarding the legitimacy of communicative agency as an ontological category. One could object that the capacity for communication is merely a function of mental capacity and could be reduced to the latter. But the same could be said of free will along with a host of other 'capacities' that emerge from the

---

[216] Col 3:10; Eph 4:17–18, 23–24; Rom 1:21; 12:2. Also see Irenaeus, *AH* 2.6.1; Augustine, *On the Trinity*, 14.12.15 and my study of these contributors in chap. 3.

[217] Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Creation and Fall*, trans. John C. Fletcher, First English edition (London: SCM Press, 1959), 38.

[218] Cf. Gunton, 'Trinity, Ontology and Anthropology', 59–60.

[219] Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom*, 50–1; Augustine, *Confessions* 1.1.1; Augustine, *Homilies on 1 John* 4.6.

[220] Gal 5:16–17; cf. Rom 7–8. Smith gives primacy to desire or love. 'We are primordially and essentially agents of love, which takes the structure of desire or longing. We are essentially and ultimately desiring animals, which is to say that we are essentially and ultimately lovers. To be human is to love, and it is what we love that defines who we are. Our (ultimate) love is constitutive of our identity'; Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom*, 50–1.

[221] Eph 4:17–19; cf. Jas 1:14–15; 4:1–3; Gen 3:6.

relative complexity of human constitution in comparison to that of animals, whether we explain such complexity in terms of brain structure or the possession of a 'soul'. We can observe that the capacity for communicative agency is not of a different kind from rational or volitional capacities. They all refer not to *substances* as such, but to particular attributes of personal ontology that are expressed in particular kinds of agency. By using the substantival form of a word (e.g. 'reason') we do not promote actions and capacities (e.g. capacity to reason) to the status of a substance. Certainly, both 'communicative agency' and 'rationality' are categories borrowed from particular discourses that attain popularity at various times in history, and we do not necessarily come closer to the truth of the matter by substituting one for the other. But references to 'communicative' action is certainly more prevalent in the Bible than references to 'rational' action, though the latter is not absent. More importantly, theological discourse is inevitably situated in particular contexts, and communicative categories are well suited for our context. Speaking of communicative, moral or relational capacities is therefore a valid form of ontological discourse.

4.1.7 Covenant Failure: The Fall

In transitioning to the next act of the play, we need to address the critical event of the failure of the original *imago Dei*. The narrative of Genesis 3 begins with the figure of the serpent (נחש). The serpent elsewhere appears as the dragon (תנים), Leviathan and Rahab, and is closely associated with the sea, the water and 'the deep' (תהום).[222] A study of the terms in these OT passages strongly suggest that there is an implicit link between the serpent of

---

[222] Isa 27:1; 148:7; Job 41:1; Ps 74:14; Isa 51:9; Ps 89:9–10; Isa 27:1; Job 26:12–13; Ps 89:9–10; Ps 148:7; Isa 51:10; 63:9–14; cf. Gen 1:2.

Genesis 3 and the 'deep' of Genesis 1:2.[223] The serpent represents the chaotic anti-life forces

of the sea, and now appears in the garden in an attempt to usurp God's authority, destroy the

image and undo creation. The serpent, who is identified later in the canon as 'Satan', tempts

Eve by deceiving her with accusations against God.[224] Adam and Eve were given the

privilege of covenant relationship and a mission to represent the kingdom of God. But the plot

is complicated by the misperformance of their divinely appointed role. As vice-regents, part

of their mission was to guard the garden against the serpent, the performance of which would

imitate God's rule over creation and implied subjugation of the darkness and the deep.[225] But

they submitted to the serpent's 'wisdom', and rebelled against their divine king.[226] Instead of

serving and guarding the garden, they served their own desires and acquiesced to the intruder.

Whereas God spoke the prohibition, the man fails to so speak.[227] Instead of mediating life and

blessing they brought death and curses into the land.

The content of the temptation is essentially a distortion of God's command and questioning of

God's character and motives.[228] The shape of the covenant is outlined by the command to

abstain from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and implicitly by the availability of

the tree of life.[229] I suggested earlier that the trees and the prohibition together specify a

---

[223] Childs, *Biblical Theology*, 386–7. Ps 148:7 and Isa 51:9–10 are particularly relevant in associating תהום with the chaotic sea serpent theme.

[224] Rev 12:9; 20:2; cf. Job 1:6. Note that 'satan' (שטן) means accuser or adversary. The three key roles and activities of Satan—deceiver, accuser and tempter—are all present in this narrative.

[225] Gen 1:2–10.

[226] Beale, *NTBT*, 359, 34; Beale, *Temple*, 84–7.

[227] Gen 3:1–6. It is certainly true that the man and the woman are equally image-bearers (Gen 1:27). But the narrative of Gen 2–3, as well as Rom 5, gives emphasis to the role of Adam, who is given the command in Gen 2:16–17 and is called to account first in Gen 3:9–11. Also see C. John Collins, *Genesis 1 – 4: A Linguistic, Literary, and Theological Commentary* (Phillipsburg: P & R Publishing, 2006), 173, 175; Beale, *NTBT*, 358–61.

[228] Collins, *Genesis 1 – 4*, 170.

[229] Gen 2:9, 16–17.

relationship of dependent communion with God as opposed to autonomy. The foundation for such a relationship is trust in God's goodness and wisdom, resulting in obedience. The serpent charges God with unreasonable restraints and false motives, introducing mistrust into the covenant relationship. 'It is noteworthy that the serpent never tells the woman to transgress God's prohibition. He simply calls into question both God's truthfulness (by denying his warning) and God's trustworthiness (by impugning his motives) and leaves the woman to draw her own conclusions'.[230] Consequently, the woman, followed by the man, chose (1) the goodness and desirability of the forbidden fruit over the goodness and desirability of God and his provisions, as well as (2) the 'wisdom' of the serpent and the self over the wisdom of God.[231] Beale observes that Adam's assertion of moral autonomy amounted to self-trust and self-worship, and therefore idolatry.[232] The image-bearers fail to conform to God's covenant righteousness.

The ultimate result of the fall narrative is the fractured covenant relationship. Although the appellation יהוה אלהים is used throughout Genesis 2:4–3:24, the covenantal name, יהוה, is omitted by both the serpent and the woman in their conversation.[233] 'By dropping the covenant name, then, the serpent is probably advancing his program of temptation by diverting the woman's attention from the relationship the Lord had established'.[234] The covenantal command is repudiated and replaced by a non-relational assessment of the benefits of the tree.[235] One may raise the question regarding why God appeared to be absent from the

---

[230] Moberly, 'Did the Serpent Get It Right?', 7; see Gen 3:1–5.
[231] Gen 3:6; cf. 2:9, 17; Prov 3:18; 11:30.
[232] Beale, *NTBT*, 360.
[233] Translated 'The LORD God' and 'the LORD' or 'Yahweh' respectively.
[234] Gen 3:1b-5; Collins, *Genesis 1 – 4*, 171; Moberly, 'Did the Serpent Get It Right?', 6.
[235] Gen 3:6.

scene of temptation. In his theodicy John Hick deemed the religious ambiguity of the world necessary to preserve the freedom of human response to God.[236] But if human action in God's presence is to be considered free, then no such appeal is possible. Abram's belief, occurring in the unambiguous presence of God, was certainly free and therefore commendable.[237] The more important question pertains to why the image-bearers failed to call on God. Having been called into covenantal relationship, a reasonable *imago Dei* response to the appearance of the serpent would be to call upon the God of the covenant. Throughout Genesis, prayer—calling upon the name of Yahweh, and the building of altars are common responses to God, to which may be added the offering of sacrifices.[238] This evokes Jenson's assertion that humans are 'praying animals' and our embodied responses are 'sacrifice'.[239] The entrance of sin into the garden, which was entrusted to the *imago Dei*, is a failure in prayer and sacrifice—a failure of covenantal speech and action—and ultimately a failure of covenant relationship.

4.1.8 Exiled: Status of the Image after the Fall

Prominent in the history of theological anthropological dialogue is the tension found in Scripture regarding the status of the image after the fall. While Genesis 9 unambiguously affirms that the image of God is retained after the fall, the NT presupposes a need for the restoration of humankind 'after the image'.[240] An *imago Dei* anthropology demands an account of the status of the image outside the garden. Particularly important is that such an

---

[236] John Hick, *Evil and the God of Love*, Revised Edition (New York: Harper & Row, 1978), 281–2. Hick writes in the context of philosophy of religion, but his suggestion is pertinent to the present discussion.
[237] Gen 15:1–6.
[238] Altars: Gen 4:26b; 12:7, 8; 13:4, 18; 21:33; 26:25; 33:20; 35:1–7; sacrifices: Gen 4:3–5; 8:20; 22:9, 13. Interestingly, altar-building is more consistently associated with prayer than with sacrifice. But this is inconsequential. Beale suggests that the clause 'calling on the name of the LORD' probably included 'sacrificial offerings and prayer'; Beale, *Temple*, 96.
[239] Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2:59–60.
[240] Col 3:10; Eph 4:24.

account both affirms the value of fallen human beings and acknowledges their fallenness and need for redemption. Proponents of the structural *imago* tend to resolve the issue by identifying the image 'retained' with structural capacities of humans, and the image 'restored' with the proper expression of such capacities.[241] Proponents of the relational *imago* tend to conceive of the image retained as unconditional responsibility before God, and the image restored as proper response and communion with God. In keeping with the theodramatic model of the *imago Dei*, I want to suggest that the image 'retained' is the unconditional appointment to the role as embodied mediators of God's kingdom in the world, while the image 'corrupted' refers to humanity's failure and consequent inability to fulfil that role. What is 'lost' or 'corrupted' is not the image itself but the active fulfilment of the image, along with the moral conformity required for such fulfilment. The image 'fulfilled' is found in Christ's work of redemption, resulting in the image 'restored', which refers to the new humanity recreated in Christ. By stating the issue in terms of an irrevocable covenantal role whose fulfilment is conditional, we can integrate the various canonical references to the image in a coherent manner. John Kilner argues that the image of God has not be lost or damaged. Rather, *human beings* have been damaged and need to be restored. This is because he views the OT image as a 'status' and the NT image as a 'standard'. Although he uses different language, the contrast of status and standard comes close to the contrast in my model between 'vocation' and 'fulfilment'.[242] The advantage of my model is that it articulates the logical relationship between the two.

---

[241] See chap. 3.

[242] Kilner's distinction between status and standard makes good sense of most of the texts, with the possible exception of 1 Cor 11:7, in which Paul identifies 'the man' as the image. Kilner rightly distinguishes between humanity and the image, but also slips into the ambiguous language of humans *being* the image of God: 'man is [or "as"] the image of God'; John F. Kilner, 'Humanity in God's Image: Is the Image Really Damaged?', *JETS* 53.3 (2010): 609, 613. Perhaps we can say that humans possess the status or vocation of *being* (i.e. serving the role as) the image of God.

The postlapsarian status of the image can be elaborated in relation to the three relevant

aspects of the covenant: sonship, shaping, sending. Sonship, the basic covenant relationship

between God and his image, is broken but retained. In being expelled from the garden the

human subjects lose the primary token of God's covenant presence. Yet God continues to be

involved in providing for, protecting and ultimately redeeming his creatures.[243] Shaping, the

moral aspect of the covenant, is clearly corrupted. The subsequent narrative traces the

progress of sin and depravity. But underlying this narrative of depravity was an implicit

criterion of righteousness that reflects the God of the covenant. Yahweh chooses the righteous

as subjects of covenant renewal.[244] He executes judgment in order to restrain evil, and grants

common grace to preserve human society. Sending, the human mission, continues in different

forms. The judgments pronounced upon the woman and the man specify hardships that affect

the practice of childbearing (i.e. 'multiplying'), the marriage relationship, and the working of

the ground (i.e. 'ruling').[245] The basic tasks of human living and mission will continue outside

the garden, but will be encumbered with affliction. The post-flood narrative repeats the

original blessing and commission, and is depicted as a 'new creation' with accompanying

themes of chaotic waters, provision of land and re-emergence of life.[246] But the call of

Abraham marks the beginning of a redemption narrative that finds its fulfilment in Christ.

Closely related to the effects on these covenantal aspects, and indeed overlapping them, is the

---

[243] Gen 3:21; 4:15; 3:15; 12:1–3; cf. Jer 30–31.
[244] Depravity: Gen 4–11; righteousness: Gen 6:8; 9:1; 12:1; 15:6. One could also argue that the choice of Abram was purely by grace, preceding his righteous response of faith. My point is that righteousness, and the faith from which it originates, is a covenant stipulation.
[245] Gen 3:16–19; cf. 1:28; 2:15.
[246] Gen 9:1–7.

impact of this corruption upon the underlying human capacities. This includes both the perversion of human desires and actions, as well as deterioration of human capacities.[247]

In assessing any account of the *imago Dei*, we must ask whether it adequately preserves the sanctity of human life and the dignity of the human person in the postlapsarian situation.[248] Structural views of the *imago Dei* which locate the image in rationality or volitionality are problematic because, although such features are present in a fully functioning person, they can be diminished or absent due to developmental anomaly, disease, or simply developmental stage. Even among fully functioning individuals, these features tend to be present to varying degrees. But it would be contrary to human dignity to conclude that higher intelligence, for instance, confers higher value on one person over another.[249] In the case of volitionality, similar problems arise not only for the incapacitated, but also for those who exhibit compulsive behaviours or significant degrees of acquiescence for whatever reason. Defining the *imago Dei* in these terms can potentially lead to unequal valuation of persons and discriminatory practices.[250] One example of this approach is Millard Erickson, who attempts to circumvent the problem by stating that the image 'refers to something a human *is* rather than something a human *has* or *does*. … It is not dependent upon the presence of anything else'. But he goes on to define the image as 'the elements in the human makeup that enable the fulfilment of human destiny', or 'that are required for these relationships and this function to take place', such as 'intelligence, will, emotions'.[251] Defining the image according to these

---

[247] Cf. Eph 4:17–19; Rom 1:18–32.
[248] Gen 9:6; Jas 3:9.
[249] E.g. Jas 2:1ff; also consider 1 Cor 12:22 in light of 1 Cor 13.
[250] Amos Yong, *Theology and Down Syndrome: Reimaging Disability in Late Modernity* (Waco, Tx: Baylor University Press, 2007), 172; contrary to Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, Second Edition (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998), 532–3.
[251] Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 532–3.

contingent elements that normally functioning humans possess naturally leads to the conclusion that where these elements are lacking, the image is absent.

Sometimes the problem of contingency is also raised against the relational and functional views. It is said that these views make the presence of the image contingent on the actual experience of relationship or the actual exercise of dominion.[252] The problem can be resolved for each of these by means of a dialectic of vocation and fulfilment. For the relational view this entails clarifying that while the human response is conditional, the divine address, or conferral of responsibility, is unconditional.[253] Similarly, the functional view can be vindicated by clarifying that while the performance of representative function is conditional, the appointment to be representatives is unconditional. I have proposed that the *imago Dei* be expanded into a covenantal dramatic identity conferred upon all humanity by God. By virtue of divine intent and appointment the *imago Dei* role is universal and unconditional, while its faithful performance is conditional.

But how does this dramatic identity, comprised of a covenant relationship and representative role, confer value and dignity? I want to argue that by virtue of covenantal sonship and sending, human beings represent God not only actively, but also passively. Given that human persons are sent as God's representatives, it follows that one's treatment of such persons constitutes a response to the God who sent them. In the ANE, images function actively in

---

[252] Erickson, who holds to the structural view raises this objection against both of these views; Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 532. Interestingly, Yong, who holds to a primarily relational view, utilises this critique against both the structural and the functional views; Yong, *Theology and Down Syndrome*, 172–3.
[253] E.g. Brunner, Jenson.

representing rulership and cultic worship, and passively in receiving homage and worship.[254]

We also see the notion of passive representation in Jesus' sending his apostles: 'Whoever receives you receives me, and whoever receives me receives him who sent me'.[255] Consequent to being sent as a kingdom representative is that people's responses to the representative is inseparable from their response to the divine sender. Regarding the needy, Jesus says, 'Truly, I say to you, as you did it to one of the least of these my brothers, you did it to me'. In this case, the notion of representation is universalised to include every needy neighbour, and indeed, to every human being. Jesus claims solidarity with each particular neighbour we encounter.[256] In James, humanity's creation in God's likeness is also the basis for human dignity.[257] Although James does not specify the meaning of being 'made in the likeness of God', it is clear that our treatment of people should be congruent with our treatment of God. I would argue that every human life is sacred, regardless of ability or performance, because it bears the irrevocable mission to be God's embodied representative on earth. The notion of passive representation safeguards human dignity in cases of disability where a person appears unable to 'contribute' to some perceived good. It also provides the foundation for the ethic of love for one's neighbour and ties it organically to the command to love God.[258] Grounding human value and dignity in the divine conferral of the *imago Dei* identity renders it absolutely inviolable.

---

[254] 'To revile the royal image is as treasonable an act as to revile the king himself'; Clines, 83; also von Rad, *Genesis*, 60.
[255] Matt 10:40; also John 13:20.
[256] Matt 25:40; cf. Luke 10:25–37. McFarland, *The Divine Image*, 163–4; cf. Yong, *Theology and Down Syndrome*, 173 and Middleton, *Liberating Image*, 297. Note that both Middleton and Yong speak of solidarity in an active functional sense of exercising dominion. As the above passages demonstrate, passive representation— how the image is treated—is the key issue in human dignity. Also see Exod 4:22; Zech 2:8.
[257] Jas 3:9–10.
[258] Matt 22:37–40 and par.

4.2 Act 2: A Covenantal *Imago Dei* Glory Community

Having outlined the basic shape of the *imago Dei* dramatic role in terms of Spirit-mediated covenantal sonship, shaping and sending, we can now proceed to apply the same structure to subsequent acts and characters. As we proceed to Act 2 of the drama, we discover that *imago Dei* language and the universal anthropological scope recedes into the background, and is replaced by national Israel, beginning with the patriarchal narratives. Although the Bible does not refer to Israel as the *imago Dei*, common motifs that suggest the association are found both in the patriarchal narratives and in the subsequent history of Israel, most prominently in the Exodus. In this section, I want to argue that Abraham and his family assume the role of *imago Dei* in a limited way as a precursor to the Messiah who would ultimately fulfil and perfectly perform the *imago Dei*. After the failure and exile of Adam and Eve, God continues to demonstrate his covenant faithfulness by working to redeem his fallen image and all creation with it. The flood was an act of judgment and purgation that leads to a 'new creation' and a renewed covenant. This is signalled by the wind-water-earth motif, the blessing and commission to 'be fruitful and multiply', the reaffirmation of the image, human dominion over the creatures and the provision of food.[259] But Abraham and Jacob are the key figures leading to the establishment of Israel as God's covenant community. Israel would play the active role of the *imago Dei* in mediating God's revelation and blessing to the nations. But the role is necessarily limited because the *imago Dei* remains the universal human vocation and must not be restricted to Israel. It is in Christ, not in Abraham, that humankind will be

---

[259] Gen 8:1–5; cf. 1:2–10; Gen 9:1, 7; cf. 1:28; Gen 9:6; cf. 1:27; Gen 9:2–3; cf. 1:28; Gen 9:3; cf. 1:29–30; Waltke, *Old Testament Theology*, 296; Beale, *Temple*, 94. This is followed by a Noahic 'fall narrative' resulting in the pronouncement of a curse upon Canaan; Gen 9:20–27.

subsumed under a new corporate head.[260] Israel's role is to testify to Yahweh and to prepare the way for his Messiah.

The call of Abraham and the covenant with Israel is the beginning of God's redemption project.[261] The initial call is set against the milieu of escalating sin and rebellion, culminating in the Tower of Babel and the linguistic chaos that resulted. The defiance and ambition that motivated the building of the tower both reflects the initial transgression that began the cycle of sin and contrasts with the faith and submission of Abraham's response to Yahweh.[262] The call of Abraham unmistakably signals that God's intent is to bless not only the chosen family, but all the nations of the earth. Israel as the elect people would enjoy the blessing of sonship and mediate God's blessing to the world. To be blessed and to mediate blessing is precisely the role of the *imago Dei* in the world. N.T. Wright affirms that in Paul's view, Israel's vocation as the people of God was to be 'the renewed human race' who would embody God's original intent in creating humans in his own image.[263] But the designation of *imago Dei* is not applied to Israel because her assumption of the role is limited to the purpose of restoring humanity. Israel does not *replace* Adam, but is assigned the task of restoring Adam in the image of God, a task that would be accomplished only in Christ as the son of Abraham.[264]

The original blessing and command to 'be fruitful and multiply' now becomes a promise: 'I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you'.[265] Such a command at this point in the

---

[260] Gen 9:6; Rom 5:12–21; 1 Cor 15:48–49.
[261] Wright, *PFG*, 494–5.
[262] Gen 11:4; 3:5; cf. Isa 14:13–14; Gen 12:1–4, 7–8. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 554; Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 431.
[263] Wright, *PFG*, 438; also pp. 493–5; Wright, *NTPG*, 262–3; also see the statements of blessing in Gen 1:28; 12:2f; 17:2, 6, 8; 22:16ff.
[264] Matt 1:1.
[265] Cf. Gen 1:28. Wright, *NTPG*, 263.

drama would have been unbearably cruel, given Sarai's barrenness. But out of the darkness and chaos of her barren womb Yahweh promises to bring forth abundant life—not only a child, but a great nation. The promise blends the theme of multiplication with creation *ex nihilo*, and is a gift and a testimony to divine sovereignty and power.[266] The covenant is founded on a divine act of salvation that is clearly beyond the reach of human powers. This accentuates the inability of sinful humanity to save itself. Israel's role is not to save, but to testify to Yahweh's salvation.[267]

4.2.1 Covenant Sonship: Called to Be a Covenant Community

In keeping with the relational aspect of the previously outlined covenantal structure, Abraham, the father of Israel, is called into a life of consciously living before God (*coram Dei*): 'Walk *before* me and be blameless'. Walking before (לפני) God primarily means being responsible to him.[268] It also suggests enjoying the saving presence and favour of God as one walks before him. The call to leave his family, along with the promises of land, seed and blessing, is a call to covenantal nationhood. These promises reverse the curses in Eden against the earth, childbearing and labour.[269] The promise of land links the patriarch with Adam and Eve in the garden as well as the subsequent history of Israel in the land, marked by disobedience and leading to the exile.[270] The promise of reciprocal blessing and curse expresses God's covenant presence and promise to deliver. Abraham responds by his obedient

---

[266] Wright lists several threats to the promise: barrenness (Sarah, Rebecca, Rachel), fratricide (Cain and Abel; Esau and Jacob; Joseph and his brothers) and 'sheer blundering' (Abraham and Sarah in Egypt; Sarah and Hagar; Isaac and Rebecca in Egypt); Wright, *PFG*, 786.
[267] Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 122–35, 144.
[268] Gen 17:1; Gen 6:11; Exod 20:3; Hamilton, *Genesis*, 461; von Rad, *Genesis*, 198. Also compare the relational models of the *imago Dei* discussed in chap. 3.
[269] Exod 33:14–15; Gen 12:1–4. See Wright, *PFG*, 787.
[270] Wright, *PFG*, 787.

departure, altar-building and prayer.[271] The dialogue is set in motion. The covenant life would

be marked by a dialogue of divine blessing and responsive worship. Tokens of promise

fulfilment are found in the acquisition of a field, a son and a blessing.[272]

The promises of blessing and offspring continue to be fulfilled in Jacob's abundance of sons

and possessions, and progresses during the sojourn in Goshen.[273] The promise of nationhood

comes into fruition as Israel becomes a numerous people under Egyptian servitude. The

nation of Israel was also designated God's firstborn son, a title later applied to the Davidic

king and ultimately to the Messiah.[274] Abraham's seed, as Yahweh's covenant partner,

becomes his holy people, his treasured possession and the object of his love.[275] To the nation

Yahweh repeats the promise to bless and multiply, along with the promise of provision in the

land on the condition of their obedience, the promise of peace and deliverance, and the

presence of God.[276] These would ultimately be fulfilled in the Exodus and settlement in

Canaan. Waltke notes that the Exodus narrative exhibits many allusions to the creation

narrative of Genesis 1–2, suggesting the notion of Israel's birth as a 'new creation': (1) a

strong east wind (רוח) divides the chaotic waters (2) to produce dry land as a means of

salvation (i.e. creation) of his people. (3) He gives light by the pillar of fire. (4) As a sign of

his care and protection, God's Spirit (רוח), which hovers over the face of the deep, now

hovers over Israel in the wilderness. (5) Entrance into Canaan parallels the creative

---

[271] Gen 12:3–8.
[272] Gen 23:17–20; 21:1–5; 14:18–20.
[273] Gen 29:31–30:43; 47:27; Exod 1:7.
[274] Israel: Exod 4:22–23; Deut 14:1; Jer 31:9; Hos 11:1; king: 2 Sam 7:14; 1 Chr 22:10; Ps 2:7–12; 89:26–27; Messiah: Col 1:15.
[275] Deut 7:6–11; Exod 19:5.
[276] Deut 7:13–14; Lev 26:3–13; cf. Exod 6:2–8.

Sabbath.[277] These parallels suggest an identification of Israel as *imago Dei* and the promised land as a counterpart to Eden.[278] But the lack of explicit application of the *imago Dei* language indicates a limit on Israel's role. Israel is primarily a pre-messianic community whose role is to prepare the way for Messiah, who is the true image of God.

4.2.2 Covenant Shaping: Glory-Bearing Communal Way of Life

Corresponding to the second aspect of the *imago Dei* role is the covenantal *shaping* of Israel, beginning with her patriarchs. Abraham is called to a covenantal way of life marked by faith and moral righteousness. He is commanded to 'walk before [God], and be blameless' and 'to keep the way of the LORD by doing righteousness and justice'.[279] He is celebrated for his faith, being characterised as one who 'believed God' and was therefore counted as 'righteous'.[280] Jacob's story revolves around the theme of blessing and involves a transformation of his character. He begins as a deceiver who by his cunning steals blessings from others. But by means of a divine encounter he becomes a humble petitioner and fearer of God. Jacob is reshaped and renamed to become one who is truly blessed, not by his own doing, and the mediator of blessing to others.[281]

Following the Exodus event, Yahweh gives the law to outline the covenantal way of life for his people.[282] Their status is conditioned on their faithfulness in obeying his voice and

---

[277] Wind/waters: Exod 14:21; cf. Gen 1:2–10; Isa 63:11–13. Land: Exod 14:29; cf. Gen 1:9; 8:13. Light: Exod 13:21; cf. Gen 1:3. Spirit/hover: Gen 1:2; Deut 32:11; the word 'hover' (Piel: מְרַחֶפֶת ,יְרַחֵף) is used only in these two passages. Sabbath: Heb 4:3–10. Waltke, *Old Testament Theology*, 294–5.
[278] Wright, *PFG*, 787.
[279] Gen 17:1; 18:19. 'Total obedience is the necessary condition to experience the covenant promises. To walk before God means to orient one's entire life to his presence, promises, and demands'; Waltke, *Genesis*, 259.
[280] Rom 4:3; Gal 3:6; Jas 2:23; cf. Gen 15:6.
[281] Gen 25:29–34; 27:5–40; 30:37–43; 32:26–30; Gen 47–49.
[282] Exod 20–23. Gunton, *The Christian Faith: An Introduction to Christian Doctrine* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 149.

keeping his covenant. Israel is called to be a holy nation that conforms to the holy God of the covenant and to his way of justice.[283] Their ethical conformity and obedience to his Torah are a performance of trusting dependence upon his wisdom that shapes them for their mission to represent Yahweh to the nations. 'But if "wisdom" is thus the means by which YHWH acts, and if human beings are then to become the means through which he acts, it is clear that wisdom is also precisely that which (like Solomon) they need to be his agents, acting wisely under obedience to the creator and in authority over the world'.[284]

By their obedience, the nation would become the earthly manifestation of God's kingdom and the dwelling place for his glory.[285] The Shekinah glory of God, which first became a prominent theme in the events surrounding the Exodus, was a manifestation of the saving presence of God and a revelation of his majesty and moral perfection.[286] I have previously argued that the theme of glory is closely associated with the *imago Dei*.[287] Relevant here is the idea that Yahweh's dwelling in Israel and Israel's moral conformity to Yahweh would manifest the moral beauty of their God, and would be a key ingredient of their testimony to the nations regarding Yahweh. In his comment on 2 Corinthians 3, Peter Balla points out that the context of Ezekiel 11:19 contains a reference to the Shekinah glory of God.[288] It is indicative of the new covenant that the departure of visible glory from the temple is

---

[283] Exod 19:5; Lev 19:2; Deut 10:17–19. Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 460–1.
[284] Prov 9:10; Wright, *NTPG*, 264–5.
[285] Deut 33:5; 1 Sam 8:7; Ps 45:6; Exod 29:43–46; Lev 26:11–12; 2 Chr 7. Note also that the 'fear of Yahweh' that leads to wisdom also leads to the enjoyment of his favour and presence; e.g. Ps 24:1–6; Isa 51:1; 55:6–7.
[286] Exod 3; 13–14; 19; 33–34. E. F. Harrison, 'Glory', in *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984), 443; J. B. Payne, 'Shekinah', in Elwell, *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, 1010. This theme extends through the construction of the temple in 1 Kgs to the eschatological temple in Ezek, and into the NT.
[287] E.g. Ps 8:5; 1 Cor 11:7. Also see John Calvin on this association.
[288] Peter Balla, '2 Corinthians', in *New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. Beale and Carson, 755.

accompanied by a promise of 'a new spirit' that indwells and transforms the heart of God's people.

4.2.3 Covenant Sending: Embodied Communal Testimony

The third aspect of the covenantal structure, sending, is also found in Yahweh's covenant with Israel and her forbearers. Abraham would be a means of extending blessing to the nations.[289] Fulfilment begins in the story of Joseph who blessed Egypt and Pharaoh, and all the nations through them, by mediating God's providential guidance through the famine years. Genesis 47–49 signals the fulfilment in Jacob who, in the context of Genesis, is the heir to the promise and the appointed mediator of divine blessing. His meeting with Pharaoh, which contains an *inclusio* formed by the repeated statement, 'Jacob blessed Pharaoh', implies a fulfilment of the promise.[290] Pharaoh's prosperity, owed to Joseph's administration, appears to be a providential fulfilment of Jacob's spoken blessing.[291]

The designation of Israel as a 'kingdom of priests' indicates not only a special relationship to Yahweh, but particularly a mediatorial role for the nation among their neighbours. Brueggemann attests to Israel's responsibility: 'Perhaps this nation is offered as priest for other nations, as mediator and intercessor for the well-being of the other nations of the world. … [And] it is to make communion between Yahweh and the world possible'.[292] Wright views Israel as the means of rescuing creation.[293] 'Abraham will be the means of undoing the sin of Adam'.[294] 'We could sum up this aspect of Genesis by saying: Abraham's children are God's

---

[289] Gen 12:3.
[290] Gen 47:7, 10.
[291] Waltke, *Genesis*, 587; Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 432.
[292] Exod 19:6. Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 431.
[293] Wright, *PFG*, 495. Also p. 501f.
[294] Wright, *Climax*, 21; also Wright, *PFG*, 784f.

true humanity, and their homeland is the new Eden'.[295] Viewing national Israel in isolation, this may be overstated. Israel, as a chosen but sinful people, could not bring about redemption. Their primary function was to testify to the redemptive activity of God as the collective forerunner of the Messiah.[296] These themes find their ultimate fulfilment in Christ who, as Son and Mediator, is sent to reveal God and save the world.[297]

4.2.4 Covenant Failure

The history of Israel, like that of Adam, is marked by positive violations of God's commands as well as the failure to serve and keep the land entrusted to them. Their unfaithfulness to the covenant relationship into which they were called was the primary reason for the exile. Instead of following Yahweh's way of wisdom and testifying of his righteousness, they followed the sins of the nations who occupied the land before them and worshipped their gods. This was an abdication of the dominion they had been given over the nations and a failure to guard the land from their pollution. Instead of extending God's kingdom blessings, they brought a curse upon their land.[298]

4.3 Intermission: Alienation, Brokenness and Hope

Yahweh had settled Israel in the land to give them rest, but because of their sins, he now expels them in order to give rest to the land.[299] This was a decisive break in the covenantal relationship and the progress of the *imago Dei* mission. Although the Jews were permitted to

---

[295] Wright, *Climax*, 23. He also points out that dominion over nature has been replaced by possession of Canaan and supremacy over enemies; Wright, *NTPG*, 263; cf. Wright, *Climax*, 24. We could reconcile this to the redemptive mission of Israel if we consider that part of the process of rescuing creation is the limiting of sin by executing divine judgment upon particular nations in obedience to God's express directive.
[296] Ps 96:2–3, 8–10; Isa 43:8–12; Isa 49:6.
[297] John 1:14, 18; 14:7; 4:34; 5:19–47; 6:27, 38, 57.
[298] Jer 2:2–11; 3:1–5; 2 Kgs 17:7–8; 2 Chr 36:14.
[299] E.g. 2 Chr 36:21; Lev 26:34–35.

return to the land under Cyrus, the postexilic narratives were characterised more by uncertainty and conflict than by peace and rest. Although the Hebrew canon ends on a very positive note of hope for resettlement and restoration, that does not bring the reader to the chronological end of the OT, an eschatological word of warning that simultaneously points ahead to John the Baptist and the coming of the kingdom in Christ.[300] The rebuilding of the temple and the rebuilding of the wall were achieved with difficulty and against formidable opposition. The books of Ezra and Nehemiah both end with the purging from the community of those guilty of intermarriage—the greatest perceived threat to the integrity of the covenant and the nation at that time.[301] The purging was certainly completed, but absent is any note of true *rest* that was prominent in the account of the first settlement under Joshua.[302] Also absent from these books is any indication that the promised Spirit is given. Matthew's perceptive genealogy indicates that Israel's true return from the exile, and the restoration of Sabbath rest, would be achieved only through the coming of the Messiah. Similarly, the promise of the Spirit is fulfilled only through Christ at Pentecost.[303]

4.4 Summary

In this chapter, I proposed a theological interpretation of the *imago Dei* as an identity-conferring role within the canonical theodrama using the covenant as an organising principle. The covenant is analysed in terms of three key aspects: sonship, shaping and sending. The defining mission of the *imago Dei* is to be the embodied representative of God by manifesting his glory and mediating his kingdom on the stage of the material creation. But a representative

---

[300] 2 Chr 36:23; Mal 4:5–6; For the theological contrast between the order of the Hebrew canon and that of the Christian OT, see Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty*, 40.
[301] Ezra 3–6; Neh 3–6; Ezra 9–10; Neh 13:23–31.
[302] Cf. Josh 21:43–45.
[303] Ezekiel 39:28–29; Matt 1:1–17; cf. 11:28–30; Matt 1:18; 3:11, 16; Luke 1:15, 35, 41; 3:16, 22; Acts 1:5.

mission implies a relationship with God and conformity to his character and will. I explored these themes of sonship (relationship), shaping (conformity) and sending (mission) in the stories of humankind and Israel with special attention to the creation narratives in Genesis. I also argued that the Spirit, who is the breath of life and the Shekinah glory, constitutes and qualifies the image for its role and mediates these three aspects of the covenant. Chapters 5 and 6 will apply this model of the *imago Dei* dramatic role to Christology and ecclesiology respectively, in preparation for my thesis that Spirit baptism, in creating the church as the *imago Christi*, represents the eschatological restoration of the *imago Dei*.

CHAPTER 5

ACT 3: A COVENANTAL *IMAGO DEI* SPIRIT CHRISTOLOGY

In the previous chapter I proposed a dramatic *imago Dei* anthropology in which the *imago Dei* is construed as a covenantal dramatic role comprised of sonship (relationship), shaping (moral conformity) and sending (kingdom-mediating mission). I argued that the *imago Dei* role is constituted by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and expressed in the embodied mediation of kingdom blessing to the world. The role was initially assigned to Adam and Eve's race and subsequently to Israel in a limited way. In the NT the focal point of both the dramatic plot and the *imago Dei* language shifts from humanity to Christ, who would be the ultimate fulfilment of humankind, Israel and the *imago Dei*. Such fulfilment makes way for the creation of the church in union with Christ through the Spirit as the new humanity and the restored *imago Dei*. Not only so, but because Christ first receives the Spirit as the anointed Messiah, he goes on to perform the role of Spirit-Baptiser, pouring out the Spirit from the Father upon his new covenant people. Structuring the theodrama according to this *imago Dei* framework with attention to the Spirit's constitutive role prepares the way for my main thesis, that Spirit baptism is the experience by which participants are restored as the *imago Dei* in Christ. The present chapter discusses the assumption and performance of the *imago Dei* by the Son of God through the anointing of the Holy Spirit.

In the following I will give an exposition of Act 3 of the drama, in which the divine Son of God takes the stage in human form to assume the *imago Dei* role and elevate it to divine-human fulfilment. I will develop the three aspects of the covenant Christ fulfils as the divine Son incarnate: his filial relationship with the Father, his Spirit-shaped obedience and his Spirit-empowered mission as the embodied mediator of the kingdom. In his successful mission he restores humankind to its rightful place under the rule and blessing of God in

anticipation of the consummate coming of the kingdom in the eschaton. In dialogue with Irenaeus and the Reformed tradition I will argue that the specific locus of Christ's saving act is in his death and resurrection. It is his death that severs humankind from Adam and liberates it from bondage to sin and death. It is his resurrection that recreates it through the Spirit as the new humanity and the *imago Christi*, to share in his own sonship, shaping and sending as embodied agents of the kingdom.

5.1 The Dramatic Orientation

I have proposed in previous chapters that the narrative of the Bible may be viewed as a drama of which the Triune God is the Author, Narrator and Actor, and humanity plays the vital role of the *imago Dei*, the primary embodied actor onstage who mediates God's speech and actions to the material world. In the aftermath of Adam's failure and consequent exile from the Garden of Eden, Israel was called to assume the role in a limited manner.[1] The elect nation was commissioned to bear witness to the divine kingdom and mediate kingdom blessing to the nations. Adam's story was echoed in the covenant failure of Israel and her exile from the promised land. The advent of Christ was the divine response to the plight of both national Israel and Adam's race, as the Son of God would assume human form as a particular Jewish man and with it, the *imago Dei* role. In the mission of the Messiah N.T. Wright sees a resolution to three distinct narratives: (1) The restoration of Israel, (2) the fulfilment of Israel's vocation in restoring humanity, and (3) the re-establishment of God's rule over the cosmos by defeating the enemies that threaten to destroy creation and bringing

---

[1] N.T. Wright went so far as to name Israel as 'the renewed humanity'; Wright, *PFG*, 438, 794. Neither that nor the '*imago Dei*' appellation was applied by biblical authors to Israel. But Israel certainly functioned at least partially in these capacities.

about a new creation. These three accomplishments correspond to his roles as Messiah, Israel and Adam respectively.[2] Notwithstanding the distinctions, we observe that these three closely interrelated narratives may be subsumed under the larger narrative of Christ's Spirit-empowered fulfilment of the *imago Dei* in restoring God's rule over Israel, humanity and all creation. In light of the universal scope of such messianic texts as Psalm 2, Isaiah 42:1–9 and Daniel 7, I would emphasise that it is as the Spirit-anointed Messiah that he achieves this entire Trinitarian kingdom mission. In this sense, the first two narratives may be subsumed under the third, with the controlling motif being the coming of God's kingdom. Since both the messianic and the *imago Dei* motifs are intrinsically royal in nature, they merge fittingly into the kingdom theme. In the postlapsarian context, the mission to mediate and extend the kingdom has become a mission to restore the kingdom and thereby redeem creation.

We should note that Messiah, Israel and Adam are mediatorial roles implying God as the ultimate Actor. The OT writers consistently maintain the distinction between the human representative and the divine saviour and king.[3] It is precisely in the new exodus oracles of Isaiah that Yahweh is affirmed as the *only* saviour. Yet the gospels boldly proclaim Christ as the saviour and king who would bring about the new exodus, supporting their claims with

---

[2] Wright, *PFG*, 521, 531. In defending against the charge of 'supercessionism', sometimes pejoratively labelled 'replacement theology', Wright argues that Paul's view of election, in line with that found in Qumran, is that of a new covenant community standing in continuity with Abraham's descendants, but constituted and empowered by the promised Holy Spirit. 'But, unlike the two previous models, in both of which there is a definite sense of *replacement* of Israel and everything it stood for with something quite new, there is here a characteristically Jewish note of *fulfilment*. … The scandal of Paul's gospel, after all, was that the events in which he claimed that Israel's God had been true to what he promised centred on a crucified Messiah'; pp. 809–10. Gunton insightfully states, 'It is not that the Old Testament dispensation has been superseded; it is rather that it has been concentrated on the life of the incarnate Son of God'; Gunton, *The Christian Faith*, 141.
[3] E.g. Isa 43:3, 11, 15; 44:6.

narratives in which he performs these roles in a manner surpassing human capabilities.[4]

Hence, the Spirit-anointed Son of God not only assumes these originally human roles, but elevates them into divine fulfilment. In Colossians, the Son is declared to be 'the image of the invisible God', by whom 'all things were created … For in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell, and through him to reconcile to himself all things … in his body of flesh'. He is the divine-human *imago Dei* who comes in visible, bodily form to reveal the 'invisible God' and mediate kingdom blessing by reconciling all creation to God. Paul's argument in Colossians 1:15-23 shows that his incarnation is necessary to his performance.[5] In 2 Corinthians, Christ the image of God is both mediator and Lord of the new covenant through the Spirit, the bearer and revealer of the glory of God, and indeed, the content of the gospel. Hebrews and John both contain clear statements of his divinity, but dramatically speak of his revelatory and salvific acts.[6] Note that all of these Christological *imago Dei* texts emphasise kingdom, revelation and redemption, in keeping with the model of the *imago Dei* I outlined in chapter 4.[7] Thus in the NT the role of the *imago Dei* originally assigned to humanity has been elevated to divine fulfilment through the self-emplotment of the Son. He is the perfect revelation and saviour because he is God in the flesh.[8]

---

[4] King and saviour: Matt 1:1–17 (implicit in genealogy); 2:2, 6; Mark 1:1, 14–15; Luke 2:11, 30; John 4:42. Exodus: Matt 2:13–15, 19–20; 3:1–12; Mark 1:1–13; Luke 3:3–17; John 1:14, 23, 29. God-like acts: Mark 1:21–28; 2:5–12, 28; 4:35–41; etc.

[5] Also see Col 2:9.

[6] Col 1:13–23; 2 Cor 3:1–4:6; Heb 1:1–4; John 1:14–18.

[7] These correspond to dominion, glory and exodus respectively. See chap. 4.

[8] That the *imago Dei* role is originally assigned to humanity is consequent to my view that the dramatic role entails embodiment. I have proposed that the image be viewed as the primary embodied actor on the stage of creation. For this reason, Jesus as the *imago Dei* comes on the scene in Act 3 for his consummate, redemptive *imago Dei* performance. To separate the image from the incarnation requires a disembodied, dedramatised interpretation of the image. See my arguments against the ontological view in sect. 5.2.

Kevin Vanhoozer has described the incarnation of the Son of God as 'authorial self-emplotment'.[9] He uses this phrase in the context of refuting the 'kenosis of empathy', in which God gives up his being in order to identify with the world.[10] By contrast, the kenosis of emplotment affirms that:

> God the Son continues to be all that God is under the veil [sic] of humanity. The subject of the life of this human hero, Jesus, is the divine Author, the Son of God. In this is love: that the Author, while remaining all that he is, nevertheless pours his uncreated self into a created form of space and time, blood and bone, in order to communicate his light and life to others.[11]

The Author's self-emplotment allows him to participate as a character in his own drama, and so communicate bodily and visibly to humankind. By virtue of remaining who he is as the divine Author, he is able to communicate himself truly to humankind, making the way for human participation in the life and love that God is.[12] This is the human form and divine content of Christ's incarnational communication, 'a Word that communicates all the Author is'.[13] But this mission requires his incarnation because the *imago Dei* is an *embodied, human* mediator. Jesus becomes the embodied location of God's voice, his corporeal discourse.[14] In him, Yahweh, who has always been Israel's saviour, has come in the flesh.[15]

---

[9] Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology*, 358.

[10] The kenosis of empathy is characteristic of contemporary relational ontotheology, in which God loses himself in order to identify with the other: 'I make myself nothing in order to feel your pain'. By contrast, in the kenosis of emplotment, 'the Son takes on the life of a character without ceasing to be Author'. He retains an 'outsidedness', a self that is required for relating to another. 'Only if Christ remains "outside" the world, as it were, can he bring something new to it'; Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology*, 358–9. Note the implicit affirmation of the 'Calvinist extra'.

[11] Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology*, 358. Note that although Vanhoozer's use of 'veil' can suggest Docetism, there is a clear affirmation of the true humanity of Jesus in this passage. Also note that Vanhoozer's emphasis on the incarnation in this particular statement comes close to the Orthodox notion of deification.

[12] Heb 1:1–3; Col 2:9; 2 Pet 1:3–4; John 1:14–18; 17:3.

[13] Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology*, 356.

[14] Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology*, 359.

[15] E.g. Isa 43:3, 11; John 1:14; Rom 8:3. Note that the incarnation, the 'becoming flesh' of the Son of God, does not mean that Christology is patterned after anthropology. Rather, the *humanity* assumed by the incarnate Christ is 'fully human', like that of all humankind, 'yet without sin', Heb 4:15. His incarnation was a real assumption

5.1.1 Recapitulation and Redemption

Irenaeus' theory of recapitulation is an atonement model that is dramatic, multifaceted and incarnational, and for those reasons could be amenable to the theodramatic model presented in this work. But a critical assessment is required. For Irenaeus, the incarnation represents an actualisation of true humanity and the union of that humanity with divinity, by which humankind is brought into communion with God and restored to the divine image. Christ's re-enactment of the human life, from birth through the various stages of growth until his death, is salvific because he lived as 'the personal reality of the whole race'—as *the human*.[16] As the image of God, he carried the entire reality of the human nature within himself and by his obedience restored it.[17] I wish to offer first a critique, then a partial appropriation of the Irenaean theory of recapitulation and of the resultant Orthodox doctrine of *theosis*.

In his doctrine of recapitulation, Irenaeus emphasises the incarnation of the Word, by which humanity has been redemptively united to deity. The implied metaphysical realism—in that the whole of human nature can be contained in Christ the archetypal image—is certainly foreign to the contemporary western worldview. One could potentially support this interpretation of Christ's humanity by appealing to Hebrews 1:3, which refers to Christ as the stamp or impress (χαρακτήρ) of the divine nature (ὑπόστασις). This term has been interpreted by some as the active agent that impresses the divine image upon humanity.[18] But this is a

---

of human nature. This entails a denial that he assumed a *tertium quid*, as well as a denial that he was eternally incarnate. See sect. 5.2.

[16] Steenberg, *Of God and Man*, 48–9; citing Irenaeus, *AH* 5.17. Irenaeus' text is not clear on this point. See *AH* 2.22.4 for the key statement on recapitulation. But see *AH* 5.23.2: 'a second creation by means of his passion'.

[17] One could certainly find limited affinity in Barth, for whom Christ is the ontological determination of humanity.

[18] Grenz, *Social God*, 221. Grenz cites J. Barmby and Kelber/Wilckens. Both Barmby and Wilckens cite Philo's application of χαρακτήρ to λόγος (*Logos*); Barmby, *Hebrews*, in *The Pulpit Commentary*, vol. 21, ed. H.D.M. Spence and Joseph S. Exell (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950), 5; Kelber and Wilckens, 'χαρακτήρ', in *TDNT*,

minority interpretation that traces back to Philo's application of χαρακτήρ to the λόγος. The majority of contemporary scholarship would read χαρακτήρ passively, meaning that Christ is the imprint, the representation that perfectly corresponds to God.[19] Ellingsworth notes that 'Philo frequently uses χαρακτήρ to denote the marks or impressions made on the soul by God, virtue or wisdom'.[20] That χαρακτήρ is linked to ὑπόστασις by a genitive construct and placed in parallel to 'radiance of his glory' (ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης) supports this reading, suggesting ontological correspondence as the basis for Christ's function in truly revealing God the Father. Note that 'radiance' is a matter of manifesting the glory rather than of causing another to bear the glory.[21]

More importantly, Irenaeus' realistic interpretation presents a serious consequence for soteriology. If Christ assumes universal *human nature* in himself and joins it salvifically to divinity, the logical consequence is universal salvation as we have seen in the Eastern Fathers and most famously in Origen and Gregory of Nyssa.[22] The 'deification' of human nature would deify every human being, since all participate in that nature. To the contrary, Paul's Christology presents Christ's human nature not as a 'universal', but as a new beginning, a

---

vol. 9, ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 422. The relevant section is credited to Wilckens; p. 423.

[19] J. Gess, 'χαρακτήρ', *NIDNTT*, 2:288–9; Paul Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1993), 98–9; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 48; Peter T. O'Brien, *The Letter to the Hebrews* PNTC (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans; Leicester: Apollos, 1999), 55; Philip E. Hughes, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 43; Leon Morris, 'Hebrews', *The Expositor's Bible Commentary, Volume 12*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 14.

[20] Ellingsworth, *Hebrews*, 99.

[21] E.g. Bruce, *Hebrews*, 447–8.

[22] This coheres with a literal but isolated reading of Rom 5:18, in which Paul uses πάντας ('all'), in contrast to the πολύς ('many') in vv. 15 and 19; cf. Dan 12:2; Matt 25:46.

'Second Adam'.[23] He is a particular man and the head of a new humanity.[24] Salvation is consequently contingent on participation in the new creation in Christ through the Spirit, rather than on participation in human nature as such.

The *Christus Victor* theme is a useful element of Irenaean soteriology, fitting well with the theodramatic framework. Christ's incarnation, obedient death and resurrection destroyed sin and the power of death, vivifying humanity and recovering the image and likeness lost in Adam.[25] My difference with Irenaeus here is primarily a matter of emphasis. For Irenaeus, the obedience of Christ—both in resisting temptation and in submitting to death—is a critical point, effecting humanity's reconciliation to God.[26] I would argue that the act of obedience that brought justification and life consists primarily of Christ's death, but is inseparably bound to his resurrection, which is wrought by the Holy Spirit, who is simultaneously the believer's hope of resurrection.[27] I would further argue that it is the specific *content* of his obedience—his sacrificial death—that effects salvation, not the mere fact of his obedience. While the obedient life of Christ is certainly a victory and a corrective performance of the *imago Dei* in contrast to Adam's and Israel's misperformances—and the comparison is unmistakably implied in both Luke and Matthew—we must maintain that the victory is ultimately achieved through his death and resurrection, and completed by the Spirit.[28] Paul's

---

[23] Cf. Irenaeus, *AH* 5.23.2, noted above.

[24] 1 Cor 15:44–49; Rom 5:12–21; Eph 2:14–16; John 20:22; cf. *AH* 3.18.1, in which Irenaeus affirms as much: 'He commenced afresh the long line of human beings …'. Also see Fee, *Pauline Christology*, 517. By 'universal' I am referring to the medieval debate between realists and nominalists regarding universals, which traces back to Platonic realism.

[25] Irenaeus, *AH* 3.18.

[26] Irenaeus, *AH* 3.18.2, 6; 5.21.

[27] Death: Rom 5:15–6:5; Phil 2:8; resurrection: 3:10–11; Rom 4:24–25; 5:10; 6:4–11; Col 3:1–4. Also Wright, *PFG*, 513. Regarding the Spirit as the believer's hope see Rom 5:5; 8:9–11, 14–25; Eph 1:13–14.

[28] E.g. Rom 6:1–11; 8:9–11; 1 Cor 15:3–4, 12–28, 42–57. Regarding the comparison, see especially Luke 4:1–12; Matt 4:1–11. Luke places the narrative immediately after his genealogy, which is traced back to 'Adam, the

Adam-Christ analogy in Romans states that 'one act of righteousness' leads to justification for all.[29] Also consider: 'For I delivered to you as of first importance … that Christ died for our sins … that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the Scriptures'. Later he states, 'And if Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are still in your sins'.[30] Herein lies the crucial effective element of the salvific work of Christ. Paul speaks much about the salvific union of believers with Christ, but does so consistently in regard to Christ's *death and resurrection* rather than his incarnation or obedience.[31] His death and resurrection puts an end to the death-dealing determination of Adam's misperformance, and inaugurates the new creation through the Last Adam,[32] the messianic King whose rule is the perfect manifestation of the kingdom of God.

The Bible's use of multiple metaphors is difficult to exhaust, and an unqualified distinction between the effects of Christ's death and his resurrection is impossible to maintain. But among them, Christ's death serves as a sacrifice for sin, a vicarious punishment, a ransom for debt, a destruction of the power of sin, a severance from the headship of the first Adam, an exodus from the kingdom of sin and darkness, a Passover sacrifice and institution of a new covenant, an example of obedience and a demonstration of God's love. His resurrection provides vindication of Jesus' Messiahship and sonship, victory over the power of sin and death, victory over the ancient serpent, the beginning of the new creation, the re-creation of

---

son of God'. Matthew, for whom Jesus is the new Israel, places it after the baptism, in which Jesus is anointed with the Spirit and affirmed as God's 'Son'. Both gospel writers frame the temptation within the context of a new exodus and wilderness sojourn; cf. Vanhoozer, *Drama of Doctrine*, 388.

[29] Rom 5:19; cf. 6:3–4; Phil 2:8.

[30] 1 Cor 15:3–4, 17.

[31] Rom 6:3–11; 1 Cor 10:16–17 cf. 11:23–26; 2 Cor 5:14–17; Gal 2:20; 5:24; 6:14–15; Eph 2:5–6, 10, 13–18; Phil 3:10; Col 1:20; 2:11–15; 3:1–4; also Heb 2:9, 14–15.

[32] Wright, *Justification*, 106; N.T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (London: SPCK; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 248–57, 728, 731; Wright, *PFG*, 1068–9.

the *imago Dei*, the life-giving power of the Holy Spirit and the way into participation in the divine life, the revelation of Yahweh's justice and salvation, the inauguration of the divine kingdom and the new Sabbath rest of God. These metaphors point to multiple narratives that coalesce in the larger narrative of *salvation* from sin and its effects and the realisation of God's *destiny* for humanity through the re-establishment of God's *kingdom* and his new *covenant*.[33] It is in Christ's death and resurrection that sin is defeated and humanity is transferred from Adam to Christ and reconciled to God. Christ's incarnate life and obedient works are a necessary revelation of God and his kingdom purposes as well as a prerequisite for his ultimate achievement of salvation, insofar as he recapitulatively performs the *imago Dei* where Adam and Israel have failed. But his salvific work is decisively located in his death and resurrection.[34] Being united with Christ by the Spirit, the Christian's con-crucifixion with Christ severs her from the headship of Adam while her co-resurrection with Christ brings her under the headship (*caput*) of the Second Adam and recreates her in the image of Christ.[35] To be sure, Christ performs an altered repetition of the earlier narratives.[36] But he also provides a transfer to a new headship and a participation in the new creation, which is ultimately completed in the final resurrection event.[37]

The *locus classicus* for the Eastern Orthodox doctrine of *theosis* is found not in Paul, but Peter. In 2 Peter 1:4, participation in the divine nature and the corresponding escape from corruption is closely tied to the 'knowledge' of Christ and comes to the Christian in the form

---

[33] Even such a description of the 'larger narrative' is subject to debate, but should be adequate to serve our purposes here.
[34] E.g. Col 2:13–15; 1 Cor 15:45–57. Also see Fee, *Pauline Christology*, 517.
[35] Rom 6:5–11; 8:11, 29. Wright, *PFG*, 532.
[36] Cf. Vanhoozer, *Drama of Doctrine*, 388.
[37] Col 1:15–20; 1 Cor 15:42–49.

of 'promises'.[38] Although 2 Peter does not cite the death and resurrection—nor incarnation!—as the means, 1 Peter affirms both the future revelation of the glory of Christ and the death and resurrection of Christ that provide this hope for the Christian.[39] Indeed, 1 Peter promises an '[imperishable] inheritance' and participation in glory, which seem to have the same referent as the participation in 2 Peter 1:4.[40] In examining these common themes in the Petrine letters, one can reasonably argue that the basis for *theosis* is more likely located in Christ's death and resurrection than in his incarnation. The impulse to emphasise the incarnation for the doctrine of *theosis* can be traced back the writings of Irenaeus.[41] But I would suggest that Irenaeus' emphasis on incarnation is best explained by his polemical interest against Gnosticism. In appropriating the notion of recapitulation and *theosis*, I would conceive of Christ's recapitulative performance as the prerequisite work that qualifies him to become the head of the new humanity in his resurrection. The Christian's union with Christ in his death and resurrection makes the way for overcoming sin and death and participating in the divine life through the Holy Spirit. This life-giving union is a matter of reconciliation and relationship with God, in whom is 'eternal life'.[42]

5.2 The Son's Status as *Imago Dei*

Our survey of the *imago Dei* literature in chapter 3 revealed a long, but by no means unanimous, tradition of distinguishing between Christ as the original image and humans who are created *according to* the image. In light of my nondistinctive use of the language and the dramatic continuity of the *imago Dei* role, it would be helpful to examine and clarify the

---

[38] 2 Pet 1:2–4, 8; 2:20.
[39] Revelation: 1:13; 4:13; death and resurrection: 1:2–3, 11, 18–21; 3:18–21.
[40] 1 Pet 1:4; 5:1.
[41] See chap. 3.
[42] E.g. John 17:3. Note that while I have given more attention to the Pauline and Petrine corpuses, this account coheres well with the Johannine material.

particular status of the Son as the *imago Dei* vis-à-vis humankind in general. Clear

designations of Jesus Christ as the *imago Dei* are found in 2 Corinthians 4:4 and Colossians

1:15. The statement in 2 Corinthians occurs in the context of Paul's defence of the gospel, by

which the new covenant is introduced and its partakers are being transformed into the image

of Christ.[43] Paul draws on the narrative of Exodus 34, making a comparison of the new

covenant in Christ with the old covenant in Moses. The main point seems to be the salvific

revelation of the glory of God that is located in Christ, the image. The Colossians statement is

part of an affirmation of Christ's supremacy in creation occurring in the context of a passage

about his role as redeemer. It also emphasises Christ's exalted status as revealer of God,

Creator-sustainer and the embodiment of deity. Note that, while there is some reference to the

ontological status of Christ, the image is not equated with ontology. Much greater emphasis is

given in these texts to the roles of Christ in revelation, redemption and to some extent,

rulership.[44] This supports the functional aspect of my dramatic model of the *imago Dei* as a

covenantal role, in which ontology is relevant, but certainly not central.[45]

Due to the prominence of the traditional assertions that Christ is the ontological *archetype* of

humankind, some critical evaluation should be given here. The affirmation that Christ is the

ontological *archetype* of humankind has been made in reference to both his deity and his

humanity.[46] Origen posited that the Son's deity, with his divine attributes, is the archetype

---

[43] 2 Cor 3:18; cf. 4:4. The larger context is Paul's defence of his apostleship.
[44] Note the correspondence to the threefold offices of prophet, priest and king; see sect. 5.5.2.
[45] See sect. 4.1.6 for the place of ontology in my model.
[46] Moo, for instance, takes this view of Col 1:15. Douglas J. Moo, *The Letters to the Colossians and to Philemon*, PNTC (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans and Nottingham: Apollos, 2008, 117–8. Moo appeals to Paul's use of the Wisdom tradition, which Fee refutes. See the following discussion.

after which Adam is made since he is the truth and revelation of the Father.[47] This raises the problem of how it is the Son's deity in particular which serves as the archetype, rather than that of the Father or the Spirit. If the three persons of the Trinity are *homoousios*, such a distinction cannot be properly made. This implicit ontological mediation of the Father through the Son is symptomatic of Origen's ontological subordinationism, which in a way analogous to Gnosticism, posits a gradation of being from the Father through the Son down to creation.[48] More common is the affirmation that the Son's humanity is the prototype for humankind. Tertullian posited that the anticipated humanity of the future incarnate Son provided the model for the creation of Adam.[49] This is a more promising method of affirming the Son as the original *imago Dei*, though not without problems. It seems exegetically dubious to suggest that 'created … in the image of *God*' in Genesis could mean that humans were created according to the true and perfect *humanity* of the future incarnate Son, which is not yet realised, but the idea of which resides in the mind of God.[50] It also introduces a circularity into the logic of incarnation, that the Son was 'born in the likeness of men', who in turn were created in the likeness of his humanity.[51] A possible solution to the problem of circularity is to suggest that Christ was eternally incarnate, but his humanity was manifested later in history.

---

[47] Origen, *First Principles*, 1.2.6.
[48] Origen, *First Principles*, 1.3.5; Gunton, *Triune Creator*, 60; Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2:54. We can also mention Platonism as the primary source of Gnostic departures from orthodox Christian theology.
[49] 'But there was One in whose image God was making man, that is to say, Christ's image, who, being one day about to become Man (more surely and more truly so), had already caused the man to be called His image, who was then going to be formed of clay—the image and similitude of the true and perfect Man'; Tertullian, *Against Praxeas* 12; *ANF* 03:1357; cf. Irenaeus, *AH* 5.16.2; Panayiotis Nellas, *Deification in Christ: Orthodox Perspectives on the nature of the Human Person*, trans. Norman Russell (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1987), 34–5; Johannes Zaccuber, *Human Nature in Gregory of Nyssa: Philosophical Background and Theological Significance* (Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2000), 158; Barth, *CD* III/2, 219.
[50] A *sensus plenior* cannot be ruled out. What is in question is the specific content of the fuller sense of the *imago Dei* motif. One wonders whether it is due to Plato's influence through Philo that Tertullian would suppose the imperfect image to be modelled after the perfect. Does Jerusalem inevitably import from Athens after all?
[51] Phil 2:7; Rom 8:3.

Not only is this a difficult reading of the Pauline texts, but the incarnation narratives and John's abbreviated theological narrative all locate the incarnation of the Son within the dramatic flow of history.[52] While the divine person of the Son is pre-existent, his humanity was created and has a temporal beginning in the womb of Mary.

The idea of an intermediary archetype between God and humans partly hangs on the distinction between Christ as the image of God and humans as being created *in* the image of God.[53] Paul's statement in 1 Cor 11:7, that man 'is the image and glory of God', casts doubt on the linguistic basis for a distinction. Conceptually, the idea that humans are modelled after an intermediary, which in turn is modelled after God, seems to have originated from Philo's Middle Platonic allegorical reading of Genesis 1: 'And this shadow, and, as it were, model, is the archetype of other things. For, as God is himself the model of that image which he has now called a shadow, so also that image is the model of other things, as he showed when he commenced giving the law to the Israelites, and said, "And God made man according to the image of God"'.[54] I would concede that Paul may be influenced by the language from Philo and the Wisdom tradition, which associate 'image' (εἰκὼν) with 'firstborn' (πρωτότοκος) as well as 'beginning' (ἀρχή).[55] But his theology is closer to Genesis and the Davidic/messianic materials than it is to Philo.[56] Philo's theology, which apparently follows Plato's distinction

---

[52] Luke 1–2; Matt 1; John 1:14.
[53] E.g. Moo, *Colossians and Philemon*, 117 n. 134, on Col 1:15ff.
[54] Philo of Alexandria, *Allegorical Interpretation* 3.95–96 (http://www.earlyjewishwritings.com/text/philo/book4.html; accessed 2 December 2015). Also see Moo, *Colossians and Philemon*, 118; Dunn, *Colossians and Philemon*, 88–89. Moo and Dunn also cite Wisdom 7:26, which uses the term εἰκὼν, but without any reference to an archetype. http://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/greek-texts/septuagint/chapter.asp?book=29&page=7; accessed 21 March 2017. Fee rejects the theory that Paul is making use of the Wisdom tradition. Fee, *Pauline Christology*, 317–25.
[55] πρωτότοκος (Col 1:15) differs from but resembles πρωτόγονος, used by Philo. But Fee denies any real connection between Col 1:15–20 and the Wisdom tradition.
[56] Cf. Fee, *Pauline Christology*, 325.

between forms and 'shadows', if applied to Colossians 1, leads to ontological

subordinationism.[57] For these reasons, I reject the reading of the Christological 'image' as an

ontological archetype for protological humanity.[58]

A third logical possibility is that humankind is modelled after the *person* of the Son. The

person of Jesus, in his relationship with the Father, his moral qualities, and his kingdom

mission, certain serves as the model for the new humanity. But what would it entail for the

person of the Son to be the model for protological humanity? None of the attributes of deity

are particular to the Son, but they are shared properties of the Triune God.[59] What is particular

to the person of the Son is his sonship, that is, his *role* in relation to the Father and the Spirit.

Therefore, the proposal in question consists of Adam being the 'son of God' in a way

analogous to the divine Son.[60] This leads to a position similar to my view of the *imago Dei* as

a role consisting of sonship, shaping and sending. Adam's relationship with God and his

stewardship of the world is analogous to the Son's relationship with the Father and his

---

[57] Philo, *Allegorical Interpretation* 3.96; cf. Plato's illustration of 'the cave' in *The Republic*, Book 7, 514–21, as well as the discussion in *Parmenides*, 127–35; in Walter Kaufmann and Forrest E. Baird, *From Plato to Nietzsche* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1994), 125–30, 130–7.

[58] Note that this is a discussion regarding protological humanity. My affirmation of Christ as the archetype for the new humanity is clear throughout the thesis, especially in chapter 6.

[59] Note that the moral qualities of Jesus can serve as a model because, in his incarnation, he reveals and embodies the moral qualities of God. This is not the case with the pre-incarnate Son, whose divine perfections are not distinct from that of the Father and the Spirit.

[60] The term 'role' in this context designates the particular relational location of the Son within the Trinity. This includes, for instance, the relation of origin, his 'begottenness'. Consequently, one could conceive of Adam's created sonship in analogy to the Son's begotten sonship; Luke 3:38. For the expansion of 'sonship' to include not only relation, but also resemblance and functional representation, see sect. 4.1.2.

One may also suggest that Adam was created in the image of the ontological substance of the person of the Son. But it is difficult to imagine what the content of this ontological analogy or resemblance may be, and how the Son's ontological substance is distinct from the ontological substance of the Father, for instance. Such distinctions lead to a mere repackaging of the Origenian variety treated above, and ultimately, to ontological subordinationism. For this reason, it may be best to avoid combining the concept of the Son as archetype with an ontological interpretation of image, which tends to incorporate, consciously or not, the implication that the Son is somehow less transcendent than the Father.

mission in creating, sustaining and ruling the world. The difference is that the proposal in question interprets the language of 'image' primarily in terms of *analogy* rather than *representation*, though the content of the image remains the same.[61] Note also that while this position affirms the tradition that Christ is the original image after which Adam was created, it does so in a form closer to the Barthian *analogia relationis* than the patristic *analogia entis*.[62]

In considering the *personhood* of the Son as the model for the protological *imago Dei*, the occurrence of ὑπόστασις in Hebrews 1:3 suggests that it may be a possible supporting text. But note that the passage speaks of the Son in relation to the Father, rather than humanity in relation to the Son. Application to humanity is inferred by virtue of *analogia relationis*.[63] Also observe that the intent of the passage is to highlight the uniqueness of the Son rather than resemblance between the Son and humankind. More significantly, such an appeal requires that ὑπόστασις be understood as 'person' instead of 'nature'. But the term ὑπόστασις is known to be nearly synonymous with οὐσία until at least the third century.[64] To read the

---

[61] That is, it reads 'image' more metaphorically than literally. But note that even a 'representative' reading of image is metaphorical to some extent. My model reads the OT 'image' in primarily physical and representative terms, and the NT 'image' as primarily analogical and ethical, though they are multifaceted and overlapping. See sect. 4.1.1.2 and 6.4.

[62] See chap. 3, particularly sect. 3.3.2.1. Again, note that these categories are overlapping rather than exclusive. There are certainly relational and ethical elements in the Church Fathers; see my analysis in sect. 3.5.1–2.

[63] I am not opposed to such analogy, but explicit support from another biblical text would have strengthened the case. The analogy in John 17 involves the church rather than Adam; see sect. 3.3.2.1.

[64] Köster, 'ὑπόστασις', *TDNT*, VIII:585–7; for the development of the term see pp. 575–7; G. Harder, 'ὑπόστασις', *NIDNTT*, 1:710–4; James Hope Moulton and George Mulligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament: Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1929), s.v. 'ὑπόστασις', 659-60; Bruce, *Hebrews*, 48; T.B. Strong, 'The History of the Theological Term "Substance": Part II', *JTS* 3.9 (1901): 36–7. Strong notes that as late as 362 AD, ὑπόστασις could be used either in reference to the one essence (μία ὑπόστασις) or the three subsistences (τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις); see Athanasius, *Tome to the Antiochenes*, 5–6, in *NPNF* 2–04:996–7. Zizioulas also claims that the Cappadocian Fathers innovated using ὑπόστασις in referring to the divine persons, because ὑπόστασις was originally synonymous with οὐσία; Zizioulas,

term in Hebrews as 'person' would be anachronous. The parallel structure of the clause also supports the usual translation of ὑπόστασις as 'nature'.[65] In light of the lack of support for the proposal that Adam was created in the image of the person of the Son, one may hold this as a plausible but unconfirmed proposal. Given my previous argument based on the ANE and biblical materials for reading 'image' in Genesis as a physical, representative ruler, the preferred option is to maintain the association of 'image' with the *incarnate* Son.[66] The Son comes on the stage of creation in Act 3 of the drama to fulfil both Israel's messianic hopes as well as the divinely appointed destiny for a perfected humanity. This also preserves the canonical location of the Christological image within the sequence of the theodramatic plot.[67]

In light of the foregoing objections against positing Christ as the archetypal *imago Dei*, I propose that we view the incarnate humanity of Christ as the perfect fulfilment and goal of created humanity, which was certainly envisioned from the beginning but actualised in history. It is Christ who perfectly lives and performs the *imago Dei*, including his redemptive mission that restores the image in the new humanity.[68] And he performs this human role as God-in-the-flesh, a perfect representative acting out the will of the Father in bodily form.[69] Within this narrative we can affirm that Christ is both beginning and end, being both the coagent of creation with the Spirit as well as the *telos* of the human creature who would be perfected in the Spirit.[70]

Being as Communion, 33-7; also sect. 3.3.2.2. Note that the idea of 'substance' or 'property' is the legal meaning behind '*substantia*', adapted by Tertullian in his formula.

[65] Also see the discussion in sect. 5.1.1.1 and the sources listed in nn. 18–20.

[66] See sect. 4.1.1 and 4.1.6.

[67] Also see sect. 5.1.1 for the association of the Christological image with the incarnation.

[68] Col 1:20; Heb 1:3; Eph 2:15; Grenz, 'Jesus as the *Imago Dei*', 620. According to Fee, the Son replaces Adam as the true image-bearer, and as the second Adam, is the beginning of the new creation; Fee, *Pauline Christology*, 299–325. Also see the next section.

[69] John 1:14; Col 1:19–20; 2:9.

[70] E.g. Eph 1:9–10; Irenaeus, *AH* 5.6.1; 5.36.3; Steenberg, *Of God and Man*, 37; Grenz, 'Jesus as the *Imago Dei*', 618.

Having established the conceptual relationship between the Christological *imago Dei* and the anthropological *imago Dei*, we may proceed to explore the various aspects of this dramatic role in reference to Christ. In the remainder of this chapter, I will demonstrate the relevance and highlight the pneumatological nature of the sonship, shaping and sending of the *imago Dei* in the life of Christ.

5.3 Covenant Sonship: Christ's Paradigmatic Filiation

The sonship of Christ is the most basic feature of his *imago Dei* role, and forms the foundation for his shaping and sending. It will also be the basis for the adoption of the Christian as a child of God in Act 4 of the drama. This section delineates the various aspects of Christ's sonship and argues that through the Spirit, he becomes the *incarnate, human son* of God who assumes this role as the paradigmatic *imago Dei*.

5.3.1 Pre-Incarnate and Incarnate Sonship

Speech about Jesus Christ as the Son of God naturally leads us to two kinds of discourse: one pertaining to his pre-incarnate life and relationship to the Father as the divine Son, and the other pertaining to his incarnate life as the fulfilment of messianic sonship and the pattern and genesis of the new humanity.[71] In regards to his divinity, he is the Son of God the Father by eternal generation who, together with the Spirit, created and sustains all things as the two hands of God.[72] In his incarnation, he becomes 'the true image-bearer, the faithful Adamic

---

[71] John 1:14; 3:16; 1 Cor 15:45–49; Rom 8:29; Gal 3:26–27; Heb 2:10; Fee, *Pauline Christology*, 299–325.

[72] Col 1:16–17, cf. v. 13; Heb 1:2–3. On creation through the two 'hands of the Father' see Irenaeus, *AH* 5.6.1; Steenberg, *Of God and Man*, 37; Behr, *Asceticism and Anthropology*, 38; Gunton, *The Triune Creator*, 9, 54. Regarding his divine sonship, Dunn notes that Jesus' use of *abba* in prayer was unusual in Judaism and implies a familial intimacy. That he regularly addressed God this way suggests a relationship distinct from all others; James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 22–26. The saying in Matt 11:27 indicates uniqueness. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 34.

"son" and the loyal "firstborn son" that Israel was intended to be'.[73] Horton refers to these as 'ontological' and 'official' sonship, equating the former with eternal/divine sonship and the latter with Adamic/messianic/adoptive sonship. The problem with this categorisation is that it does not leave room for *divine* acts of the Son that occur outside of his Adamic/messianic office, namely his creation and sustenance of the world. The term 'ontological' is unnecessarily restrictive, unable to account for the relational and functional aspects of his divinity. The title, *pre-incarnate Son of God*, is preferred, designating Christ as one who lives in eternal perichoretic relationship with the Father and the Spirit.[74] He is also sent, along with the Spirit, to create the world and to continue his mission in providentially sustaining the world. But as the *incarnate Son* and the *imago Dei*, he is sent with the Spirit to redeem the world through his revelatory work and sacrificial death and resurrection.[75] Horton's category of 'official' sonship rightly emphasises the Adamic and messianic offices of the incarnate Son. The human title, 'son of God', indeed refers to Adam, Israel and the Davidic king who was the hope of Israel.[76] As I noted in chapter 4, the notion of sonship is primarily relational in nature, but is closely tied to resemblance and representative function. In designating the king as God's son, the OT texts express a special relationship of covenant love.[77] Kingship is certainly a function. But that representative function is inseparably linked with the filial relationship conferred upon the Davidic king. Correspondingly, the Son of God who eternally lives in intimate relationship with his Father is sent to reveal the Father as one who is

---

[73] Michael Horton, *The Christian Faith: A Systematic Theology for Pilgrims On the Way* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011), 459.
[74] John 17:20–26; 10:30.
[75] Col 1:15–20; Heb 1:2–4.
[76] E.g. Luke 3:38; Exod 4:22; Ps 2:7. Wright affirms that for the first century Jew, 'son of God' was an idiomatic way of saying that he was Messiah in the sense of 2 Samuel 7 and Psalm 2; Wright, *RSG*, 726–7.
[77] 2 Sam 7:14; Ps 2:7; Ps 89.

conformed to his character, as well as to act on behalf of the Father as his incarnate representative.[78] The missions of the Son and the Spirit are manifestations of the eternal reciprocal love of the immanent Trinity.[79] We should also note that although the Second Adam and the Messiah are human offices, they are elevated into divine fulfilment by Christ who is both God and man.[80] And although the title 'son of God' originally referred to these human offices, it became for the early Christians an affirmation of the divinity of Christ.[81] Hence he is the 'image' and the 'firstborn', yet also Creator and sustainer, Lord and reconciler, in whom 'all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell'.[82]

A further distinction can be made within Christ's incarnation sonship between 'divine' and 'human' sonship for the simple reason that his human sonship provides a pattern for the new humanity who become 'children of God' in Christ through the Spirit.[83] Although I previously denied that Christ was the ontological archetype of Adamic humanity, he is nevertheless the covenantal archetype of the new humanity in terms of his relational sonship, ethical shaping, and mediatorial sending. Furthermore, given that the new creation entails an ontological change, one could argue that the resurrected Christ is also the ontological archetype of the new humanity that will be fully manifested in the eschaton.[84]

---

[78] John 1:14–18 implies that the Word's intimate fellowship with God qualifies him to make God known; Köstenberger and Swain, *Father, Son and Spirit* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2008), 113.
[79] Also see John 3:34–35; 5:20; 15:9; 17:20–26.
[80] This is not to deny that the Roman designation of the emperor as 'son of god' hints at divinity. But early Christian usage of the term is better regarded as a confrontation of the Roman usage, rather than derived from it; Wright, *RSG*, 728–9.
[81] Wright, *RSG*, 731–6. Note for instance, the clear statement of divine sonship in John 10:30–38. Also see John 3:16–17, 31–36; as well as his unique uses of 'my Father' in John 5:17; 6:40; 8:54; 10:18; 15:15.
[82] Col 1:15–20.
[83] Rom 8:13–17, 29.
[84] 1 Cor 15:42–49.

Tom Smail proposes that not only does the Spirit proceed from the Father through the Son, but the Son is begotten from the Father through the Spirit.[85] The Spirit plays an instrumental role as the Spirit of sonship first in the eternal begetting of the Son and second in his missional conception, anointing, and resurrection as the messianic son of God.[86] Correspondingly, the Spirit of sonship is instrumental first in the creation of original humanity, and second in the adoption of the new humanity in union with Christ.[87] Hence the adoption of humans as children of God in both the original and the new creation is effected through the Spirit and modelled after the intra-Trinitarian relationship between the Father and the Son in its immanent and economic forms.[88] The perfect eternal communion of the divine persons is reflected in a limited way in the covenantal communion granted to humans through the Spirit. But note that within my dramatic model, the *imago Dei* is an *economic* title, designating the Spirit-bearing embodied agent of the kingdom who inhabits the stage of creation. It is the *incarnate* Son who, as the Spirit-anointed Messiah exemplifies human sonship, and as the Spirit-Baptiser makes the way for adoption of others through the new covenant.[89]

5.3.2 Affirmations of Christ's Incarnate Sonship

Affirmations of the incarnate sonship of Christ begin in the earliest moments of the New Testament dramatic sequence, with the annunciation. The virgin Mary is greeted by the angel with news that she would conceive by the Holy Spirit 'the Son of the Most High', who would

---

[85] Tom Smail, *The Giving Gift: The Holy Spirit in Person*, 179–81.
[86] Conception: Luke 1:35; Matt 1:20. Anointing: Matt 3:13–17; Mark 1:9–11; Luke 3:21–22; John 1:32–34. Resurrection: Rom 1:4.
[87] Rom 8:15–17; Gal 3:25–4:7; Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 25.
[88] The immanent-economic distinction is not to be confused with the divine-human distinction. Economic sonship entails both human and divine.
[89] Barth, *CD*, IV/4:22–34; Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 55, 59, 63, 81. Also Gal 3:26; 4:6.

receive the throne of David and reign over Israel forever.[90] The association originating in the OT between the 'Son of God' title and his Messiahship is clear in this passage.[91] Matthew's birth narrative uses the sonship motif specifically to identify Jesus as Israel by way of reference to the exodus, though its primary theme is his kingship.[92] His messianic sonship is publicly affirmed at his baptism by the divine voice from heaven as well as the descent of the Spirit that signals his anointing for his messianic mission.[93] That Jesus, as Israel and Messiah, stands in a covenant of love with his Father is given primary emphasis in the passage. But also implied and thoroughly integrated are the sanctification and missional themes. He is the beloved Son delivered 'out of Egypt' who pleases his Father and is gifted with the Holy Spirit to be the restored Israel, Yahweh's servant and Davidic king.[94] A similar affirmation is found in the transfiguration scene, which appears to parallel the giving of the covenant at Mount Sinai.[95] In place of the Spirit is the glory that shone from the face of Christ and overshadowed them as a cloud.[96] In addition to affirming his belovedness and his pleasing the Father, the voice commands the disciples to 'listen to him'. The Son was sent to be God's 'word' of the new covenant.[97] In both of these key narratives, sonship, shaping and sending are held together as one integrated covenant relationship.[98] Through his incarnation, death and resurrection, the Son of God opens the way for humanity to be incorporated into his filial

---

[90] Luke 1:31–35.

[91] 2 Sam 7:14; 1 Chr 17:13; Pss 2:7; 89:26; cf. Matt 16:16; 26:63; Luke 4:41; John 1:49; 11:27; 20:31.

[92] Matt 2:15; cf. Hos 11:1; Exod 4:22; Matt 2:1–12. John 1:51 also identifies Jesus as Israel; cf. Gen 28:12.

[93] Matt 3:13–17; Mark 1:9–11; Luke 3:21–22; John 1:32–34. The Fourth Gospel diverges by placing the affirmation in the form of John's testimony rather than the voice from heaven. Regarding the descent of the Spirit, see Isa 11:2; 42:1; 1 Sam 16:13. Also see N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London: SPCK; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 537.

[94] Besides the above biblical references, also see Ezek 36:27; Joel 2:28–29; Isa 42:1–9; Heb 1.

[95] Matt 17:1–8; Exod 19–24.

[96] See the discussion in sect. 4.1.5 on 'Image, Glory and Spirit'.

[97] Note that the 'Ten Commandments' are known as the 'Ten Words' (עשרת הדברים) for the Hebrews, Exod 20:1; cf. John 1:14–18; Heb 1:1–2. John 1 similarly alludes to the exodus-Sinai event.

[98] Note that these three elements of relationship, character and mission are also found in Isa 42:1–9. For other significant affirmations of Christ's sonship, also see Matt 8:23–28; 21:33–46; Rom 1:4.

relationship, to become children, and 'images', of God in union with him by adoption through the Spirit.

5.4 Covenant Shaping: Christ's Paradigmatic Obedience

I have previously argued that the *imago Dei* as a covenantal dramatic role includes the three interrelated aspects of sonship, shaping and sending. As a function of his covenant sonship and a pre-requisite of his covenant sending, Christ was shaped and directed by the Spirit and thereby fully conformed to the will of the Father, both negatively in living a blameless life and positively in perfect obedience.[99] He was tempted in every way, yet without sin.[100] He also accomplished the Father's will in his life and ministry, as well as in his death and resurrection.[101] This concurs with Irenaeus, for whom the incarnate Son, as the full image of the Father, is above all the obedient one and the paradigm for human conformity to the will of the Father. He is 'an image of human life lived as the dynamic recipient of the life and action of the Father in the Spirit. Christ realizes the Father's will through his obedient relationship as Son and through the sanctifying chrismation of the Spirit'.[102] In this Trinitarian work of an incarnate obedient life the true image is revealed and a way is made for humans to participate in the divine life of the Triune God through union with Christ and the gift of the Spirit.[103]

The life of Christ is characterised above all by submission to the kingly authority of God his Father and dependence on the wisdom and power of the Father through the Spirit, in contrast

---

[99] Cf. Rom 8:14.
[100] Heb 4:15; also 2:10–18.
[101] E.g. John 15:10; 17:4.
[102] Steenberg, *Of God and Man*, 34–5. Note that in this context, the image is a matter of economy and more specifically of morality.
[103] Steenberg, *Of God and Man*, 37. For Irenaeus, the image is both economic and eternal; see p. 35. I differ in understanding the 'image' to be an economic and dramatic concept, as I have argued. Consequently, I emphasise the incarnation.

to Adam and Israel. Köstenberger and Swain observe that 'Jesus' absolute filial dependence upon the Father characterizes all of his activity in the Gospel of John'.[104] Jesus was confident of his Father's presence with him in his mission because of his perfectly obedient life.[105] In the synoptic baptismal scenes, the Father's voice from heaven affirms the Son as one 'with whom [he] is well pleased'.[106] Matthew's account of the transfiguration repeats the same affirmation.[107] In the synoptics, Christ's submission and dependence is demonstrated in the temptation narratives at the beginning and end of his ministry.[108] In each of these cases, his victory over temptation is the precursor to his effective ministry in life and in death. According to Gunton, Jesus' moral victory is the source of the authority and power for his life and ministry, his 'true speech and effective action. … By this human victory over evil, in a war waged only by the power deriving from obedience to God, the rule of God over an enslaved world is reinaugurated. The struggle climaxes with the cross, because there the accumulated power of evil and Jesus' final temptation to run away from the battle field are overcome in his refusal to do anything but the will of his Father'.[109] The first test demonstrates his life-long resolution of dependence on and submission to the Father, which culminates in his second test, his obedient death on the cross. His obedient death is his 'one act of righteousness' that accomplished salvation for all.[110] His perfectly righteous action

---

[104] They list the examples of his dependence: 'for his life (5:16), power (5:19), knowledge (8:16), message (7:16), mission (7:28), instruction (14:31), authority (17:2), glory (17:24) and love (10:17)'; Köstenberger and Swain, *Father, Son and Spirit*, 118.
[105] John 8:28–29; cf. 12:49–50; 14:31; 15:10.
[106] Matt 3:17; Mark 1:11; Luke 3:22; Horton, *The Christian Faith*, 461.
[107] Matt 17:5.
[108] Luke 4:1–13; 22:39–46; Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology*, 430; Shelton, *Mighty in Word and Deed*, 60–1.
[109] Gunton, *The Christian Faith*, 73–4.
[110] Phil 2:8; Rom 5:18–19.

reflects his perfectly righteous character, and is indispensable to the accomplishment of his mission.[111]

A primary objective of salvation is to recreate humanity in the image of God, restoring and transforming them into bearers of God's glory.[112] We had already observed in the previous chapter that the *imago Dei* in the NT is primarily ethical in reference. In Pauline literature, the interim process of transformation into the image and glory of Christ passively involves the Spirit's work in the believer, but actively involves 'putting on' Christ in daily living and ecclesial relations until the eschaton, when the 'sons of God' will be revealed in glory.[113] Salvation and new creation are achieved 'in Christ' and the redeemed are directed to walk in Christ and to follow his example.[114] It stands to reason that as the image of God and the revelation of his glory, Christ exemplifies perfect ethical conformity to God, being shaped and directed by the Spirit in his obedient living. Christ, as the incarnate Son of God, is the paradigmatic *imago Dei*, the moral prototype, through whom and after whom God's new covenant people would be recreated. Although the act of re-creation would be initiated in the resurrection of Christ, his sinless life was the pre-requisite, the necessary prelude.[115] It was as the sinless obedient one that he would die a sacrificial death. He would carry the *imago Dei* identity consistently from his natural incarnate life through death and resurrection to the birth of the new humanity.

My understanding of salvation and the restoration of the image in Christ is to be distinguished from both Irenaeus and the Reformed tradition. For Irenaeus, Christ ontologically unites

---

[111] Heb 9:14; also consider the close relationship between sanctification and mission in John 17:17–19.
[112] 2 Cor 3:17–18; Fee, *Pauline Christoslogy*, 487–8.
[113] Col 3:1–17; Rom 8:18–30; 2 Cor 3:17–18; cf. 4:4–6.
[114] E.g. Eph 1:3–14; 2:4–10; 4:13, 16, 20–24; 5:2; Phil 2:5; Col 3:10–14; 1 Pet 2:21–23.
[115] E.g. Rom 6:4; Eph 2:4–6, 10; Col 3:1, 3, 10; 1 Cor 15:20–25, 42–49; Wright, *Justification*, 106.

human nature to himself, accustoming the divine and the human natures to one another, and by his recapitulative obedient living, heals humanity. In Reformed theology, Christ lives a vicarious sinless life and dies a substitutionary death, exchanging his righteousness and reward for our sin and punishment.[116] Rather than being a vicarious obedient life, I suggest that Christ's life is a pattern for his disciples to imitate, leading ultimately to his obedient death, which is both a substitutionary death and an exemplary obedience.[117] But the locus of the union is in the death and resurrection of Christ, by which sin is defeated and put to death at the cross, guilt and punishment are imputed to Christ, and the power and status of the resurrection life are communicated to the Christian. Union with Christ in his resurrection through the Spirit is the locus of the Christians' re-creation as *imago Dei* and adoption as 'sons of God'.[118]

5.5 Covenant Sending: Christ's Paradigmatic Mission

Christ's soteriological mission as the divine-human messianic Son sent from the Father is the most prominent aspect of his role as the *imago Dei*.[119] The logic of his dramatic identity begins with his filial relationship with the Father through the Spirit, flows through his Spirit-shaped conformity to the Father and reaches its climax in his Spirit-empowered mission for the Father, which presupposes the former two. And because the Spirit's anointing constitutes the messianic *imago Dei* mission of the Son, his fulfilment of the mission also prepares for

---

[116] Wright has demonstrated convincingly that the imputation of righteousness is not to be found in Paul; Wright, *Justification*, passim; see in particular pp. 135, 158–63, 206. Wright also affirms the centrality of Christ's death and resurrection as the locus of his saving work of justification, new exodus and new creation; e.g. pp. 106, 206, 233, 235.

[117] Exemplary life: Phil 2:5; substitutionary death: Rom 5:6–8; Isa 53:5–6; exemplary death: 1 Pet 2:21.

[118] See my discussion in sect. 5.1.1.1 above. Regarding the language of 'son' and 'sonship', see my discussion in chap. 4 n.1.

[119] Consider, for instance, that the statement of his role as 'the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation' in Col 1:15 is bracketed by references to his mission in vv. 13–14, 20–22. Also see sect. 5.5.2.2 below.

the constitution and mission of the church as the Spirit-baptised, messianic, *imago Dei* community. In fact, Balthasar declares that Jesus' identity is given *along with* his mission, implying that the latter is the definitive element of the former.[120] This radical emphasis on mission may be overstated. The three elements of his covenantal identity are inseparable. But I maintain, in harmony with Balthasar, that it is the mission that drives the dramatic action forward. A quick survey of the key NT *imago Dei* texts shows that their primary concern is economic, incarnational and soteriological.[121] In 2 Corinthians 3:1–4:6 Christ is the content of the gospel, the salvific revelation of divine glory and the mediator of the new covenant. In Colossians 1:15–20 he is the Creator and sustainer of all things, the Lord of the church, the genesis of the resurrection community and the reconciler of all things.[122] Christ as the *imago Dei* and the Son of God was certainly the embodiment of filial relationship with God the Father and of dependent conformity to God's will. But he steps onto the stage of creation ultimately to redeem the world by re-establishing the kingdom of God. The mission of the Son was not limited to redemption, for he was initially sent to create and sustain the world in conjunction with the Spirit in Trinitarian acts of divine kingship. In Act 1 of the drama, the providential rule of the world was delegated to humanity as the *imago Dei*, the embodied

---

[120] Balthasar, *TD*, 3:155; italics mine. He then restates it as follows: 'the imparting of *being* coincides with the imparting of *mission*' and more provocatively, 'as if the Father loved the person of the Son only because this person was identified with his mission'; p. 156; citing John 10:17 for the latter statement. The move from the coincidence of being and mission to their identity gives one pause, as it can implicitly reduce persons to means rather than ends. This Balthasar denies because the mission does not take precedence over his 'I'; p. 168. From my perspective this is both corrected and alleviated by two considerations. First, John 17:24 clearly shows that the Father's love for the Son precedes his mission. Second, the conferral of a mission from God is to be seen as a blessing and not a curse. Such a mission accompanied by his love, rather than depriving the person of dignity, confers it. Also Walter Kasper, *Jesus the Christ*, trans. V. Green (Kent: Burns and Oats; Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1976), 252–3.

[121] Balthasar, *TD*, 3:251; cf. Barth, *CD* III/2, 219.

[122] Cf. Heb 1:1–4 and John 1:14–18, in which the same themes are prevalent but cast in prophetic and new exodus contexts respectively, without explicit use of the *imago Dei* terminology. Douglas Moo asserts that as 'firstborn from the dead' Christ initiates the eschatological resurrection; Moo, *Colossians and Philemon*, 129.

mediators of kingdom blessing. But in Act 3, in the wake of the failures of both Adam and

Israel, Christ takes up the *imago Dei* role as the Spirit-bearing embodied mediator of the

divine kingdom to the fallen world, redeeming creation by defeating the powers of darkness

and re-establishing the rule of God through his death and resurrection.[123] Where the first

Adam failed to speak and to act, the Last Adam faithfully speaks and acts on behalf of the

Father by the power of the Spirit in his obedient life and death. As the recipient of the

consummate blessing of the Father, being fully submitted to the Father's rule, Christ is sent

with the Spirit to mediate kingdom rule and blessing to the world. It is by the power of the

Holy Spirit that he fulfils his mission as the Spirit-anointed Messiah.[124] His messianic mission

may be elaborated following either his threefold office as Prophet, Priest and King, or the

Pentecostal fivefold gospel, which designates Christ as Saviour, Sanctifier, Spirit-Baptiser,

Healer and Soon Coming King. Both of these schemes are potentially useful, but the former

fits more naturally with my dramatic framework, particularly in the transition from

Christology (Act 3) to ecclesiology (Act 4). Its corresponding notions of communication,

reconciliation and rule are inherently relational concepts that translate easily to the mission of

the church.[125] I will therefore make primary use of the threefold office, with attention to

corresponding elements of the fivefold gospel.

5.5.1 The Kingdom of God

The advent of Christ was an eschatological event and represents the coming of the kingdom,

and each of his three official functions serve this purpose in the context of his earthly

ministry. Therefore, a brief discussion of the kingdom motif will help to frame the ensuing

---

[123] Wright, *PFG*, 521.
[124] E.g. Luke 4:18–19; Matt 12:28.
[125] For a helpful application of the fivefold gospel to the ministry of the church, see John Christopher Thomas, ed., *Toward a Pentecostal Ecclesiology: The Church and the Fivefold Gospel* (Cleveland: CPT Press, 2010).

exposition of the various aspects of his mission. A prominent theme in the OT was the kingly rule of Yahweh over creation and over his covenant people, which entailed not only a narrative of provision and deliverance, but also a counter-narrative of the 'hiddenness of Yahweh' and the delay of his promised deliverance.[126] The key demonstration of Yahweh's salvation is the event of the exodus, a deliverance wrought by the decisive triumph of Yahweh over Pharaoh. The lament psalms, along with the experience of exile, testify to the theme of hiddenness and ambiguity. In the face of suffering, injustice and divine silence, the prophets foretold the day of Yahweh, when the divine King of Israel would finally come to execute justice and to deliver Israel from her enemies. 'The long night of exile, the "present evil age", would give way to the dawn of renewal and restoration, the new exodus, the return from exile, "the age to come"'.[127] The day of Yahweh would be a manifestation of God's righteous rule and his covenant faithfulness. But even after the return from the exile, the anticipated day was delayed and true *shalom* eluded the Jewish settlers as they faced conflict and opposition from their Samaritan neighbours and continuing occupation by the Greeks and the Romans.

It is into the context of these long-awaited hopes that John the Baptist proclaimed the imminence of 'the kingdom of God'. The Jews longed for deliverance from foreign oppressors. The awaited Messiah would defeat the enemies and restore the promised Davidic kingdom as a manifestation of the rule of God. It is this eschatological anticipation, foretold by Isaiah, Micah and others, that the incarnation, the self-emplotment of the Divine King,

---

[126] See for example, Walter Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, which uses this contrast as a major structural component.

[127] Wright, *JVG*, 482. The day of Yahweh and the Messiah were distinct themes in the OT, but began to coalesce in such passages as Isa 9 and Mic 5. They certainly come together in Christ's preaching of the kingdom.

would address.[128] But in his advent Jesus addressed this anticipation in a most unexpected manner. He revealed that the core problem was not pagan oppression, but sin, which has infected all humanity, including Israel.[129] He called for a radical shift in national self-perception from the category of victimisation to that of covenant-breaking. Although he delivered some from the oppression of demons and disease, the sin problem required a much more radical solution: the death and resurrection of the Messiah. Note that locating the primary problem in 'sin' is not the same as locating it in 'guilt', which is but one of many consequences of sin. Sin also leads to alienation, corruption and death, as well as various oppressive social, political and economic conditions. Each of these are formidable enemies that threaten creation and life. The successful mission of the Messiah would ultimately defeat every enemy of humankind and creation, the root of which is sin, the greatest personification of which is Satan, and the ultimate consequence of which is death. The defeat of these enemies constitutes a true fulfilment of Jewish hopes for a new exodus and the dawn of the age to come, and re-establishes humanity under the rightful reign of God, which is characterised by the blessing of 'rest' and *shalom*. Just as the original creation reaches its telos in divine *rest*, so the mission of the Messiah and the coming of the kingdom aims to restore all creation to this same *rest*. It is in Christ, the personification of divine rest, that 'every spiritual blessing' is proleptically dispensed in the present age to the new humanity and in the eschaton, consummate rest and life for the world.[130] In light of this overarching mission, we may now proceed to examine Christ's threefold office.

---

[128] Isa 9:1–7; Mic 5; cf. Joel 3:2; Zeph; Obad; etc. Note that the theme of eschatological salvation and reward, as well as judgment of sin, is rooted in the Deuteronomic principle; see Deut 28, 30.
[129] Wright, *PFG*, 750–1, 754.
[130] Matt 11:28–30; Eph 1:3–14; Rev 21–22.

5.5.2 The Threefold Office: Prophet, Priest and King

The threefold office of Christ as Prophet, Priest and King has been used notably in Reformed but also in other traditions to delineate various aspects of his messianic identity. It was found first in Eusebius, but more recently in Martin Bucer and most famously in Calvin.[131] Christ's titles of Prophet, Priest and King represent his functions in revelation, reconciliation and rule (deliverance), and in the soteriological context, address the problems of deception, guilt/alienation and bondage to sin and death. In answer to these, Christ comes to proclaim, provide and dispense kingdom blessing to his covenant people as Prophet, Priest and King. Although the offices can be distinguished from one another in exploring various aspects of his saving work, they are best held together as distinct facets of one unified mission. We may observe that each of these three offices mediate some aspect of God's kingdom in the world.[132] Bucer's statement specifies that it is by the Spirit that Christ fulfils these offices.[133] Since these offices are various aspects of his messianic work, it stand to reason that it is by the Spirit, who is the kingdom anointing upon Christ, that he executes each office.[134] And

---

[131] Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 1.3.8, in *NPNF* 2–01:123; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf201.pdf; accessed 23 Jan 2016; Martin Bucer, *Enarrationes*, in *Sacra Quator Evangelia* (Basel, 1536), 9, 606; Geoffrey Wainwright, *For Our Salvation: Two Approaches to the Work of Christ* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 104; Robert Sherman, *King, Priest, and Prophet: A Trinitarian Theology of Atonement* (New York and London: T & T Clark, 2004), 65; Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.15; also *Westminster Shorter Catechism* QQ 23–26. Bucer likely influenced Calvin, who spent three years (1538–41) in Strasbourg under his tutelage. Sherman, *King, Priest, and Prophet*, 66; Wainwright, *For Our Salvation*, 104.
[132] See Sherman: 'The Reformed reading of the Bible understood each and all of these "offices" as serving a mediatorial function between God and the covenant people. The king mediated the sovereignty of God, the priest mediated the holiness and forgiveness of God, and the prophet mediated the truth and commands of God'; Sherman, *King, Priest, and Prophet*, 74.
[133] 'Rather, by the Holy Spirit he [Christ] directs minds and wills in the way of eternal salvation; by the Spirit he offered himself as an expiatory sacrifice for us, so that we too might become an acceptable offering to God; and by the same Spirit he teaches and admonishes, in order that those destined for his kingdom may be made righteous, holy and blessed in all things'; Martin Bucer, in Sherman, *King, Priest, and Prophet*, 65. Also Abraham Kuyper, *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, 1.6.21, http://biblehub.com/library/kuyper/the_work_of_the_holy_spirit/xxi_not_like_unto_us.htm, 30 Jan 2016.
[134] Luke 4:18; Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.15.2; Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Holy Spirit*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, vol. 5, trans. William Moore and Henry Austin Wilson, ed. Philip Schaff (New York:

since it is the Spirit who mediates the Christian's union with Christ, it is also the Spirit who

mediates the benefits of Christ's work. There are some obvious points of contact between the

threefold office and the Pentecostal fivefold gospel of Christ as Saviour, Sanctifier, Spirit-

Baptiser, Healer and Coming King, and these correlations will be highlighted in what follows.

But we can begin by observing that Christ's role as Saviour involves all three of these

offices.[135] As the human problem is multifaceted, so is the salvation Christ brings, and is

therefore mediated through his prophetic, priestly and kingly actions.

5.5.2.1 Christ as Prophet

In his office as Prophet, Jesus mediates the redemptive communication of God to the world.

Prophecy is arguably the highest form of human communicative action.[136] God's word

mediated through the prophet is an effective word, and much more so when that prophet is the

divine *Logos* incarnate and the Spirit-anointed Messiah, who uniquely mediates grace, truth

and knowledge of the Father.[137] To fallen humanity held in darkness and deception by Satan's

exercise of his role as deceiver, Christ comes as Prophet, teacher and revealer of truth.[138] Just

as God creates by a word of address he also redeems by a communicative act. In John's

gospel the twin metaphors of creation and exodus, alluding to the key covenant-defining

redemptive acts of God, were woven together to express the climactic work of deliverance

from sin and death. The new creation was inaugurated by the *Word* of God that was sent into

Christian Literature Publishing, 1892; PDF ebook, Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf205.html; accessed 14 June 2011), 508.
[135] Note also that Christ's roles as Sanctifier, Healer, Coming King, and possibly even Spirit-Baptiser, may be conceived as aspects of his saving work.
[136] Note that words and actions are not to be sharply distinguished in this respect. For examples of prophetic communicative acts, see Isa 20; Jer 13:1–11; 32:6–15; Ezek 4, 12; Hos 1, 3.
[137] Deut 18:22; Isa 55:11; John 1:1, 14; 14:6–7; cf. Heb 1:1–3.
[138] For the three roles of Satan as deceiver, accuser and tempter, see Gen 3:1–6 and sect. 4.1.7.

the world in fleshly form. The new exodus was achieved through Christ who, in the singular communicative act of his whole life as the 'Lamb of God', reveals the Father, manifests his glory and dispenses grace and truth.[139] That his communicative act was salvific is seen in the concise purpose statement near the end of John's gospel: 'these are written so that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in his name'.[140] Note that the exodus metaphor is also developed in 2 Corinthians 3:1–4:6, in which the new covenant narrative is explicitly associated with Christ as the *imago Dei*. Here the visual metaphor holds primacy: God's glory is manifested in the face of Christ, and those who gaze upon his face are transformed into his image. In both the new creation and new exodus metaphors, Christ is the giver of life through the Spirit and the life he gives consists in the knowledge of God.[141] In the Jubilee proclamation, Christ's Spirit-anointed prophetic voice dispenses liberty from every oppression as a manifestation of God's kingdom and concomitant 'rest'.[142] Here too his prophetic word integrates performative speech with communicative action and is effective in dispelling the curse of sin and death. It is a life-giving, kingdom-dispensing proclamation. One could also trace the Sabbath theme through the synoptics in light of the key statement in Matthew 11:25–30.[143] In dispensing forgiveness of sin, miraculous works of healing and deliverance from demonic oppression Christ proclaims and embodies the kingdom, the new exodus, the Jubilee, the Sabbath rest and the *shalom* of God, pointing backward to the creation that was completed and pronounced 'very

---

[139] John 1:1–18, 29.
[140] John 20:31.
[141] E.g. John 1:4; 4:14; 7:37–39; 17:3; 2 Cor 3:6f; 4:6.
[142] Luke 4:18–19; Isa 61:1–11; also see the following narratives in Luke, e.g. 4:38–44; 6:1–5; and notably 9:1–2; 10:9.
[143] Note that the Jubilee was also a Sabbath, being the culmination of seven Sabbath years.

good', and forward to the new creation that will be the perfect fulfilment of God's intent for the world.[144] Note that the coming of the Messiah and his proclamation of the kingdom is an eschatological event, bringing the future proleptically into the present experience of those who encounter him.

As the Spirit-anointed Prophet, Jesus is also the Sanctifier and Spirit-Baptiser.[145] As the Spirit-conceived Word incarnate who was given the Spirit 'without measure', he embodies divine glory in a manner surpassing every other human being.[146] He not only bears the Spirit and the glory uniquely, but he is thereby uniquely qualified to dispense the Spirit and the glory to redeemed humanity, so that they may be recreated in the image of Christ and that he may become the 'firstborn among many brothers'.[147] It is the Spirit who mediates the word, effectively renewing the creature, giving life and illuminating the mind and heart.[148] Note that the *imago Dei* texts in Romans and 2 Corinthians are concerned with a transformation process wrought by the Spirit that result in moral conformity to Christ. Contrastingly, the Lukan texts give emphasis to the empowering, and particularly the prophetic anointing of the Spirit.[149] Thus the anointing of Jesus becomes the source of the 'anointing', or empowering presence of the Spirit, in the Christian's life.[150] Both corpuses also associate the Spirit with covenant-

---

[144] Rev 21–22.
[145] John 1:33; Kenneth J. Archer, 'The Fivefold Gospel', in Thomas, *Pentecostal Ecclesiology*, 40.
[146] John 1:14; 3:34; 2 Cor 4:6. Recall my argument in the previous chapter that the Shekinah glory of God is to be identified with the Holy Spirit.
[147] Rom 8:29; John 1:33; 2 Cor 3:18.
[148] Calvin, *Institutes*, 1.9.3. Note Calvin's appeal to 2 Cor 3.
[149] E.g. Acts 1:8; 2:4, 17; 4:31. Paraphrasing Irenaeus, Behr writes: 'Jesus, at his baptism, was anointed by the Father with the Spirit so that man might also share in the abundance of his Unction which made him Christ'; Behr, *Asceticism and Anthropology*, 67; also Steenberg, *Of God and Man*, 37. But note that in Irenaeus' text, the unction shared by humanity was *salvific rather than empowering*: 'Therefore did the Spirit of God descend upon Him, [the Spirit] of Him who had promised by the prophets that He would anoint Him, so that we, receiving from the abundance of His unction, might be saved'; Irenaeus, *AH* 3.9.3.
[150] Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.15.2.

initiatory events, though the relational idea of covenant is always laden with ethical and missional implications, as I argued in Chapter 4.[151] Neither the Pauline nor the Lukan corpus should be construed as limiting the Spirit's activity to less than the threefold covenantal function.[152] What is important here is that as Sanctifier and Spirit-Baptiser Christ dispenses the Spirit so that Christians can share in his covenant sonship, shaping and sending. The Holy Spirit becomes the active agent in uniting the church to Christ, so that she is adopted, sanctified and anointed in Christ through the Spirit to be the covenant people and the restored *imago Dei* community in the world.[153] As Prophet, Christ communicates not only God's grace and truth, but most emphatically his love.[154] In view of Augustine's proposal that the Holy Spirit is the gift of love from the Father and the Son, one could also suggest that the life-giving Spirit is the content of his communication to the world, his ultimate gift.[155] As the Spirit is sent from the Father and the Son, he becomes the gift of love to redeemed humanity. Consequently, love is the essence not only of covenant sonship, but also shaping and sending. Love is the relationship, the ethic and the mission of the Spirit-mediated kingdom of the Messiah.

5.5.2.2 Christ as Priest

By virtue of his priestly office, Christ performs the ultimate communicative act of love in reconciling humanity to God.[156] In contrast to the prophetic office, which gives primacy to speech, the notion of a priestly office suggests a greater emphasis on sacramental action that effects reconciliation, though intercessory prayer is also in view. Fallen humanity is alienated

---

[151] E.g. 1 Cor 12:13; Acts 10:44–45.
[152] These matters will be more fully addressed in chap. 7.
[153] Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.1.1, 3.11.5.
[154] John 3:16; 13:1–2, 31–35; 15:9–17; 17:23, 26; 1 Jn 4:9–10; cf. Rom 5:8.
[155] Augustine, *On the Trinity* 15.18.32, 15.19.37; Rom 5:5; 1 Jn 4:12–16; John 1:33; 4:14; 7:37–39; 20:22; cf. Isa 44:3; Joel 2:28; 1 Cor 12:13; Gal 3:14.
[156] John 15:13; Rom 5:8; 1 John 3:16.

from God by guilt and victim to Satan's role as accuser. Christ comes as Priest, advocate and atoning sacrifice in order to reconcile and restore humankind to relationship with God. The Passover-Exodus metaphor, which includes that of Christ as the 'Lamb', is primarily oriented towards salvation as deliverance while the atonement metaphors speak of forgiveness and sanctification, though these two are sometimes combined.[157] These may correspond to the Saviour and Sanctifier roles. Christ's self-giving as an atoning sacrifice to save and to sanctify the church is his definitive act of love, and is accomplished through the Spirit.[158]

Many Pentecostals have associated healing with the atonement, implicitly subsuming it under the priestly ministry.[159] In Isaiah, 'healing' is a matter of cleansing from sin, and therefore associated with salvation and sanctification.[160] But Matthew applies this motif to every kind of healing and clearly points to Christ as Healer.[161] The primary work of Christ as Priest is to mediate reconciliation by providing forgiveness and purification.[162] It may be best to consider physical healing a part of 'salvation', broadly defined, which involves each of the three

---

[157] E.g. John 1:29.

[158] John 15:13; Heb 9:14.

[159] Isa 53:4–5; Matt 8:16–17. Kimberly E. Alexander, 'The Pentecostal Healing Community', in Thomas, *Pentecostal Ecclesiology*, 184–5. This is confirmed by official statements from the Assemblies of God USA (http://ag.org/top/Beliefs/Statement_of_Fundamental_Truths/sft_short.cfm; accessed 21 Feb 2017), the Church of God (Cleveland, TN) (http://www.churchofgod.org/beliefs/declaration-of-faith; accessed 21 Feb 2017), the International Pentecostal Holiness Church (http://iphc.org/beliefs/; accessed 21 Feb 2017), and the Assemblies of God Great Britain (http://www.aog.org.uk/about-us/what-we-believe; accessed 21 Feb 2017). Healing is not explicitly associated with the atonement in the statements of the Elim Pentecostal Church (http://www.elim.org.uk/Articles/417857/Our_Beliefs.aspx; accessed 21 Feb 2017), the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada (https://paoc.org/family/what-we-believe; accessed 21 Feb 2017) and the Apostolic Church of Pentecost (http://acop.ca/acop_faith.php; accessed 21 Feb 2017).

[160] In Isaiah healing from sickness is a metaphor for cleansing from sin (1:5–6, 18;53:5–6, 10–12; cf. 1 Pet 2:24).

[161] That Jewish messianic expectations included healing for sickness is evidenced in the Talmud as well as in the gospels (e.g. Matt 11:4–6; Luke 4:18; R.E.O. White, 'Heal, Health', *Baker Theological Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. Walter A. Elwell (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), 328. But note that healing was also associated with the prophetic office in the OT.

[162] E.g. Heb 9:11–10:18. Note that intercession in these contexts refer to the work of reconciliation (Heb 7:23–25; Isa 53:12).

offices in some way, and will be fully realised in the eschaton, but may be partially experienced in the present through the Spirit's mediation.[163]

Note that the primary *imago Dei* passage in Colossians, while affirming Christ's supremacy, is bracketed by statements of his redemptive work. In the preceding statement deliverance from 'the domain of darkness' entails a transfer 'to the kingdom of [the Father's] beloved Son, in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins'.[164] The 'Christological hymn' recounts not only the story of his creating and sustaining the world, but ultimately leads us back to his reconciling work through the cross and on to the apostolic ministry of Paul.[165] One could argue that it is a soteriological dramatic sequence regarding Christ's salvific performance of the *imago Dei* which continues with Paul's ambassadorial performance. The paraenesis that dominates the remainder of the letter could be the church's performance of the resurrection life in union with Christ. The Messiah's priestly performance of the *imago Dei* reconciles humanity to God and recreates us as the *imago Christi*, leading to the next act of the drama.[166]

Although the atoning sacrifice of Christ is 'finished' at the cross, his larger work of reconciliation and re-creation continues through the events of resurrection, ascension, Pentecost and session at the 'right hand of God'.[167] In sending the Spirit, Christ recreates humanity through union with himself, bringing them by adoption into his filial relationship with the Father to share in the fellowship of the Trinity. Christ's continuing intercession is the

---

[163] In keeping with my abbreviated statement above, we may say that Christ proclaims healing as Prophet (Luke 4:18–19), provides healing as Priest (Isa 53:4–5; Matt 8:16–17) and secures and dispenses healing as King (Matt 8:5–13; 9:1–8; 12:22–29).
[164] Col 1:13.
[165] Col 1:20–2:5.
[166] Col 2:6–4:6; note 3:10.
[167] Finished: John 19:30. Continuing: e.g. Heb 7:22–28; Acts 2:33; 5:31; Rom 8:34; Heb 1:3; cf. 10:12.

basis of the church's continuing fellowship with God. His reconciling work thus includes the sending of the Spirit of adoption as well as his continuing advocacy before the Father on behalf of his people. Furthermore, by sending the Spirit, Christ sanctifies the church to be the temple and priests of God in union with himself, so that they too may offer spiritual sacrifices and make intercession for others.[168] As his Spirit-anointed people, the church mediates and shares not only in his prophethood, but also in his priesthood as the *imago Christi*.

5.5.2.3 Christ as King

In his capacity as King, Christ battles to deliver his creaturely subjects from their enemies. Fallen humanity is held in slavery to sin and death, having fallen to Satan's work as tempter. Christ comes as King to restore creature and creation under the rightful rule of God, delivering humankind from the power of sin and death, and recreating humanity in the *imago Dei*. In his earthly ministry Christ fulfils the kingly role in his Spirit-anointed demonstrations of power over Satan the tempter, over disease and death, and over every kind of alienation suffered by those under the power of sin. He begins his conquest through the Spirit by resisting temptation and undoing the curse of sickness, demon-possession and death.[169] According to Wright, his celebration of the Passover meal, which symbolised Yahweh's return to redeem his people in a new exodus, also communicates that 'Israel's god was about to become king'.[170] But he wins the decisive victory and destroys the work of the devil by bringing the legacy of Adam to its demise at the cross and by rising from the dead in order to

---

[168] 1 Cor 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; Eph 2:20–22; 1 Pet 2:5, 9; Rev 1:6; 5:10; 20:6; Rom 15:15–16.
[169] Luke 4:1–21; Acts 10:38; Matt 4:23–24; 12:28.
[170] Wright, *JVG*, 557.

initiate the new creation and impart the Spirit of life.[171] The drama of *Christus Victor*, which depicts Christ as Saviour, is a function of his kingly office.

The divine-human person of Christ, being the embodiment of Yahweh the God of the covenant, is uniquely qualified to mediate his salvation. In Colossians, the indwelling Holy Spirit is replaced in Christ by 'the fullness of God' and in the Christians by Christ himself.[172] We may observe that, unlike 2 Corinthians, Colossians does not associate the *imago Dei* with the Holy Spirit. But note that the paucity of reference to the Spirit is characteristic of the letter as a whole. According to Bruce, this was likely due to nature of the Colossian heresy, which seemed to be influenced by *Merkabah* mysticism and involved inordinate attention to angels and archons. Paul's response was to emphasise the supremacy and sufficiency of Christ, even attributing to Christ various functions normally attributed to the Spirit.[173] Not only is he the Spirit-anointed Messiah, he is the divine King who assumes humanity in order to elevate the messianic promise to divine fulfilment. In his pre-incarnate kingship he creates and sustains the universe; as the incarnate King he now comes to redeem the world.[174] In Colossians there is a continuity of personal identity through these distinct roles and actions.

In the final scene before his ascension, Jesus commissions his disciples to carry on the work of making kingdom citizens.[175] His ascension signals the beginning of a new act in the drama,

---

[171] Heb 2:14; also Rom 5:12–21; Rom 8; 1 Cor 15:20–28, 42–57.

[172] Col 1:19; 2:9; 1:27.

[173] F. F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 24–28. Compare Eph 1:13–14, 2:22 and 4:30 with Col 1:27 and 3:4; also Eph 4:3 with Col 3:15. Also consider the close functional identity between Christ and the Spirit in 2 Cor 3:17–18.

[174] Note that 'firstborn' in Col 1:15 is royal language, likely alluding to Ps 89:27 and affirming Christ's fulfilment of God's covenant with David. Read in conjunction with Rom 8:29, 'firstborn' may also hint at the restoration of the anthropological *imago Dei* through Christ; cf. Col 3:10.

[175] Matt 28:19–20; cf. 10:7–8; Archer, 'The Fivefold Gospel', 39.

in which he will be bodily absent, yet present in the power of the Spirit.[176] His act of sending

is a delegation of his power and authority to continue the task of establishing the kingdom of

God in the world through the Spirit.[177] Although Christ's person and work were unique in

significant ways, there is also continuity to be found in the identity and mission of the church

as his embodied representatives in the present age.[178] As Christ sends the Spirit to continue

his kingdom mission through the church, there is now a limited 'reversal' of roles between the

Son and the Spirit. In his earthly life, the Son is sent in the power of the Spirit and directed by

the Spirit. In the post-Pentecost situation, the Spirit is sent by the Son to work on his behalf

through the church.[179] The Son's roles as Spirit-anointed Messiah and as Spirit-Baptiser both

entail kingly functions. Within the latter role, the sending of the church and the concomitant

sending of the Spirit are both acts of his kingly office.

Upon his ascension, Christ takes his place 'at the right hand of God', an idiom indicating his

place of authority as co-regent and representative ruler with the Father. His present reign in

heaven corresponds to his reign on earth through the mediation of the Spirit and the church in

a series of functional mediations that extend from the Father through the Son, through the

Spirit and through the church to the world. But note that the Holy Spirit, as the eschatological

agent, also mediates the future realities of Christ's kingdom to the present. The reign of Christ

---

[176] The Lutheran notion of the ubiquitous presence of Christ's body leaves us with two unfavourable options regarding the future resurrected bodies of his people. On the one hand, if all human resurrected bodies are likewise ubiquitous, it seems to suggest that all the divine attributes would be communicated to them as well. The new creation becomes more a matter of the making of gods rather than the re-making of humans. On the other hand, if they are not ubiquitous, there is a disparity between Christ's body and that of the new humanity, against 1 Cor 15:42–49.
[177] Matt 28:18–20; Mark 16:15–18 (but note the textual issue); Luke 24:46–49; John 20:21–23; Acts 1:1–8.
[178] Col 1:20–29; 2 Cor 5:16–21. Note that each of these occur in close proximity to key *imago Dei* passages (Col 1:15–20; 2 Cor 4:4. Acts 1:1–8 is also highly suggestive of this continuity.
[179] John 16:13–15.

through the Spirit is for the church a foretaste and a promise of the blessings of the future kingdom. Similarly, the manifestation of Christ's reign through the church is a testimony that invites the world to participate in the future kingdom. When Christ returns to consummate this drama, his victory will be fully enforced, his kingdom fully established, and the remaining signs of sin and death will be finally eradicated from the created order.[180]

5.6 Summary

In this chapter, I explored Christ's role in the covenantal theodrama as the divine Son of God who, through the Spirit, emplots himself in human form for a divine-human redemptive performance of the *imago Dei*. In the aftermath of Adam's and Israel's failures, the Son of God assumes human nature and takes up the *imago Dei* role, elevating it to divine fulfilment, in order to restore fallen humanity and bring it to its God-intended destiny. He lives perfectly the covenant life in filial relationship with the Father, in Spirit-shaped moral conformity to the Father's will, and in fulfilment of his mission in mediating kingdom blessing to the world. His Spirit-empowered recapitulative performance can be seen to re-establish the kingdom of God in two ways. Retrospectively, he perfectly fulfils the covenant that Adam violated, and in his substitutionary death provides a way out of slavery to Adam's heritage of sin and death. Prospectively, he recreates humanity in his resurrection making a way into the new covenant and its gifts of fellowship, transformation and mission. As the new humanity is united with Christ by the Spirit, it is recreated as the *imago Christi*, the embodied Spirit-bearing kingdom representative who shares in and extends Christ's covenant sonship, shaping and sending upon the stage of creation.

---

[180] It should be obvious that this section corresponds to the last element of the Christological fivefold gospel, the Soon Coming King.

My exposition in this chapter of Act 3 of the *imago Dei* theodrama prepares the way for Act 4, in which the church is constituted as the restored *imago Dei* in union with Christ through the mediation of the Spirit. The development of the ecclesiological *imago Dei* in the next chapter will complete the dramatic sequence necessary for my final argument, that Pentecost is the dramatic moment of the constitution of the church as the restored *imago Dei*, and therefore, Spirit baptism is the experience by which believers are incorporated into the new covenant community to participate in the *imago Dei* role.

CHAPTER 6

ACT 4: A COVENANTAL *IMAGO DEI* SPIRIT ECCLESIOLOGY

The preceding chapters outlined Acts 1 to 3 of the canonical theodrama, in which the *imago Dei* role has been assigned first to Adam's race, then implicitly to Israel, and climactically to Christ whose divine-human performance is its ultimate fulfilment. I proposed that the *imago Dei* in each of these acts may be viewed as the Spirit-bearing embodied mediator of God's kingdom on the stage of creation, a role that entails the Spirit-mediated covenantal aspects of sonship, shaping and sending. Having traced the theological drama from Adam through Israel to its climax in Christ, we now arrive at the movement most critical to my proposal regarding Spirit baptism. A close examination of the particular action involved in Spirit baptism, which I will argue is the creation of the church as the restored *imago Dei*, must await the next chapter, after we have sketched the broader terrain of ecclesiology. An exposition in the present chapter of Act 4, which is the ecclesiological act in the drama, provides us with a necessary context for examining its defining moment. Therefore, this chapter will utilise the framework of the covenantal *imago Dei* drama I have established in the preceding chapters and apply it to ecclesiology. At issue is the question of the expressed divine intent for the church as the *imago Dei* within the context of the canonical theodrama. For our purposes, the church may be defined as the community of God's new covenant people who have been recreated in union with Christ in his death and resurrection through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit to participate in the inaugurated kingdom of God as the restored *imago Dei*.

6.1 The Dramatic Orientation

The transition from the Christological Act 3 to the ecclesiological Act 4 is marked by the twin events of the ascension and Pentecost. In Act 3, Christ was the paradigmatic *imago Dei*, being not only the true fulfilment of the divinely intended role of humanity as the Spirit-bearing

embodied agent of God's kingdom upon the stage of creation, but also the pattern and progenitor of the new humanity which would be recreated in him. His ascension marks the end of Act 3 in the theological drama, which featured his bodily presence on the earth. Christ's announcement to his disciples of his departure was accompanied by the promise of 'another παράκλητος', the Holy Spirit, who would mediate Christ's presence, teaching and works.[1] For this reason Christ was able to promise his presence with the disciples even as he ascends into heaven.[2] The sending of the Spirit at Pentecost commences Act 4, in which the church corporately assumes the role of the *imago Dei*, becoming agents of God's kingdom in the world. As the Spirit unites the church with Christ he constitutes her as the new humanity and begins to transform her into the *imago Christi*. Just as Christ was the embodied covenantal representative of God, so the church is now the embodied covenantal representative of Christ and derivatively, of God. The multiple levels of sending signifies multiple levels of mediation: The Son is sent by the Father through the Spirit; the Spirit is sent by the Father and the Son; and the church is sent by the Son through the Spirit. Therefore, Christ's presence to the church is now mediated through the Spirit, and his presence to the world is now mediated through the Spirit and the church.[3] This critical transition from Christ to the church raises issues that bear consequences for multiple theological loci, not least for her status as the *imago Dei*, and therefore requires careful attention.

---

[1] John 14:16–31; 15:26; 16:7–15. παράκλητος = advocate, intercessor, helper.
[2] Acts 1:1–11; cf. Matt 28:20.
[3] Andreas J. Köstenberger, *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples According to the Fourth Gospel: With Implications for the Fourth Gospel's Purpose and the Mission of the Contemporary Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 191. This will be developed later in this chapter.

6.1.1 Ascension and Pentecost

The ascension of Christ coincides with the sending of the Spirit at Pentecost. Although the two events are temporally distinct, they are theologically linked.[4] Jesus' promise in the Johannine farewell discourse to send the Spirit is part of a cluster of final instructions to his disciples in which he (1) announces his departure, (2) comforts them with the promise of his return as well as the promise of the Spirit and (3) instructs them regarding their life and mission during his intermediate absence.[5] The departure of the King ironically signals a continuing advance of the kingdom rather than a regress.[6] This is because the bodily absence of Christ is accompanied by his spiritual presence, which is mediated through the Holy Spirit.[7] Note that Christ's sending of his disciples is both analogous to his own mission and accompanied by the impartation of the Spirit.[8] The mission of the Son is continued in the mission of the church by the agency of the Spirit, as strongly implied in Acts 1:1–2 and by the body metaphor, which I will address later in this chapter. In Trinitarian fashion, this God-initiated mission was accomplished in the Son and is being perfected by the Spirit working through the church until the eschaton, when his kingdom will be fully realised.

Regarding the Spirit's mediation of the Son, one could distinguish between his mission to the world on one hand, and his mission to the church and through the church to the world on the

---

[4] Acts 1:3–8; 2:1. Farrow, *Ascension and Ecclesia*, 176–7.

[5] John 14–16. Farrow, *Ascension and Ecclesia*, 37–8.

[6] John 14:12; cf. Matt 18–20.

[7] Gunton observes that the celebration of the Lord's Supper '"in memory of him, until he comes" (1 Cor. 11.24–6) implies that he is not there, and therefore a real absence. The crucial action is accordingly that which brings the church into real relation with the ascended and bodily absent Lord whose presence this side of the end is mediated by the Spirit'; Gunton, *The Christian Faith*, 133. Vanhoozer remarks that the exodus of Jesus makes way for the entrance of the Holy Spirit; Vanhoozer, *Drama of Doctrine*, 388; see John 16:7; also Simon Chan, 'Mother Church: Toward a Pentecostal Ecclesiology', *Pneuma* 22.2 (Fall 2000): 198.

[8] John 20:21–22.

other. The Spirit would directly 'convict the world concerning sin and righteousness and judgment'.[9] He would also teach, guide, comfort and empower the church.[10] It is primarily by indwelling the church to join her to Christ, and by directing and empowering the church's mission, that the Spirit would complete this Trinitarian mission.[11]

6.1.2 Union with Christ through the Spirit

The Spirit's work in uniting the church to Christ plays a crucial role in restoring humanity in the *imago Dei*, and therefore must be addressed before we proceed. Some aspects of the current dialogues on justification also require attention, due to their implications for our discussion. Calvin stated that the Holy Spirit is the bond by which the Christian is united to Christ and consequently enjoys his benefits. What Christ has accomplished in the past through his death and resurrection is now mediated to the church and made effective through the Spirit.[12] This concept is sometimes referred to as 'mystical union' because of its transcendent nature and in order to designate the church as Christ's mystical body in contradistinction to his natural body.[13] Calvin begins his entire discussion of the application of the benefits of Christ with a statement of the union of Christians with Christ through the Holy Spirit.[14] For Calvin, the entire *ordo salutis*, including justification, sanctification and

---

[9] John 16:8–11. This leaves room for the Spirit to providentially prepare individuals to receive the proclamation of the gospel, as well as to otherwise reveal Christ to those outside the church; Terrance L. Tiessen, *Who Can Be Saved? Reassessing Salvation in Christ and World Religions* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 113–22.

[10] John 16:12–15; 14:26ff; 15:1ff. The theme of empowerment is implied in John 14:12 and 15:1ff. It is made explicit in Acts 1:8.

[11] John 14:26; 15:4–5, 26–27; 16:12–15; 20:21–23; cf. Acts 1:1–11.

[12] Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.1.1, 3.11.5; also see Barth, *CD*, IV/4:22–34; Horton, *People and Place*, 18.

[13] Horton, *The Christian Faith*, 590; Demarest, *The Cross and Salvation*, 319–20.

[14] Calvin, *Institutes* 3.1.1. Book Three of the *Institutes* is entitled 'The Way in Which We Receive the Grace of Christ: What Benefits Come to Us from It, and What Effects Follow'. For Horton, who follows the classical Reformed tradition, regeneration logically precedes faith and repentance. In my reading of Calvin and 2 Cor 5:17, regeneration appears to be a benefit of incorporation into Christ. Gal 3:2, 5 strongly implies that faith precedes Spirit reception, which in the Galatian context is more soteriological (i.e. regeneration, adoption) and

glorification, is dependent on covenantal incorporation into Christ through the Holy Spirit, which occurs at the moment of genuine repentance and faith. That the Christian's incorporation into Christ is a function of Spirit baptism is clearly supported in Paul: 'For in one Spirit we were all baptized into one body—Jews or Greeks, slaves or free—and all were made to drink of one Spirit'. James Dunn has argued that 'the gift of the Spirit is what makes us … sons of God and puts us ἐν Χριστῷ'.[15] In the Johannine farewell discourse, it is the Spirit who takes that which belongs to the Son and mediates it to the disciples.[16]

Michael Horton ambiguously uses the language of union in reference to both the broader concept of covenantal union with Christ and the Christian's experiential transformative participation in Christ.[17] This results in a rather confused discussion in which union is sometimes logically prior to justification, and sometimes subsequent to and grounded in justification.[18] In his monograph, *Covenant and Salvation*, Horton makes an excellent statement regarding mystical union with Christ as the wider field that integrates justification, sanctification and glorification.[19] He then supplies some pertinent quotes from Calvin to this effect, only to arrive at a *non-sequitur* conclusion: 'Forensic justification through faith alone is the foundation of union with Christ in all of its renewing aspects'.[20] For sake of clarity it

---

transformational than charismatic. Also see James K. Beilby and Paul Rhodes Eddy, eds., *Justification: Five Views* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011), 26–7.

[15] I.e. 'in Christ'; Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 108.

[16] 1 Cor 12:13; John 14:26; 16:13–15.

[17] The latter he refers to as 'organic union', or simply 'union'; Horton, *The Christian Faith*, 591; Bruce Demarest, *The Cross and Salvation: The Doctrine of Salvation* (Wheaton: Crossway, 1997), 325.

[18] Horton, *The Christian Faith*, 588–9, 596–9. Horton's most balanced statements speak of 'mystical union' in the inclusive sense; p. 597. Unfortunately, this occurs in the minority of instances.

[19] Horton, *Covenant and Salvation*, 141.

[20] Horton: 'Regardless of whether union temporally preceded justification, Calvin is clear that the latter is the basis for the former: … "But our partaking of Christ … is rather the effect of believing"'; Calvin, *Commentary on Ephesians*, in *CO* 51 (CR 79):186–87, on Eph 3:17; Horton, *Covenant and Salvation*, 143. Cf. Pringle's translation: 'The fellowship which we have with Christ is the consequence of faith'; Calvin, *Commentary on*

seems best to reserve this terminology for the covenantal union with Christ through the Spirit by which his salvific benefits are distributed.

Wright agrees that justification is a result of covenantal incorporation into Christ, since it is located 'in Christ'.[21] He also argues that justification in Paul is both forensic and covenantal, since the covenant has an inherently forensic element.[22]

> This God will not only act in fidelity to the covenant; when he does so, that will be the means by which he will *put all things right, like a judge finally settling a case*. The *forensic* meaning of the divine righteousness thus originated in the *covenantal* context in the first place (Israel's belief in the ultimate justice of the one God; Israel's appeal to that ultimate justice as the source of rescue and vindication), and belongs closely with it.[23]

Note that the justification of Israel, on this account, is the decision in Israel's favour that comes at the anticipated 'Day of Yahweh'. Read against the background of John the Baptist's preaching, Spirit baptism was the expected sign of the divine vindication of Israel against her enemies, and the means of cleansing and restoring Israel for the age to come.[24] While both covenant membership and sonship are governed by a forensic element, they are both essentially relational concepts which come to fruition in a moral transformative experience. I propose that at the moment of faith, Christians are covenantally incorporated into Christ through the Spirit to enjoy all the benefits wrought by Christ's salvific work, including

---

Galatians, Ephesians, trans. William Pringle (Grand Rapids: CCEL), 220. Horton's error lies in his equating 'believing' with 'justification', and 'fellowship' with the more technical concept of 'union'. Even if we grant Horton's preferred translation, Calvin's statement simply places *faith*, rather than *justification*, before union.
[21] Wright, *PFG*, 944, 949–50; also Vanhoozer, 'Wrighting the Wrongs of the Reformation? The State of the Union with Christ in St. Paul and Protestant Soteriology', pp. 235–59 in *Jesus, Paul and the People of God: A Theological Dialogue with N.T. Wright*, ed. N. Perrin and R. B. Hays (Downers Grove: IVP, 2011).
[22] Wright, *Justification*, 206; Wright, *PFG*, 530, 948.
[23] Wright, *PFG*, 935; italics original.
[24] Cf. Matt 3:16–17 and par.; Turner, *Power*, 182–3, 185, 211, 301, 315. This causes a slight discrepancy regarding the place of Spirit baptism in relation to justification in the *ordo salutis*. But we need to keep in mind that John's warning of a final judgment was not fulfilled in the way he expected at the advent of Christ. John had expected Spirit baptism to be the reward of the righteous. But when Christ came, he baptised in the Spirit to create a righteous people.

justification, sanctification, and ultimately glorification. It is the Holy Spirit who mediates all the benefits of Christ's work.[25]

Macchia's contributions on justification also requires treatment, not least because he equates justification with Spirit baptism. He eschews both the Protestant forensic model and the Catholic transformative model, and instead proposes that justification consists in right relation and participation in the divine Trinitarian life through the indwelling of the Spirit.[26] Macchia's model is relational and eschatological, and fundamentally equates justification with his own broad conception of Spirit baptism. The eschatological component can be supported by the Pauline notion of resurrection as vindication, first of Christ, then his covenant people with him.[27] But such vindication is forensic and covenantal in nature, rather than 'relational'. Although justification may *result* in communion, nowhere in Paul is it *equated* with communion.[28] Macchia argues that in Galatians, both justification and Spirit reception are attributed to faith and not the law.[29] But attributing both to a common means of reception does not specify the relationship between the two. Paul seems to be arguing that since the Galatians received the Spirit by faith, they also receive justification by faith, thus implying that Spirit-reception logically precedes justification.[30]

In broadening justification to include Spirit-reception and relational communion, Macchia expands the term beyond conventional usage, as he does with Spirit baptism. There are

---

[25] Rom 5:1–2; Gal 3:2–9, 14.
[26] Macchia, *Justified in the Spirit*, 13, 39, 134.
[27] Macchia, *Justified in the Spirit*, 191–3; Wright, *Paul*, 935; Rom 1:4; 4:23–25; 8:10–11.
[28] E.g. Wright, *Paul*, 935–6, 940. In Rom 5:1–2, justification appears to be logically prior to 'peace' and 'access'.
[29] Macchia, *Justified in the Spirit*, 196; Gal 2:16; 3:1–8, 14. Macchia makes the same argument in 'Justification and the Spirit: An Appreciative Interaction with N.T. Wright', *Pentecostal Theology and the Theological Vision of N.T. Wright: A Conversation*, ed. Janet Meyer Everts and Jeffrey S. Lamp (Cleveland, TN: CPT, 2015), 79–80.
[30] Gal 3:2–6.

certainly benefits to bringing together concepts that have been wrongly separated from one another. But the attendant danger is that as theological terms are redefined to include a broad scope of concepts, they can lose their distinctive contribution. Forensic justification, achieved through covenantal union with Christ in his death and resurrection, carries implications regarding the nature of covenant transgression and eschatological judgment that are lost when justification is dissolved into Spirit-reception and participation in the divine life. This theological content can be better preserved by maintaining the distinctions between terms while also articulating appropriate relationships between them.[31] Similarly, the Roman Catholic notion of justification as infused righteousness, which originates in Augustine but developed through the Middle Ages, tends to conflate justification with sanctification.[32] Regarding Paul's use of the terms, Wright has shown that 'the *dikaios* root, though it is indeed *related closely* to the whole theme of human salvation by God's mercy and grace through Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, does not *denote* that entire sequence of thought … but rather denotes *one specific aspect of* or *moment within* that sequence of thought'. What it

[31] Wright, *Paul*, 934; also p. 928: 'The theme of "covenant" and "covenant faithfulness" is the full biblical setting for what has often been spoken of as the "relational" aspect of the notion of *tsedaqah/dikaiosynē*. By itself, the word "relational" is vague, suggesting that "justification" is about "someone's relationship with God". That, in a very general sense, is not untrue, but to substitute "relation" for "covenant" is to take a large step away from historical moorings'; contra Macchia, *Justified in the Spirit*, 134, in which he appeals to the OT concept of covenant faithfulness to support his relational view of justification.
[32] Eddy, Beilby and Enderlein, 'Justification in Historical Perspective, in Beilby and Eddy, *Justification*, 29; Collins and Rafferty, 'Roman Catholic View', in Beilby and Eddy, *Justification*, 271, 277, 279–80; Gregg R. Allison, *Historical Theology: An Introduction to Christian Doctrine* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011), 501–2; Augustine, *On the Spirit and the Letter*, 18, 50–52, in *NPNF* 1–05:324–5, 369–72. My brief statement reflects both the Council of Trent and the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*, by Lutheran World Federation and the Roman Catholic Church. See http://history.hanover.edu/texts/trent/ct06.html; accessed 21 March 2017, sixth session, chap. 10; http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/documents/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_31101999_cath-luth-joint-declaration_en.html; accessed 6 March 2017, 4.2.24, 4.3.27.

denotes is not '*an action which transforms someone* so much as *a declaration which grants them a status*'.[33]

I want to suggest that Spirit reception and justification are distinct, and that Spirit reception is logically prior to justification, though they are temporally simultaneous. This is because the Holy Spirit is not only a sign, but also the active agent in creating the covenantal bond between Christ and his people. I argued earlier that the specific locus of Christ's saving work in his incarnate life is in his obedient death and resurrection. Certainly, his teachings and miracles testify to the coming kingdom. But it is his death and resurrection that breaks us free from the oppressive, death-dealing legacy of Adamic headship and initiates the new creation and the new humanity under Christ. As an act of penal substitution his death purchases forgiveness. As a sacrifice it purifies from sin. As a ransom it procures release from slavery. His resurrection is the genesis of new creation and opens up the availability of citizenship in his kingdom and new life in communion with the Triune God. Calvin affirms that all such benefits are located 'in Christ', and enjoyed by virtue of the church's being covenantally united with Christ through the Spirit by faith.[34] It is the Spirit who creates this union at Pentecost and so brings the church into the covenant and all its benefits, including its forensic, relational and transformative aspects.[35] Individual Christians are pneumatically incorporated into Christ and the church at the moment of faith, consequently sharing the same benefits.

---

[33] Wright, *Justification*, 87, 91; italics original. In his response to Macchia, he rightly argues: 'Ecclesial unity is not based, for Paul, on the transformation of character through the Spirit, vital though that is. … It is based on the fact that all believers share the same *status*'; Wright, 'The Word and the Wind: A Response', in *Pentecostal Theology*, 168.
[34] Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.1.1; Eph 1:3–14.
[35] Rom 8:9–10; 1 Cor 12:13; Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.1.1.

Forensically, this incorporation confers forgiveness of sins upon the subject, as well as filial status and the vindication of having been raised with Christ and 'seated … with him in heavenly places'.[36] These privileges are present foretastes of the coming kingdom, which will be consummated at the Second Advent when Christ's people are resurrected and vindicated. Justification, as the vindication of his covenant people, is an eschatological kingdom reality that was achieved through Christ's death and resurrection, but is brought into present experience by the Spirit.[37] *Relationally*, Christians have been '[reconciled] to God … through the cross', given 'access in [the] Spirit to the Father', and incorporated as 'fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God'.[38] In the eschaton, they will live in the consummate presence of God and experience fullness of life in communion with him.[39] *Transformatively*, the Christians' sanctification is rooted in their having been purchased and purified by the sacrificial death of Christ. They are progressively being made holy in communion with God through the Spirit until the eschaton, when they will be glorified and perfected in the likeness of Christ. In every way, salvation was achieved and inaugurated in the past, is covenantally applied and proleptically experienced in the present, and will be consummated in the future. And it is the Holy Spirit who mediates the past work of Christ and the future kingdom of God into present experience.

Note that in this model, justification, reconciliation and sanctification are distinct but interconnected features of a holistically conceived salvation bestowed in union with Christ through the Spirit. The 'hope of righteousness' entails final vindication, which is

---

[36] Eph 1:5, 7; 2:5–6; cf. 1:20; Rom 8:1–4, 14–17. Also see Wright, *Paul*, 935–6, 944–9.
[37] Gal 5:5; Eph 1:13–14; Rom 5:5; 8:10–11, 23.
[38] Eph 2:16–19.
[39] Rev 21–22.

accompanied by glorification and moral perfection. Similarly, the inauguration of justification is also accompanied by the transformative presence of the Spirit.[40] Consequently, justification is not 'legal fiction', but is organically linked with sanctification as a present foretaste of a future promise. The Roman Catholic penchant for conflating these elements is overcome by maintaining a clear distinction between justification and sanctification. The corresponding concern for transformation is affirmed by positing sanctification and glorification as essential aspects of salvation for the glory of God.[41] The Protestant penchant for dichotomising these elements is also overcome by maintaining the relational aspect of salvation as the principle that links the forensic with the transformative.[42] The corresponding principles of *sola fide* and *sola gratia* are affirmed by maintaining forensic justification as logically prior to sanctification. All this points to reconciliation as the crucial centrepiece of salvation, with divine glory as the ultimate end. Just as the covenant is essentially relational in nature, so salvation, which covenantally restores humankind, is reconciliatory and therefore relational at its core.[43] With Macchia we can affirm that God's primary purpose in creation is to expand the blessing of his intra-Trinitarian fellowship to humanity, and through them to extend his kingdom blessing and abundant life to the rest of creation. Likewise, his purpose in redemption is to restore humanity to this life-giving communion and through them to restore all creation to his kingdom.[44] In agreement with Irenaeus, who stated that 'the glory of God is a living man', we can affirm that the restoration of the *imago Dei* works to the glory of God

---

[40] Gal 3:2–6, 14; 5:5, 16–18, 22–25; Rom 5:1–5; 8:1–39. 1 Pet 1:3–9; 2 Pet 1:3–4; 1 John 3:2–3.
[41] Eph 1:3–14; Phil 1:9–11.
[42] Cf. Calvin, *Institutes* 2.11.10: 'For they believed especially in the Mediator; and they did not doubt that through him the Spirit was given to them that they might do good, and that they were pardoned whenever they sinned'.
[43] John 17:3; Irenaeus, *AH* 4.20.5.
[44] Macchia, *Baptized*, 116–7.

and the human enjoyment of communion with him.[45] The organic link between justification and communion is ensured because the indwelling Spirit mediates all aspects of this holistic salvation.

6.2 The Church as *Imago Christi*

I have defined the *imago Dei* as a theodramatic role that entails Spirit-mediated participation in covenant sonship, shaping and sending. In the dramatic context the *imago Dei* functions as an embodied Spirit-bearing covenant agent who mediates God's kingdom blessing to the world. This role is perfectly fulfilled in Jesus who as the Spirit-anointed Messiah lived in covenant relationship with God, exemplified conformity to the Father's will, and fulfilled his mission in proclaiming and re-establishing the kingdom of God in the world for the redemption of his creatures. The church's performance of the role is initiated when she is joined to Christ in covenantal union, thereby becoming the *imago Christi*, and sharing in all three aspects of Christ's *imago Dei* role. In the same manner that the Spirit was the kingdom anointing upon Christ who marks him as God's Son, leads him in God's will and empowers him for God's work in the world, the Spirit also incorporates the church as God's people, shapes her according to his will and empowers her to continue the work of proclaiming God's kingdom through her performative speech and communicative action. As Christ mediates God to humanity, so the church now mediates Christ to the world as the *imago Christi* and derivatively mediates God to the world as the *imago Dei*.[46] Luke's two-volume work chronicles in parallel fashion first the Spirit-empowered proclamation and accompanying

---

[45] Irenaeus, *AH*, 4.20.7; cf. Westminster Shorter Catechism, Q1.A.: 'Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever'.
[46] McFarland, *The Divine Image*, 165–66.

miraculous signs of Jesus followed by the analogous Spirit-empowered proclamation and signs through his disciples.[47] The analogy between Christ and the church is also present in John. In the Farewell Discourse, Jesus reveals that his works are a mediation of the Father's works, and that this mediation is based on their mutual indwelling. He proceeds to foretell the disciples' mediation of his own works, which is also based on love and mutual indwelling mediated through the Spirit.[48] Köstenberger and Swain suggest that Johannine analogies between the Son and his brothers imply the Spirit as the author of the analogy.[49] It is the Spirit who joins the church to Christ, and it is also the Spirit who anoints the church to be the embodied representative of Christ in a manner that parallels the Spirit's anointing of Christ as the embodied representative of the Father. This is implied in the Johannine *missiō*: 'As the Father has sent me, so I am sending you. … Receive the Holy Spirit'.[50] As the church is united with Christ through the Spirit, she now participates in the covenantal sonship, shaping and sending of Christ.[51] It is this union and participation that defines the church's covenantal identity as the *imago Christi*.

Given the emplotment of Christ as the God's image and the establishment of the church as Christ's image, there is a series of pneumatological mediations from God the Father through the Son through the church to the world. Just as the unembodied God was bodily present through Christ, the ascended Christ is now present through the embodied church by the

---

[47] E.g. Luke 4:14–15; 9:1–6; Acts 1:1–2; 2:42–43.
[48] John 14:10–17; 15:1–11; 15:26–27.
[49] E.g. (1) The Father glorifies himself in the Son by answering his prayers, and by answering the disciples' prayers in Jesus' name; (2) The Son glorifies the Father by bearing fruit, as will the disciples; (3) As the world hated and persecuted Jesus, so they will hate and persecute his disciples; Köstenberger and Swain, *Father, Son, and Spirit*, 147.
[50] John 20:21–22.
[51] Köstenberger, *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples*, 192, 195. See my discussion later in this chapter.

indwelling of the Spirit.[52] In her proclamation of Christ, who is the unique Mediator of the covenant and the kingdom, the church becomes a secondary 'mediator' of God to the world.[53] By making the distinction between Christ's salvific mediation and the church's proclamatory mediation, we guard against the error of presenting the church as a replacement for Christ. The analogy between Christ and the church is limited by the uniqueness of his incarnation and atonement.[54] The church's mediation consists of an embodied proclamation, not as God incarnate, but as a witness who testifies to Christ and his kingdom in her speech and actions. Note that in the present context, as in previous acts, the ontology of the *imago Dei* forms the basis and presupposition for its function.[55] The church's embodiment and communicative agency make way for her human performative speech and communicative action upon the stage of creation.

6.3 Covenant Sonship: The Church as the Family of God

In light of the exposition of the sonship, shaping and sending of Christ in chapter 5, and church's union with Christ in the previous section, the participation of the church in these aspects of Christ's *imago Dei* role follows naturally. I have shown that sonship is the foundational element of the covenant relationship from which the other two originate. In the covenantal union forged by the Spirit between Christ and the church, she is constituted as the *imago Dei* and the way is opened for her members to participate in the Son's filial relationship with the Father. As I observed in chapter 4, this is the aspect of the *imago* Dei

---

[52] E.g. John 14:12, 16–17.
[53] Note that kingdom and covenant are distinct but closely related concepts. The covenant regulates the relationship between God the King and the church as his people, thus bringing them into the realm of his kingdom.
[54] 1 Tim 2:5; Köstenberger, *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples*, 195.
[55] See sect. 4.1.6 and 5.1.1.

that corresponds to the 'relational' views of the image. The believer's sonship entails both a legal status and a relational communion that is accessed by faith and mediated through the Spirit. In the Fourth Gospel, those who are regenerated or 'born' of the Spirit become children of God and gain access to his kingdom.[56] In Romans adoption through the Spirit of sonship entails becoming heirs through Christ of the hope of resurrection and glorification.[57] But while sonship includes a legal element, it also entails a relationship with the Father as recipients of his love, which forms the foundation of election and redemption. In terms of sonship, the legal and the relational cannot be separated, since love and blessing are closely linked to inheritance.[58] Note also that adoption into sonship is eschatological. It is inaugurated in the present, but awaits consummation in the eschaton, when participants will be fully 'adopted as sons' and recreated as the new humanity through the resurrection of the body.[59]

6.3.1 The Familial Metaphor

Familial themes were already present in the OT. Indeed, Yahweh's covenant with Abram entailed the making of a family that would become a nation. As God's people, Israel was an extended family covenantally adopted to be Yahweh's 'firstborn son'. At times the marriage metaphor was substituted so that Israel was corporately referred to as Yahweh's bride.[60] The old covenant was inherently relational in nature. With the advent of Christ, the covenantal identity of Israel was now located in the person of Jesus, who was identified as both the Son of Abraham and the Son of God. Correspondingly, the church's new covenant relationship with Christ is often depicted in familial metaphors. The church is the 'bride of Christ' and

---

[56] John 1:12–13; 3:3–8; Gal 3:7–9; 4:4–7.
[57] Rom 8:15–30.
[58] Deut 7; Eph 1:3–14; Rom 5:5; 8:15–39; John 3:16; 13:1; 15:9–13; 17:6–26; Ps 2:7–8; cf. Gen 27:35, 37. 'Inheritance' in the NT texts tend to be associated with freedom, glory and rulership, and seems to approximate the various aspects of 'the kingdom of God' in NT usage.
[59] Rom 8:23; 1 Cor 15.
[60] Exod 4:23; Jer 2:2; Hos 1.

Christians are 'sons of God'. Rather than rushing to neutralise the gendered language, it seems advantageous to first extract the implications of the particular terms and to apply them inclusively to the church as a community of males and females. The term 'bride' implies exclusivity, intimacy, beauty and affection, as well as sacrificial courtship on the part of the bridegroom.[61] The metaphor of sonship implies favour, inheritance, resemblance and representation.[62] The abolition of gender, class and racial distinctions in Christ affords all of these privileges and responsibilities indiscriminately to all who are 'in Christ', whether male or female.[63] Moreover, the familial metaphor implies that the church is not merely a collection of individual Christians, but a community that is constituted and organically unified by the Spirit. Just as the Spirit incorporates believers into Christ, so the same Spirit continues to be the bond of love that mystically and relationally unites the church as the body of Christ and the family of God.[64]

6.4 Covenant Shaping: The Church as the Temple of the Holy Spirit

As the church is united with Christ through the Spirit to participate in his *imago Dei* role, she shares not only in the filiation of the Son, but also in his sanctification. This aspect of the image corresponds to the 'ethical' view held by Luther and Calvin. The language of 'sharing in sanctification' is not to be misinterpreted to mean the forensic imputation of the holiness of

---

[61] Eph 5:25–33.
[62] Rom 8; Gal 4. Also see chap. 4.
[63] Gal 3:27–29. Note that the primary implication of the sonship metaphor in Gal 3–4 is that of inheritance. While it is not within the scope of my intentions here to advocate particular positions regarding the status of Israel and the church in God's economy, nor the status of men and women in church leadership, we may observe that there is considerable analogy between the issues of racial and gender equality that could be explored.
[64] Eph 4:3–4. 'The way forward for evangelicals (and here we must include Pentecostals) is to recognize that the church in its gathering around word and sacrament is no longer just a collectivity of individuals, but is constituted as corporate entity of the Spirit. It is the body of Christ and the temple of the Spirit'; Simon Chan, *Pentecostal Ecclesiology*, 79.

Christ to the believer.[65] Rather, the sanctity of Christ is the basis for the sanctity of the church.[66] The principle of the church's sanctification is rooted in her consecration to God in union with Christ. Its content derives from her participation in the Spirit of the resurrection of Christ, and is manifested in conformity to Christ.[67] Calvin states that the Spirit is the 'root and seed of heavenly life in us', and 'by his secret watering the Spirit makes us fruitful to bring forth the buds of righteousness'. It is by participation in the Spirit that the Christian experiences the love of God and the grace of Christ, and so is sanctified.[68] One can argue that it is through communion with God, in union with Christ and mediated through the Spirit, that believers participate in Christ's resurrection life and are transformed into his likeness.[69]

The Spirit's work in transforming the people of God, which I have called covenant shaping, is the natural consequence of covenant sonship. Those who are incorporated into Christ through the Spirit's indwelling become sons and daughters of God who enjoy full covenant status as his people. As it was in the old covenant, so the new covenant people are called to be a holy community distinguished by the presence of God's glory and by their moral conformity to God's character and will. The same Spirit who mediates the adoption of Christians into sonship also mediates their shaping in conformity 'to the image of [the] Son, in order that he might be the firstborn among many brothers'.[70] The content of their communion with the Father is also the means of their shaping. As adopted children of God continue to behold 'the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ', they are also transformed by the Spirit 'into the

---

[65] Note that holiness is not a forensic metaphor.
[66] John 17:17–19; Acts 10:15; 11:9; 15:9; Macchia, *Baptized*, 222.
[67] Rom 1:4; 8:9–10, 29; Gal 2:20; 3:27; 5:16–24; Eph 4:23–24, 30; Col 3:1–4, 9–11. Also see Eph 1, 5.
[68] Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.1.2–4; he cites 1 Cor 15:45; 2 Cor 13:14; Rom 5:5; Isa 44:3; Luke 3:16; 2 Cor 5:17; etc.
[69] Also see Macchia, *Baptized*, 223.
[70] Rom 8:15–17, 29.

same image'.[71] As I argued in Chapter 4, the 'glory' of the covenant is the indwelling Holy

Spirit who mediates God's presence to his people. The Spirit who is communicated from

Christ also effects the subjective knowledge of God revealed in Christ, and so mediates the

face-to-face communion between Christ and his church, and by that communion conforms the

Christian to Christ's image. Barth is well known for his designation of the Father as Revealer,

the Son as Revelation and the Spirit as Revealedness, for which he has been wrongly

criticised for implying that humanity's problem is ignorance.[72] For Barth, divine revelation is

God's personal self-impartation.[73] By speaking of revelation as transformative, or broadly

salvific, I make no assumption that such revelation is cognitive in content. Rather, as implied

in 2 Corinthians 3–4, this revelation is relational in nature and transformative in effect. The

Spirit mediates to the church a transformative communion with God through Christ. In this

respect Christ as the Word and the image is the Revelation, the personal performative content

of the knowledge of God. The Spirit is the Revealedness, the agent effecting the subjective

knowing of God through Christ. In terms of speech-act theory we could say that the mission

of the Word is illocutionary, being the communicative action of God, while the mission of the

Spirit is perlocutionary, producing the intended effect.[74]

Any relational communion between God and humanity is naturally conditioned by his

kingship as Creator over his creation. Within the biblical drama, God is King and creatures

---

[71] 2 Cor 4:4–6; 3:18. Also see Irenaeus: 'the life of man consists in beholding God'; *AH* 4.20.7.
[72] Barth, *CD* I/1, 361–3; Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, second edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 360–1, 364; Gustaf Wingren, *Theology in Conflict: Nygren, Barth, Bultmann* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1958), 112–7, 128. In defence of Barth, Hart points out that Barth (1) rejects the anthropological optimism of his predecessors and (2) eschews the polarity between epistemic and soteriological categories; Trevor Hart, 'Revelation', *The Cambridge Companion to Karl Barth*, ed. John Webster (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 54–5. Also see Gunton in the same volume. Colin Gunton, 'Salvation', *The Cambridge Companion to Karl Barth*, 144–55.
[73] Barth, *CD* I/1, 358–9, 363.
[74] Vanhoozer, *Drama of Doctrine*, 65–68.

are his subjects. The problem is precisely human rebellion against God, which has resulted in enslavement to sin and death. Redemption entails the liberation of humankind from the dominion of darkness and their restoration to the rule of God. Within this drama the church becomes the kingdom community and takes up the corresponding *imago Dei* role. She is the community of those who live under the rule of God as kingdom citizens, and who are consequently conformed to his will and become witnesses and agents of the kingdom in the world. Therefore, kingdom submission and conformity are naturally the prerequisite for kingdom commission.

Just as Christ's body was the temple of God through the Spirit, so the church united with Christ and indwelt by the Spirit becomes the temple, the throne room of God the King and the manifestation of his presence on the earth.[75] Just as Christ bore the glory of God in his incarnation, suffering and resurrection, so the church who participates in his suffering and resurrection also bears his glory. The deposit of the Spirit progressively increases through the sanctification process 'from one degree of glory to another' until the eschaton, when God's people will be consummately indwelt and filled with the Spirit, who is the Shekinah glory of God in his new temple.[76] That the church is the temple of the Spirit is a prominent theme in Paul.[77] But John's vision of the new heaven and new earth is one in which the entire world is a temple, filled with the presence of God.[78] Beale and Macchia have both proposed that God's

---

[75] Beale, *NTBT*, 632–9.

[76] John 1:14–18; Rom 5:1–5; 5:12–7:6; 8:17–30; 1 Cor 15:35–58; 2 Cor 3:18; 2 Cor 4:4–12, 16–18. Note that Paul in these passages speaks of the process of sanctification in terms of both experiential suffering and mystical participation in Christ's death and resurrection, implicitly linking them together; see Phil 3:10–11. For image, glory and Spirit, see sect. 4.1.5.

[77] E.g. Eph 2:21–22; 1 Cor 3:16–17; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; etc. But note that the 'fullness' ($\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}\rho\omega\mu\alpha$) metaphor in Eph 1:23 is not likely a picture of Christ's indwelling the cosmos. See the extensive discussion in Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 294–301.

[78] Rev 21–22.

ultimate goal is for all creation to be restored as the temple of God, the dwelling place for his presence.[79] That is, his dynamic rule, benevolence and transformative influence will be released to recreate and reshape the character of the entire created order. The present re-creation, indwelling and transformation of the church as the new humanity not only affords a foretaste of her perfect glorification in the future, but also points to the corresponding redemption of the cosmos.[80] Recall the covenantal triad of God-people-land outlined in Chapter 4.[81] The earth will be fittingly recreated and perfected as a token of God's blessing upon his covenant people in the consummation of the new covenant. Note the language of covenantal presence and relation between God and people in Revelation 21:3. The metaphors of a New Jerusalem and a New Garden of Eden points to the final fulfilment of that which was intended in the original creation and the establishment of Israel.

6.4.1 The Holiness of the Spirit-Shaped Community

Although sexual purity is not the only aspect of holiness, it serves as a primary metaphor for the sanctity of the church, and therefore deserves special attention. In 1 Corinthians 6 Paul pleads for sexual purity on the basis that the bodies of Christians are 'members of Christ' and '[temples] of the Holy Spirit'. The metaphor of the one-flesh union between husband and wife is applied both to the church's union with Christ and her adulterous union with prostitutes.[82] For Paul, sexuality is a metaphor for the covenantal communion and exclusivity between Christ and the church. This covenantal metaphor sanctifies the human body and human sexuality, as is reflected in Paul's reverence for marriage and his prioritised condemnation of

---

[79] Beale, *Temple*, 24–6, 313, 368; also *NTBT*, 632–9; Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 86, 89.
[80] Rom 8:19–23.
[81] Block, *God of the Nations*, 5–6. See sect. 4.1.1.3.
[82] Gen 2:18; 1 Cor 6:16–17.

'sexual immorality' in his vice-lists.[83] Idolatry is often depicted as spiritual 'adultery' in the OT prophets, and is essentially a matter of dependence and service directed towards false deities in lieu of God.[84] But note that in 1 Corinthians 6, the body is the locus of holiness, illustrating its critical importance in God's economy.[85] Not only is the body a medium for covenantal service in the world, but its sexual expression is also a metaphor for worship.

Ezekiel and Jeremiah proclaimed that the new covenant people will be characterised by a new heart and a new Spirit, with the law of God inscribed upon their hearts.[86] Note that new covenant sanctification is first a *promise* before it is a command, and therefore wholly dependent upon grace. Paul applies this promise to the sanctifying work of the Spirit, who indwells the Christian, transforms her affections and directs her in God-pleasing action.[87] He contrasts life in the Spirit with both life in the flesh and the works of the law. Life in the Spirit is a matter of submission and dependence on God, and is characterised by love, whereas life in the flesh is determined by mere humanity, and is therefore autonomous, self-reliant and antithetical to love.[88]

The church's representative function as *imago Christi* is conditioned by the work of the Spirit in shaping and sanctifying the church. The church bears the calling and responsibility to represent Christ to the world. But she only represents him authentically to the extent that she is conformed to his likeness and acting according to his will by the direction and power of the

---

[83] Eph 5:22–33; 1 Cor 6:12–20; Gal 5:19; Eph 5:5. Note also that temple cult prostitution is likely in the background of these texts.
[84] Hosea 1–4; Ezekiel 23; etc.
[85] Rom 12:1.
[86] Ezek 11:19–20; 36:26–27; Jer 31:31–34.
[87] Galatians 5:16–24; Romans 8:1–17.
[88] Rom 7:14; 8:13–14; Gal 5:13–14; 1 Cor 13. A. C. Thiselton, 'Flesh', *NIDNTT*, ed. Colin Brown (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975, 1986), 1:675–6; F. B. Knutson, 'Flesh', in Bromiley, *ISBE*, 2:314. See my previous discussion on the trees in the Garden of Eden in sect. 4.1.3.

Spirit. Hers is an unconditional vocation that awaits conditional fulfilment, and consequently, there is an element of contingency insofar as the responsibility can be met with either faithfulness or unfaithfulness. The conferral of a vocation upon the church to be the *imago Christi*, the 'face' of Christ to the world, bears consequences for good or ill. And until her sanctification is finally consummated, her Spirit-shaped performance, however fruitful, will be tainted with weakness and sin.[89]

Colossians 3 defines the restored image as the new self, manifested in a new set of character traits and behaviours patterned after Christ, who is the image of God.[90] It seems that in Paul, to be recreated in the 'image' of Christ entails an inner transformation by which the Christian community conforms to his character and embodies the glory of God as he did.[91] That this is part of covenant life is made clear in 2 Corinthians 3: 'And we all, with unveiled face, beholding the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into the same image from one degree of glory to another'. In this passage, Paul is describing the role of the church as a 'letter from Christ' and apostles as 'ministers of a new covenant', whose qualification is precisely the manifestation of God's glory through the Spirit.[92] Glory in this context refers to the manifestation of Christlike attributes that result from the Spirit's transformative indwelling of the church.[93] Consequently, the progress in 'glory' may be understood as progress in the Spirit's influence and control in the Christian's life and conversely the Christian's submission to the Spirit's leading.[94] In this section, Paul speaks of the apostolic role in terms of being

---

[89] E.g. Phil 3:12. The Corinthian church, whom Paul affirms as 'sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints', 1 Cor 1:2, was notoriously problematic in this regard.
[90] Col 3:10, 12–17; cf. 1:15.
[91] Col 1:19; 2:9; 1:27.
[92] 2 Cor 3, vv. 18, 3 and 6 respectively.
[93] Mark A. Seifrid, *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*, PNTC (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2014), 184–7; Philip E. Hughes, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1962), 118–21; Balla, '2 Corinthians', 761–2.
[94] Cf. Rom 8; Gal 5.

'ministers of a new covenant' and 'ambassadors for Christ' in a special sense. But there is a limited sense in which the church also functions as ministers and ambassadors. Otherwise, the gospel of Christ would be left without representatives following the death of the apostles. Therefore, the church as the *imago Dei* is both 'minister' and 'letter'. The Spirit-shaped, Christ-conformed church community becomes both the herald and the manifestation of God's kingdom to the world, whose dual vocation illustrates the inseparability of sanctification and mission in the life of the church.

6.4.2 The Unity Created by the Spirit

The church's vertical relationship with God and participation in his Trinitarian fellowship is reflected in her horizontal relationships both within and without the church. The Spirit who unites the church in one body to the one Triune God also creates unity within the church.[95] And just as the Spirit is the bond of love between the Father and the Son, and analogically between Christ and the church, so he becomes the bond of love and the creator of fellowship within the church.[96] Among the Spirit-forged analogies between the Son and his disciples in John's gospel is Jesus' high priestly prayer for unity: 'The glory that you have given me I have given to them, that they may be one even as we are one … that the love with which you have loved me may be in them, and I in them'.[97] Similarly, though in distinctive Pauline style, Ephesians 4:1 introduces the paraenesis on love and unity by referring to the unity produced by the Spirit. The entire paraenesis is an exhortation for the church to live together in love. The exhortation in Ephesians 5:18 to 'be filled with the Spirit' occurs in the context of his instruction about Spirit-shaped relationships within the church. In this context, being filled

---

[95] Eph 2:13–16; 4:3–6.

[96] Augustine, *On the Trinity*, 15.17. It is well observed that the Spirit is often associated with love and fellowship in the Pauline corpus; e.g. Rom 5:5; 1 Cor 12–14; Gal 5:13–24; 2 Cor 13:14; Phil 2:1.

[97] John 17:22, 26. Köstenberger and Swain, *Father, Son, and Spirit*, 147.

with the Spirit would result in transformed mutual address in the assembly and transformed relationships in the home between wives and husbands, children and parents, slaves and masters.

In the book of Acts, one of the distinctive marks of the church following the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit is the unity that transcends economic divisions and is manifested in the sharing of material goods with the poor. This was not an enforced communism but a natural manifestation of the solidarity created by the Spirit, in which disciples recognised one another as members of Christ's unified body, resulting in generous voluntary giving.[98] Their economic sharing was also a true recognition in one another of the *imago Christi*, their dignity-conferring role as Christ's embodied representatives in the world. This coheres with Christ's repeated call to a lifestyle of mercy culminating in his striking statement, 'as you did it to one of the least of these my brothers, you did it to me'.[99] The care of bodily needs also affirms the goodness of creaturely embodiment in honour of the Creator. Finally, providing basic needs for the poor is a neighbourly act that reflects the OT ethos of recognising and dignifying widows, orphans, foreigners and the disadvantaged. The church stands in continuity with Israel as God's chosen people who reflect his full affirmation of human life.[100]

6.5 Covenant Sending: The Church as the Body of Christ

The dramatic role of the *imago Dei* is rooted in covenant relationship and characterised by covenant sanctification, but reaches its ultimate expression in the covenant mission of the church as embodied kingdom representatives who, being pneumatically united with Christ, speak and act the intents of God the Author on the stage of creation by the power of the Holy

---

[98] Acts 2:44–46; 4:32–37; cf. 5:4; 1 Cor 12:25–26.
[99] Matt 25:31–46; cf. 5:7; 9:13; 12:7; 23:23; Luke 6:36; 10:25–37.
[100] E.g. Lev 19:9–18.

Spirit. This final aspect corresponds to the functional view of the image. Covenant sonship is the source, and covenant shaping is the manner, of the covenant sending of the church to bear witness to Christ and his kingdom, thereby moving the plot of the drama towards its consummation. Köstenberger observes that the Fourth Gospel presents Jesus' relationship with his sender as a model for his disciples' mission: 'They are to do *Jesus'* will, perform *Jesus'* works, and speak *Jesus'* words. The disciples are to witness to *Jesus* and to represent *him* accurately. And they are to know *Jesus* intimately, live in close relationship with *him*, and follow *his* example. In a word, *their* relationship to *their* sender, Jesus, is to reflect *Jesus'* relationship with *his* sender, the Father'.[101] The rich Johannine analogy between Jesus and his disciples incorporates relational, characteristic and functional aspects. One could even suggest that there is a limited ontological analogy between his embodiment and theirs. Embodiment is the presupposition of the mission because embodied communicative action is the particular mode of the church's mission, as it was of Jesus' mission. Frank Macchia goes so far as to speak of the Spirit-baptised church as 'incarnating' the kingdom and the presence of Christ.[102] Macchia rightly qualifies this metaphor by putting the verb 'incarnate' in quotation marks. The hypostatic union of deity and humanity in Christ is absolutely unique and unrepeatable, and although the church is covenantally united to Christ, she remains ontologically and functionally distinct. Therefore, any application to the church of the language of 'incarnation' requires a sensitivity to the uniqueness of the technical meaning.

---

[101] Köstenberger, *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples*, 191–2, 215–7; John 20:21; cf. 17:18.
[102] Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 162, 187; also John R.W. Stott, *Christian Mission in the Modern World* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1975), 24; John R.W. Stott, *The Contemporary Christian: Applying God's Word to Today's World* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 358, 373.

But there are certainly points of continuity between the Spirit-anointed incarnate mission of

Christ and the church's embodied mission. In John 20:21–22, Christ imparts the Spirit to his

disciples with the words: 'As the Father has sent me, even so I am sending you'.[103] We may

observe that: (1) Christ draws an explicit analogy between his own mission and that of his

disciples; (2) the act of sending implies an impartation of authority; (3) his breathing upon the

disciples alludes to the creation of humankind;[104] and (4) the divine breath that originally

animated the human creature and constituted them as the *imago Dei* is now identified as the

Holy Spirit. The Spirit now indwells the disciples as the new humanity and the restored *imago

Dei*. The scene depicts the New Adam, who is also the Creator God made flesh, now

recreating his disciples as the new humanity and sending them on a mission that supplements

his own. Although an exegetical link cannot be clearly established between the Johannine

missiō and the prologue, they may be read as a 'new creation' *inclusio* around the body of the

book. The Logos who authored the original creation, now incarnate as the glory-bearing

human, proceeds to author the new creation and the new humanity.[105] And while the Fourth

Gospel does not use *imago Dei* terminology, both passages share conceptual ties to the *imago

Dei* as Spirit-bearing embodied covenantal agency.

John's prologue, having introduced the Logos as the divine Creator and the source of life,

proceeds to depict his mission in terms of a new exodus, with 1:9–13 as a transition. The

dramatic conflict is incited as the Creator is rejected by his own, and graciously responds by

---

[103] According to Morris, the emphasis is on the link between Jesus' mission and that of the disciples. Indeed, the latter is dependent on the former; Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 846. Others emphasise the relationship between the sender and the one sent in each case.
[104] Gk. ἐνεφύσησεν; cf. Gen 2:7; Ezek 37:9 LXX.
[105] John 1:1–14. Note that 'life' in v. 4 could well be an allusion to the Spirit; cf. John 4:10, 14; 6:63; 7:37–39. Also note the association between Spirit and glory, as I argued in sect. 4.1.5.

creating a new family from the old by means of a new birth. Note that the 'birth' motif links John 1:12–13 with 3:3–8, and intimates a new humanity born of the Spirit.[106] The 'impossibility' of the new birth is reminiscent of the son of promise born to an aged barren couple.[107] In light of the creation and exodus allusions, this transition may plausibly be read as a 'fall narrative' that parallels Genesis 3–12, leading to the creation of Israel. In each case, the 'election' of the few from the many is made on the basis of faith rather than lineage, and is effected by a supernatural birth. Ultimately, the new humanity would be sent out to bless the nations.

The incarnation of the Word depicted in exodus metaphor affords some useful elements for a constructive proposal regarding the manner of the church's mission. Christ's incarnate mission is characterised by: (1) embodiment – 'The Word became flesh'; (2) presence – 'dwelt among us'; (3) manifestation/revelation – 'we have seen his glory … made [the Father] known'; and (4) bestowal of grace and truth.[108] Although these elements are not exhaustive, they yield a coherent picture of the manner and purpose of the incarnation: the eternal Word became an embodied, glory-bearing representative of God's covenant presence who mediates the knowledge and blessing of God to the world. This limited portrait of the incarnation not only mirrors my exposition of the *imago Dei*, but also provides a fitting pattern for the mission of the church: The church is called to be the embodied, Spirit-bearing representative

---

[106] Gk. γεννάω. Also see Wright, *RSG*, 667.

[107] John 3:4, 9; cf. Gen 17:17; 18:11–14; Gal 4:21–31. This is a speculative but plausible comparison made on the basis of some common features: (1) a humanly impossible birth that (2) brings about the creation of a covenant people (3) by means of a promise that is (4) received by faith and (5) fulfilled 'according to the Spirit'. Note also the context of the new exodus motif.

[108] John 1:14, 16–18. The Greek word for 'dwelt', ἐσκήνωσεν (from σκηνή), literally means 'tented' or 'tabernacled', alluding to the glory in the tabernacle.

of Christ, mediating the knowledge and blessing of Christ to the world. And the embodied mode of her Spirit-anointed communication stands in continuity with the Spirit-anointed, embodied discourse of Christ and the prophets.[109]

The church is sent with the authority of Christ to proclaim the kingdom and make disciples. And the same Spirit who anointed Christ to be the paradigmatic *imago Dei* is now the kingdom anointing that empowers the church to be the *imago Christi*. Note that it is the Spirit who 'baptises' believers into the body of Christ, recreating them in his image, and who also distributes the *charismata* to the church and so empowers her for service.[110] The work of redemption performed by Christ would now be perfected by the Spirit through the church. Although the Spirit certainly works in unmediated ways in the hearts and minds of human subjects, he would now direct the bodily performance of the church in continuity with the incarnate mission of the Son.[111] The unembodied Holy Spirit breathes life into the embodied action of the church, which serves as the primary medium of his mission.

---

[109] Consider such embodied prophetic acts as those of Elijah, Ezekiel or Hosea, e.g. 1 Kgs 18; Ezek 4; Hos 1.
[110] 1 Cor 12:4–7, 13; also Rom 12. McFarland notes that to be incorporated as members of Christ's body is to become the image of Christ and therefore the image of God. Ian A. McFarland, *The Divine Image: Envisioning the Invisible God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 165–66.
For 1 Cor 12 and the extension of charismata for the common good of the world at large, see Mark J. Cartledge, 'Renewal Theology and the "Common Good"', *JPT* 25.1 (2016): 90–106. We should acknowledge that the primary function of the body metaphor in Paul is to illustrate unity and diversity. But note the context of charismata and service. The metaphor is also used to illustrate Christ's covenant with the church; 1 Cor 12:13; Eph 1:23; 4:4–7; 5:25–30. The use of the body metaphor to designate covenantal representative mission is not far from Paul.
[111] Tiessen, *Who Can Be Saved?*, 113–22. Cartledge holds that all experiences of the Spirit are mediated. But note that his use of 'mediation' is more broadly defined than my own, to include internal (e.g. affective) and external (e.g. circumstantial) aspects of spiritual experience, with an emphasis on personal and sacramental elements; Mark J. Cartledge, *Mediation of the Spirit: Interventions in Practical Theology* (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2015), 65–8. I am using 'mediation' in a more restricted sense to refer to the communication of an action or grace through an intermediary agent or medium.

Therefore, there is a functional continuity as well as discontinuity between the Spirit-anointed Christ and the Spirit-anointed church. Christ, as the primary image, *achieves* the destruction of sin's dominion and initiates the new creation in his death and resurrection through the Spirit. The church, as the secondary image, *bears witness* to the achievement of Christ so that the world may, in response to her testimony, participate by faith in the new creation in union with Christ through the Spirit. But the church's testimony is not merely a dispensing of information. It is a Spirit-empowered performative communication that serves as a means of bringing hearers into covenant with Christ and thereby producing kingdom citizens.[112] The remainder of this section will elaborate on the church's continuation of Christ's incarnational mission in terms of his threefold office of prophet, priest and king.

6.5.1 The Church as a Pneumatological Prophetic Community

The primary analogy between Christ's offices and the church's mission is the prophetic anointing of the Spirit, as implied by Peter's quotation of Joel at Pentecost.[113] This is because the prophetic function is inherently representative and communicative. As Christ communicated on God's behalf, so the church communicates on Christ's behalf, bearing witness not only to his revelatory content, but also to his atoning and ruling works. It is in this weak sense of prophecy as witness-bearing that the church serves in a 'prophetic' capacity, testifying to Christ's official work as Prophet, Priest and King.

Anointed with the same Spirit of prophecy as Jesus, the church becomes a prophetic community to proclaim Christ's gospel for the salvation of all people. As Christ the Prophet is

---

[112] Rom 1:16; 10:14; Matt 28:19. On continuity, see for example, Köstenberger, *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples*, 103, 156.
[113] Acts 2:17–18; cf. Luke 4:18.

the ultimate salvific revelation of God, so the church in her witness *presents* the salvific testimony of Christ.[114] Although the original apostles were authoritative witnesses of Christ and his gospel, the church continues to bear witness to the gospel of Christ that has been 'handed down' to her.[115] Calvin infers from Joel's prophecy that the prophetic anointing of Christ, 'to be herald and witness of the Father's grace', 'was diffused from the Head to the members', so that the church may preach the gospel of Christ by the power of the Spirit.[116] Therefore, the church's proclamation is an extension of his prophetic ministry. Prophecy in the OT involves speaking a historically relevant divine message usually addressed to God's people within the covenantal context. In the NT, as the scope of the covenant and salvation is broadened to include all nations, the gospel, through the corporate witness of the church's communicative action, becomes the content of the prophetic word to those outside the church. The divine call to repentance and faith is an invitation to kingdom citizenship as disciples of Jesus Christ under the new covenant.[117]

Turner argues that not all Christians are 'prophets', nor should preaching and teaching be called 'prophecy'.[118] It is certainly true that the term 'prophet' is not applied in the NT to the church at large, and that 'prophecy' is used to refer to oracular speech. Nevertheless, conceding these exegetical points and avoiding the broad application of these technical terms, one can speak of a broadly 'prophetic' function that consists of extending Christ's prophetic

---

[114] Note the pervasive use of 'witness' and 'testimony' in the book of Revelation, in addition to 'witness' in Acts; e.g. Rev 1:9; 2:13; 3:14; 6:9; 11:7; 12:1, 17; Acts 1:8, 22; 2:32, 40; etc.

[115] L. *traditio*, from *tradere*.

[116] Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.15.2; citing Joel 2:28; Isa 61:1–2; Luke 4:18; etc. Also see Rom 1:16–17; Acts 1:8; Matt 28:19–20.

[117] Matt 28:18–20. On the church as Spirit-empowered witness to Christ, in correspondence to his prophetic office, see Karl Barth, *CD* IV/3, 791–2; for this reference I am indebted to Gary D. Badcock, *The House Where God Lives: The Doctrine of the Church* (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009), 89.

[118] Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 206–12.

communicative acts to the world. Note that the activity of prophesying is not restricted in the NT to those who are called 'prophets'.[119] More importantly, consider Exodus 7:1–2, in which Aaron is referred to as the 'prophet' of Moses. Aaron does not receive the revelation from God, but mediates the revelation given to Moses. In light of this metaphorical use of the term, and because our task is theological, rather than exegetical, prophetic function can be conceived more broadly than Turner allows.[120] Consequently, Joel's prophecy foretells a collapse of status distinctions to the effect that all covenant members become bearers of the Spirit of prophecy, and possess a latent prophetic potential. Furthermore, initiation into the new covenant as Spirit-bearing sons and daughters entails a vocation and corresponding anointing to 'prophetic' service in this qualified sense.[121]

Closely related to the church's prophetic witness is the work of healing. As healing is often associated with prophetic ministry in the OT, and also with Christ's prophetic office, so the church's prophetic witness can include prayer for healing.[122] The Pentecostal insistence that Christ is the Healer leads naturally to the expectation that the Holy Spirit would continue to heal the diseased through the church who shares his anointing. That the ministry of healing is closely associated with the preaching of the gospel testifies to the holistic concern of God's kingdom and salvation, which includes the well-being of the body. The coming of the kingdom in the eschaton will bring the resurrection of the body, signalling the consummate healing and restoration of the human being.[123] The Spirit testifies to the future kingdom by bringing a foretaste of its blessing of *shalom* into the present experience through the church.

---

[119] E.g. Acts 19:6; 21:9.
[120] Consider also 1 Chr 16:22; Ps 105:15.
[121] Joel 2:27–28; cf. Num 11:29; Macchia, *Baptized*, 145. See Bock's comment on Acts 2:33; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 131.
[122] Luke 4:18–19; Acts 3:1–10; Jas 5:14–16.
[123] Matt 10:7–8; Rom 8:23; 1 Cor 15:50–57; Phil 3:20–21.

Hence healing as a prophetic-eschatological phenomenon complements the preaching of the gospel as part of the prophetic witness of the church.

6.5.2 The Church as a Reconciling Community

Continuing our analogy between the church's mission and Christ's threefold office, we may correlate Christ's priestly office with the church's role as a reconciling community. The work of Christ in his death and resurrection, complemented by the Spirit beginning at Pentecost, brings peace and reconciliation in both the vertical divine-human relationship and the horizontal relationships among his people. That both the vertical and the horizontal dimensions are represented reflects both the relational nature of sin and the relational nature of human creatures, who were designed to live in communion with God and one another. As the Spirit-anointed church extends the mission of Christ in her proclamation and embodied witness to his gospel, those who respond in faith are incorporated into Christ through the Spirit, forgiven and reconciled to God, and granted access into communion with the Father.[124] Paul testifies that the apostles have been entrusted with the message and ministry of reconciliation, and Calvin extends this to include all the ministers of the church.[125] But given the Protestant affirmation of the priesthood of all believers, the work of reconciliation can certainly be extended to the entire church and her corporate witness to Christ.[126]

As the church testifies to the priestly work of Christ, sinners are reconciled not only to God, but also to one another. Relational sins committed against fellow human beings abound throughout history, creating alienation and enmity, beginning with Adam's accusation against

---

[124] 2 Cor 5:17–21; Eph 2:13–18; Rom 5:1–2; Heb 10:18–22. Also Badcock, *House Where God Lives*, 127–8.
[125] 2 Cor 5:18–20; Rom 15:16; Calvin, *Institutes*, 4.1.22.
[126] 1 Pet 2:5, 9; cf. Matt 5:9, 21–26, 38–48; 6:14–15; 18:15–20.

Eve and Cain's slaughter of Abel.[127] The early church was twice confronted with cultural

differences that could potentially have divided the church, first between Hellenistic and

Hebraic Jews, and later between Jews and Gentiles. In both cases, the leaders of the church

were directed by the Spirit to propose peacemaking solutions so that the cause of the gospel

would not be hindered.[128] Paul's theological development of the Jew-Gentile reconciliation

was integrated into his gospel of the cross and was critical in defending his ministry to

Gentiles and their inclusion in the church.[129] Accordingly, the Christian community is to be

marked by love for one another as disciples of Christ and love for one's enemies. Among the

beatitudes of virtue, Christ lists mercy, peacemaking and the willingness to suffer persecution.

At the root of these virtues is the Christlike willingness to extend blessing to others at one's

own expense.[130]

The NT application of the metaphor of priesthood to the church extends beyond reconciliation

to the privileges of praise and service. As the church gains access to God's presence through

Christ and the Spirit, she is called to offer sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving to God.[131] The

proper mode of communion between human creatures and their Creator is embodied worship

in the form of words and deeds.[132] Set in the backdrop of a redemption drama, the most basic

response to Christ's salvation is thanksgiving. But for embodied creatures made for

---

[127] Gen 3:12; 4:1–6.
[128] Acts 6:1–7; 15:1–35. Note that in Luke, the basis for unity is pneumatological, whereas in Paul, it is Trinitarian and Christological; Eph 2:13–18; 4:1–5; 1 Cor 12:4–6.
[129] E.g. Eph 2:11–22; also Romans and Galatians, passim.
[130] E.g. John 13:35; Luke 6:27–36; Matt 5:7–12. Bruner discerns two types of beatitudes in Matt 5, which we may paraphrase as the beatitudes of need and the beatitudes of virtue; F.D. Bruner, *The Christbook: A Historical/Theological Commentary* (Waco, TX: Word, 1987), 135, 146.
[131] 1 Pet 2:5, 9; Heb 13:15; cf. Col 3:15–17.
[132] Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, 2:60. Note also that bodily expressions of praise have been a distinctive mark of pentecostal worship.

communicative action, appropriate response includes bodily acts of service.[133] Following his extended theological discussion of 'the gospel' in Romans, Paul begins the paraenesis with a call to 'present your bodies as a living sacrifice'.[134] In this context, the consecration of bodies as a token of the whole self naturally leads to the Spirit-shaped, loving service of church, enemy and neighbour alike.[135]

6.5.3 The Church as a Disciple-Making Kingdom Community

The final aspect of the analogy between the church's mission and Christ's threefold office consists of her testimony to Christ's kingly work, in which she functions as a disciple-making kingdom community. In explicating this point, it may be helpful to review the achievement of Christ in bringing the kingdom to his people. Matthew's gospel depicts Jesus as the fulfilment of Israel, the Messiah and the promised return from exile. He is the son of Abraham in whom all nations would be blessed. Moreover, he is the promised king who comes to deliver Israel and all humanity from their enemies, which are revealed to be sin and death, together with every manifestation of depravity and suffering.[136] Finally, he is the provision of Sabbath rest, which was typified in the settlement in the promised land under Joshua, now achieved in his resurrection from the dead, and will be fully manifested in the eschatological re-creation of the world.[137] Each of these metaphors of salvation presuppose a clear demarcation of the

---

[133] Note the natural transition from the 'sacrifice of praise to God … the fruit of lips' (Heb 13:15) to bodily acts of service and material sharing (v. 16).

[134] Rom 12:1.

[135] Rom 12:9–13:14. Note also the close integration of worship, service and love in 1 Cor 11–14.

[136] Matt 1–4. Matthew meticulously crafts his gospel with countless OT allusions and quotations to support the development of these themes, beginning with his genealogy, through the Magi's declaration of Jesus' kingship, the escape of his family to Egypt and Herod's massacre of the children, and the ministry of John the Baptist, to the ministry of Jesus.

[137] Matt 11:28–12:8; 13:24–30, 36–43, 47–50. The theme of eschatological rest is less prominent in Matthew, but nevertheless mentioned in various discourses and parables; e.g. Matt 25:21, 34. The Apocalypse develops this theme extensively, most notably in Rev 21–22.

covenant people of God, who will be heirs of the blessings he provides. But the prophets from Amos to John the Baptist have testified that covenant blessing is contingent on covenant faithfulness, hence the call to repentance in the preaching of Joel, John and Jesus. Participation in the kingdom naturally requires submission to the authority of the King.[138]

Consequently, the church is a community that lives in obedience to Christ as King in order to embody kingdom principles and reproduce kingdom citizens in light of the hope of the eschatological consummation of his kingdom. The disciple is essentially a kingdom citizen who embodies kingdom teachings in submission to Christ, with baptism as the citizen-initiation rite and the Eucharist as a continuing corporate re-enactment of the gospel.[139] Within this reproductive process, the 'disciple' and 'disciple-maker' roles naturally coincide in the same persons: the disciple-maker is simultaneously a disciple; the disciple is in the process of becoming a disciple-maker. Thus, the command to make disciples echoes the primeval command to 'be fruitful and multiply' insofar as disciples of Christ are now bearers of the restored *imago Dei* in union with Christ. The intent to fill the world with the glory-bearing image of God remains the same. The accompanying command to exercise dominion, which I previously argued is expounded in Genesis 2 as a mission to extend the blessings of God's kingdom to the world, remains the same, though the particular kinds of communicative action take on a different form in the present act of the drama.[140] The twin tasks of multiplying disciples and dispensing kingdom blessing are naturally integrated in the ministries of Jesus and his disciples, providing a model for the mission of the church. The

---

[138] See sect. 5.5.1; also 4.1.3.
[139] Matt 26:26–29; 28:18–20; cf. 1 Cor 11:23–26.
[140] See sect. 4.1.4.

proclamation of the kingdom, which includes the pronouncement of forgiveness, is accompanied by demonstrations of the kingdom in the form of healing of disease, cleansing of leprosy and deliverance from demons.[141] The hearers of kingdom speech also experience kingdom liberation and are called to submit to the King. Note also that kingdom actions are not restricted to these miraculous signs. In calling his disciples to radical love and social justice Jesus consolidated sanctification and mission, so that embodied love and mercy become the mode of proclamation. Just as Jesus incarnated grace and truth, so his church embodies his grace and truth in her ministry.[142] The great commandment shapes the culture of the great commission community. Fitting performance of the *imago Dei* mission requires an *imitatio Christi* mode of being and relating.

6.6 Summary

This chapter has provided an exposition of Act 4 of the *imago Dei* theodrama in which the church, united with Christ through the Spirit, assumes the *imago Dei* role as God's covenant people and is shaped by the Spirit to be the embodied representatives of his kingdom on the stage of creation. I previously proposed that the *imago Dei* can be fruitfully conceived as a dramatic role initially assigned to humankind, to be God's covenant partners and kingdom agents in the world. The *imago Dei* role was successively misperformed by Adam and Israel, but perfectly fulfilled by the divine-human Son of God, whose Spirit-anointed performance paves the way for the restoration of humankind and creation. In this chapter I argued that, upon the ascension of Jesus, the Holy Spirit comes to constitute the church as the restored *imago Dei* by uniting her to the resurrected Christ, in whom the new creation has been initiated. The same Spirit who anointed Jesus for the *imago Dei* role also brings the church

---

[141] Matt 4:23–24; 10:7–8.
[142] Matt 5:38–6:4; John 1:14–18; 2 Cor 3:1–4:6.

into participation in his covenantal sonship, shaping and sending. United with Christ the Son, the church becomes the family of God and shares in his filial relationship. She also shares in Christ's sanctification through communion with God and participation in his life-giving Spirit, being thereby transformed into his likeness. Finally, she shares in Christ's mission by mediating the benefits of his prophetic, priestly and kingly offices through her proclamation of the gospel, work of reconciliation and reproduction of kingdom citizens. This theodramatic plot frames the discussion for the next chapter, in which I will offer a constructive proposal for Spirit baptism by locating it within the *imago Dei* theodrama.

CHAPTER 7

A DRAMATIC *IMAGO DEI* MODEL OF SPIRIT BAPTISM

In the preceding three chapters, I have proposed that the *imago Dei* can be viewed as a theodramatic role that is sequentially assumed by humankind, Christ and the church. Humans were made to be God's covenant agents who live in relationship with God in conformity to his righteous will, and whose mission is to represent God's kingdom in the world through their embodied performance of divinely-authored, Spirit-directed communicative actions upon the stage of creation. With the entrance of sin, God chose Abraham and his descendants to begin the redemption process in a limited reassignment of the role. Israel also failed in her mission and was exiled from the land. Jesus, the Spirit-anointed Son of God, takes the stage as the second Adam, Israel and the Messiah, in order to redeem both humanity and Israel. He was the paradigmatic *imago Dei* who, through his death and resurrection, liberates humankind from sin and death and brings them into the kingdom of God to participate in the new creation through his life-giving Spirit. Hence, the *imago Dei* vocations of the Spirit-bearing Adam and the glory-bearing Israel were both fulfilled in the person and work of the Spirit-anointed Christ. The church, having been united with Christ through the Spirit, becomes the new humanity and the restored *imago Dei*, in order to participate in the sonship, shaping and sending of Christ. In this chapter, I will argue that Pentecost is the dramatic moment at which Christ sends the Father's gift of the Spirit to constitute the church, incorporating her into the new covenant with its transformative and missional implications. Correspondingly, Spirit baptism is the *experience* by which subjects enter into participation in the new covenant in

Christ through the Spirit and are thereby initiated into the church as the *imago Christi*.[1] I will

also argue that the language of Spirit baptism is exclusively used, not only in Paul, but also in

Luke, to denote liminal experiences of covenant initiation. I will proceed to explore the

transformative role of the Spirit in the church and his work in empowering the church's

mission. Finally, I will address the question of the role and function of glossolalia with

respect to the Spirit's work in mediating Christ.

7.1 Pentecost as a Dramatic Moment

The first major section of this chapter summarises some key strands of evidence that

cumulatively establish the case for my thesis that Pentecost was the dramatic moment of the

restoration of the *imago Dei*. It begins by surveying three interrelated themes that form the

context for the promise of the Holy Spirit, namely the new covenant, the new exodus and the

day of Yahweh. The present exposition of OT themes will also serve as a backdrop for a more

detailed examination of some of the key texts in the discussion later in the chapter on the

pentecostal doctrine of Spirit baptism. The study of the promise is followed by a brief

statement of its fulfilment, which is accomplished by the Spirit-anointed Christ, who as Spirit

Baptiser sends the Spirit to recreate his people as the new humanity. Finally, it summarises

the cumulative evidence and, with support from Barth, Irenaeus and the Gospel of John,

argues that Spirit baptism recreates God's people as the *imago Dei* in Christ.

7.1.1 The Promise of the Spirit and Its Thematic Contexts

The expectation of the gift of the Holy Spirit is rooted in various OT texts and embedded in

various thematic contexts and metaphors that serve as precursors and sources for both John

---

[1] The designation of the church as the *imago Christi* and of Christ as the *imago Dei* implies a series of
pneumatological mediations from the Father through the Son through the church to the world. See the discussion
in section 6.2.

the Baptist and the subsequent event of Pentecost. This section will introduce the mosaic of

overlapping themes that form the backdrop of the promise of the Spirit, including the new

covenant, the day of Yahweh and the new exodus. The Babylonian exile was one of the most

conflicted scenes in the drama in which God's covenant people had been punitively removed

from the land due to their unfaithfulness. The prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel emerged in

Jerusalem and Babylon respectively to deliver messages of hope, not only for a return from

exile, but also for a coinciding new covenant accompanied by elevated communion with God

and inner transformation of the heart through the indwelling Spirit.[2] In place of their 'heart of

stone', they would be given a 'heart of flesh', and the Spirit would cause them to live

according to God's law.[3] Although Joel's prophecy is not explicitly linked to the exile, it also

announced the eschatological outpouring of God's Spirit upon 'all flesh', anointing the sons

and daughters of the covenant for prophetic function. The promise is associated with the 'day

of Yahweh' and given in the context of the locust plague.[4] The arrival of the Spirit would

signal an eschatological coming of Yahweh in salvation and judgment to restore his covenant

people. The transformation and empowerment of Israel through the Spirit would enable her to

fulfil her vocation to be a holy nation, bearing witness to Yahweh before the nations.

Another important OT passage for the advent of the Spirit at Pentecost is Isaiah 40–54, which

promises the return from exile using language borrowed from the exodus.[5] The primary

---

[2] The 'day of Yahweh' theme certainly emerged in the pre-exilic prophets (e.g. Amos), and all of these can be ultimately be traced back to the exodus. But they became most prominent during the exile.
[3] Ezek 36:26–28; 37:1–14; 39:25–29; cf. Jer 31:31–34.
[4] Joel 2:28–32.
[5] The structure of Isaiah is a complex matter that falls beyond the scope of the present work. But we can safely say that chapters 40–54 appear to share this common focus on the return as a 'new exodus', though the theme is also found elsewhere in the book.

message of comfort and promise of deliverance is interspersed with the promise of judgment upon Israel's enemies.[6] All four gospels allude to Isaiah 40:3 in reference to John the Baptist's ministry as the herald of Christ, thus depicting Jesus as the coming of Yahweh to deliver God's people from exile. It is in the context of the Isaianic new exodus theme that John promises the coming of one who would baptise in the Holy Spirit.[7] Although a reference to the Spirit is not in the immediate context of Isaiah 40, it is frequently found elsewhere in the book, often in context of the redemption of Israel from the nations.[8] Isaiah 4:2–6 is the passage that likely served as the primary source for John's message. It depicts the future restoration of Jerusalem as a washing away of filth 'by a spirit of judgment and by a spirit of burning'. It also promises that Mount Zion will be protected by the glory of God in the form of a cloud by day and a fire by night. Significantly for the gospels, this text combines the prospect of salvation-judgment with the promise of moral purification by means of the Spirit. That is, the dividing line between salvation and judgment also runs *through* God's covenant people, so that their sin will be consumed by fire while the people, collectively and individually in the case of the repentant, will be purified and 'saved'.[9] 'Purification' may potentially be understood in this passage as being applied to the nation, i.e. by eradicating the wicked, as we see clearly in Matthew and Luke. But the promise that 'the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion' strongly suggests an element of personal

---

[6] E.g. Isa 41:15–16; 43:13–17; 45:14–16; see especially Isa 63:1–6.

[7] Matt 3:3; Mark 1:2–3; Luke 3:4–6; citing Isa 40:3–5; John 1:23. Turner, *Power from on High*, 244–50, 300, 302, 346. Contrary to Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 61, I would argue that the dominant thematic context for Spirit baptism in the gospels is not the kingdom, but the closely related new exodus motif. Also Acts 1:3–5; 2:38–40; cf. Deut 32:5; Ps 78:8. Also see Lisa Stephenson, *Dismantling the Dualisms*, 130; Carroll Stuhlmueller, *Creative Redemption in Deutero-Isaiah* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1970), 233.

[8] E.g. Isa 42:1; 44:3; 48:16; 59:21; 61:1; also Isa 11:2, cf. v. 11–16; 34:16, cf. v. 2–10.

[9] Salvation is best understood in these contexts as deliverance and the restoration of peace (e.g. Isa 4:5–6). Also see Isa 33:11–17, 22, 24.

purification.[10] Like Jeremiah and Ezekiel, Isaiah foretells a restoration in which deliverance

and covenant renewal is inseparable from the sanctifying work of the Spirit.[11] But elsewhere,

Isaiah also promises an 'anointing' or empowerment through the Spirit in a manner more akin

to Joel.[12]

Central to the discussion of the coming of the Holy Spirit is the Baptist's promise of the

coming one who would 'baptize [Israel] with the Holy Spirit and fire'.[13] The accounts in

Mark and John omit 'and fire', ostensibly to highlight salvation and covenant restoration

rather than judgment. Matthew and Luke provide the additional warning, presumably from

'Q',[14] that the unrepentant would be 'thrown into the fire'. The dual message of salvation and

judgment reflects the eschatological hope for the 'day of Yahweh', which has its OT origins

in the exodus from Egypt. Yahweh demonstrates his power and his righteousness by

delivering his 'son', Israel, and punishing Pharaoh. The eschatological hope carries the

assumption that Yahweh's covenant people are righteous, deserving salvation, while their

enemies are wicked, deserving punishment. But in a dramatic turn of prophetic preaching,

Amos warned that the day of Yahweh will be 'darkness' and called the people to repent of

their injustices, whereupon they would be purified and restored.[15] The dividing line cuts

---

[10] Isa 4:4.

[11] Isa 32:15–18; 44:3. Isa 32 speaks of the restoration of Israel by means of the Spirit 'poured upon us from on high', resulting in fruitfulness, justice, righteousness and peace. Note that v. 1 associates this restoration with the righteous rule of a king. This appears to be one of the sources for Luke 24:49, along with 43:10–12; 49:6–7; see Turner, *Power from on High*, 301. Isa 55 promises a new covenant. Although the Spirit is not clearly mentioned, God's word is metaphorically depicted as 'the rain and the snow' that causes fruitfulness. The thirst/water motif at the beginning of the chapter is echoed in John's gospel, where it refers to the Holy Spirit.

[12] Isa 42:1; 61:1; note that in Isa 44:1–6, Israel's status as Yahweh's 'servant' is associated with the Spirit's restoration of the land and the offspring. Covenant blessing and covenant mission are seamlessly conjoined. This immediately follows the new exodus oracle of Isa 43.

[13] Matt 3:10–12; Luke 3:9, 16–17; cf. Mark 1:8; John 1:33.

[14] I tentatively accept the theory of a 'Q' source for the materials shared by Matthew and Luke which are excluded from Mark. But that discussion is beyond the scope of the present work.

[15] Amos 5:18–24; 9:7–15.

through the nation between the faithful and the unfaithful. Joel echoes the same call to repentance, adding the famous promise of the Spirit of prophecy.[16] The gift of the Holy Spirit would be the means of restoring and elevating Israel into a new covenant in which the repentant and faithful becomes a Spirit-bearing, Spirit-transformed and Spirit-empowered prophetic community.[17] Pentecost was the fulfilment of the promise of the Spirit, who is both the sign of the new covenant and the divine transformative and empowering agent for the restored Israel.

The notion of Spirit-anointed prophetic communication transfers easily into our theodramatic metaphor, in which the Spirit is the Director who, without being bodily present onstage, nevertheless creates the action through the actors so that the church's performance is the result of this dual agency. It is for this reason that the acts of the apostles can rightly be called the acts of the Holy Spirit.[18] The Spirit animates the actors with his vivifying breath, prepares them for performance, and directs and empowers their speech and actions, thereby recreating them as the new covenant people. Note also that these OT promises cumulatively and repeatedly affirm that the Spirit will vivify God's new covenant people and mediate a heightened level of communion, purification and prophetic empowerment, which approximate the covenantal structure of sonship, shaping and sending I previously outlined.

---

[16] Joel 2:28–29. Note the common themes shared by Amos 8:9–10 and Joel 1:13, 15; 2:2, 12: darkness, destruction, feasts to mourning, sackcloth. One may also see the affinity between 'pour out my Spirit on all flesh', Joel 2:28, and 'the glory of the LORD shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together', Isa 40:5.

[17] Turner, *Power from on High*, 300–1, 315, 345; Max Turner, 'Does Luke Believe Reception of the "Spirit of Prophecy" Makes All "Prophets"? Inviting Dialogue with Roger Stronstad', *JEPTA* XX (2000): 9. Also see sect. 6.5.1.

[18] The doctrine of concursus supports the notion that while the human agent is freely choosing and performing a particular action, God can be providentially working behind the scenes to direct such action according to his decrees; Barth, *CD* III.3, 94–154; Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, revised and enlarged edition (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953), 171; Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* 1.105.

7.1.2 The Promise Fulfilled through the Spirit Baptiser

The promise of the restoration of Israel is ultimately fulfilled in Jesus, who is depicted as Messiah, Israel and the return from the exile. I have described in Chapter 5 how Jesus in his climactic performance as the Spirit-anointed *imago Dei* fulfils God's authorial intentions by rescuing Israel and humankind from death and destruction and bringing them under the kingly rule of God. After his ascension, the Anointed Messiah becomes the Spirit-Baptiser who sends the Spirit to draw humans into life-giving communion with God.[19] Vanhoozer notes that Jesus' 'exodus' leads to the entrance of the Holy Spirit, making way for a new entry into a new 'promised land' of life in the Spirit.[20] In Farrow's eloquent rephrasing of Irenaeus,

> If Jesus is head of the human race from Adam to the last generation, if indeed he is lord of all creation, it is as and because the Spirit lends to that creation a perichoretic form of existence which is centred on him. Conversely, if creation becomes fruitful and fecund, flourishing in all its particulars as God intended it too [*sic*], it is because through Christ the waters of the Spirit flow upon it. … Christ's ultimate mission, in other words, was to draw the Spirit into man and man into the Spirit, that man might truly become a living being.[21]

Christ's work as Spirit-Baptiser not only restores Israel, but recreates his people as the new humanity, indwelt by 'living water' and 'abundant life'.[22] Beale affirms that the Spirit-accompanied *missio* in John 20 is a renewal of the original commission given to Adam.[23] As the Spirit joins Christians to Christ, he does so as the Spirit of holiness who forms them into Christ's likeness, and as the messianic anointing who empowers her for the *imago Dei*

---

[19] 'Whereas in the sending, in the surrender and in the resurrection, the Spirit acts on Christ, and Christ lives from the works of the creative Spirit, now the relationship is reversed: the risen Christ sends the Spirit; he is himself present in the life giving Spirit; and through the Spirit's energies – the charismata – he acts on men and women'; Jürgen Moltmann, *Trinity and the Kingdom of God: The Doctrine of God* (London: SCM, 1981), 89; also Cartledge, *Mediation of the Spirit*, 72, 100.

[20] Vanhoozer, *Drama of Doctrine*, 388; Luke 9:31; John 16:7; also Farrow, *Ascension and Ecclesia*, 36.

[21] Farrow, *Ascension and Ecclesia*, 60; Irenaeus, *AH*, 3.24.1; 5.6.1; 5.12.2.

[22] John 7:37; 6:32–3; 10:10 cf. 1:4.

[23] Beale, *Temple*, 198; Gen 2:7; cf. Matt 28:18–20.

mission. It is as if Christ were the form and the Spirit were the life-breath, so that the

Christian life can be seen as the Christoformic Spirit-vivified life.[24]

7.1.3 The Restoration of the Imago Dei

I previously argued that the *imago Dei* is a covenantal dramatic role constituted by the Spirit's

indwelling.[25] I also argued that the church's covenantal union with Christ through the Spirit

communicates all the benefits of his salvation and brings her into participation in his *imago*

Dei role. I will argue in section 7.2 that Spirit baptism is the experience that initiates the

participant into the new covenant in Christ. The remainder of this chapter will confirm and

elaborate on the Spirit's mediation of the other aspects of the church's participation in the

imago Dei role. This series of arguments combines to establish my primary thesis, that Spirit

baptism recreates God's people as the *imago Dei* in Christ. This section will directly reinforce

this primary thesis with preliminary support from Barth, Irenaeus and the gospel of John.

The thesis that Spirit baptism recreates the ecclesial *imago Dei* finds support in Karl Barth,

who held that Spirit baptism brings humans into covenant with God as his counterpart, which,

as we have seen, is the essence of the image for Barth. Spirit baptism manifests 'a new

beginning of existence … the totality of salvation, the full justification, sanctification and

vocation of man brought about in Jesus Christ'.[26] Irenaeus appeals to various biblical texts to

---

[24] My use of 'form' here is not in reference to Plato, but to Gen 2:7; cf. Blocher, *In the Beginning*, 77.

[25] The association of the gift of the Spirit with the *imago Dei* is not new; e.g. Irenaeus, *AH* 5.8.1; see my discussion of Irenaeus in chap. 2; Yong, *Spirit Poured Out*, 102; Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 177; Stephenson *Dismantling the Dualisms*, 126, 130; Kline, *Images of the Spirit*, 70, passim; Horton, *Lord and Servant*, 111; Friedrich Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, trans. from 2nd German ed., with preface by Paul T. Nimmo (London / New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016), 578–80.

[26] Note the approximate correspondence to sonship, shaping and sending; Barth, *CD*, IV/4, 31, 36; also pp. 22–34; cf. Clement of Alexandria, who includes regeneration 'by water' and growth 'by His Spirit' among various means of restoring the image and likeness; *Paedagogus*, 1.12. Also see 1 Cor 12:13 and sect. 6.1.2.

affirm that the creation and re-creation of humanity in the *imago Dei* is achieved through the two hands of God, the Word and the Spirit. He held that the 'breath of life' in Adam endowed him with reason, which, as we have seen, is the principal element in his theology of the image. In the incarnation, the Word and the Spirit are united with human substance so that humanity may be made alive in the Spirit and recreated in Christ, 'not by the will of the flesh, nor by the will of man, but by the good pleasure of the Father … that Adam might be created [again] after the image and likeness of God'.[27] In this passage, Irenaeus depicts the Johannine spiritual rebirth as a restoration of the breath of life in Adam, and therefore the restoration of the image and likeness.[28]

This brings us to the Gospel of John, which presents these concepts using the closely related new creation and exodus motifs.[29] The prologue echoes the creation narrative in Genesis 1, identifying the 'Word' as the Creator and the source of life and light.[30] John also attributes to Jesus various metaphors associated with Israel, such as tabernacle and glory, exodus and Passover.[31] The references to 'living water' and 'bread of life' have their origins in the wilderness narratives, yet also imply the major creational assertion that God is the source of life and provider of sustenance.[32] But note that John specifically equates the 'living water' with the Spirit.[33] Similarly, the claim that Jesus is 'the light of the world' seems to allude

---

[27] Irenaeus, *AH* 5.1.3. Despite my differences with Irenaeus regarding the precise locus of Christ's saving work, we can agree that it is the Spirit's indwelling and the believer's participation in Christ that effects the restoration of the image. See the discussion on recapitulation in sect. 5.1.1.1.

[28] Gen 2:7; John 1:12–13. Also see Irenaeus, *AH* 5.6.1 and 5.8.1.

[29] For the relationship between creation and exodus, see my discussion in Chapter 4.

[30] John 1:1–4; cf. Gen 1. Also John 4:14; 5:21; 6:47–51; 7:37–38; 8:12; 14:6; 17:3.

[31] John 1:14, 19–34; vv. 16–17 compares Jesus, the mediator of grace and truth, with Moses, the mediator of the law.

[32] John 4:14; 6:47–51; 7:37–38; Exod 16:1–17:7; Gen 1; 2:6–7, 10; also Isa 55:1; Jer 2:13.

[33] John 7:39.

primarily to creation, yet we can infer a secondary allusion to the light of the *Shekinah* glory

in the wilderness, which is closely associated with the Spirit in the NT.[34] Thus Jesus is the

Creator and Redeemer, and the giver of life through the Spirit. Having reinforced these

opening creation-exodus metaphors throughout the intervening chapters, the gospel brings it

to a climactic fulfilment in 20:19–23, in which Jesus breathes the Spirit into his disciples in a

re-enactment of the creation of humankind and the restoration of Israel.[35] Jesus' gesture of

breathing into the disciples clearly alludes to Genesis 2:7, in which God breathes into Adam

the divine Spirit to create him as the *imago Dei*. It also alludes to Ezekiel 37:9–10 in which

the people of Israel, whose exilic state is depicted as a valley full of dry bones, are recreated

and restored through a new covenant, as symbolised by their being given breath and life.[36]

Implicit in Jesus' gesture is the re-creation of humanity and the restoration of Israel through

the gift of the Holy Spirit to the church. And as in the case of the original creation of the

imago Dei and in the call of Abraham, Jesus' act of the re-creation seamlessly combines

covenant with mission. The becoming of the new humanity and the new covenant people

entails being sent to continue the mission of Christ, being com-missioned—'sent together'—

with the Holy Spirit, to extend the forgiveness of sin provided through the mission of Christ,

the paradigmatic *imago Dei*. Within the literary context of John's gospel, this appears to be

the fulfilment of the Baptist's promise of Spirit baptism, which was closely associated with

the forgiveness of sins and restoration of Israel in a new exodus.[37] And although John's

---

[34] For 'light' and 'glory' see John 8:12; Gen 1:2–5; Exod 13:21; cf. 10:23. For the association of 'glory' with the Spirit, see Isa 63:10–14; Eph 4:30; 2 Cor 3; as well as my discussion in Chapter 4.

[35] Wright also sees a correspondence between the Prologue and John 20; *RSG*, 667.

[36] For identity of the 'breath of life' in Gen 2:7 as the Holy Spirit, see Turner, *Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 91; Wright, *RSG*, 667; also Wisdom 15:11. Although there is no separate preposition in the Greek text for the translation 'into', the prefix of ἐμφυσάω is from ἐν ('in'). ἐμφυσάω is a rare verb, but used in the LXX of Gen 2:7 and Ezek 37:9; cf. Ezek 36:26.

[37] John 1:23, 29–34; Turner, *Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 94.

gospel does not use the term, its metaphors and concepts certainly affirms the re-creation of the *imago Dei* through Spirit baptism.

7.2 Initiation: Baptism in the Holy Spirit

I previously outlined some major thematic elements that stand in the background of the promise of the Spirit. In this section, I will apply these themes, as well as some specific texts, to argue that Pentecost and Spirit baptism are covenant initiation events. The coming of the Spirit at Pentecost is a divine eschatological intervention that brings his future kingdom into the present human reality to create the church. While it is true that the advent of the kingdom began in the ministry of Christ, and that the new creation was initiated at his resurrection, it was only at Pentecost that the church became the resident of the Spirit and the locus of kingdom blessing and agency in the world. The outpoured Holy Spirit brings about the birth of the new humanity who now participates in the resurrection of the Son and his filial relationship with the Father.[38] Hence the resurrection of Christ and the outpouring of the Spirit are complementary eschatological events in which God's future, the new creation, has invaded the present. And as a part of the new creation, the restored *imago Dei* is an eschatological entity. The church as *imago Dei* is the covenant partner of God and the community of his eschatological kingdom as well as its corporate agent in the present world that awaits renewal. This coheres with Cartledge: 'This means that Christ establishes his church by means of his Spirit, as the Spirit is outpoured at Pentecost a *liminal event* is

---

[38] Rom 1:4.

experienced that draws the disciples into union with Christ and begins to fulfil the eschatological work of redemption and the fulfilment of creation'.[39]

7.2.1 Baptism as Exodus

The initiatory function of Spirit baptism is further supported by the ritual and theological implications in the terminology. The verb 'baptise' (βαπτίζω) means to plunge, to dip or to immerse, and metaphorically, to overwhelm.[40] The root of Christian baptism is traced by all four gospels to the ministry of John the Baptist and Jesus' submission to baptism at the Jordan.[41] Although John's baptism was likely influenced by Jewish purification rites, particularly as practiced in the Qumran community, it was likely original in being a one-time immersion and being set in the context of eschatological preaching.[42] John's innovation resulted in an ablution that was also a rite of passage, expressing a conversion to a new way

---

[39] Cartledge, *Mediation of the Spirit*, 72. Graham Twelftree denies that Pentecost is the 'birth' of the church, arguing that Pentecost, as an empowerment experience, parallels the empowering of Jesus with the Spirit at his baptism rather than his birth. But this assumes that the only basis for locating the church's inception at Pentecost is the parallel with Jesus' life. He fails to address the many considerations I have discussed thus far; Graham Twelftree, *People of the Spirit: Exploring Luke's View of the Church* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009), 75.

[40] Everett Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 38, 47; Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 26.

[41] Jewish proselyte baptism has often been named as an antecedent, but its priority and adaptation are disputed; Ferguson, Beasley-Murray, Black and Albright are sceptical about both priority and decisive influence on John the Baptist; Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church*, 76–82; G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962), 31, 40–42; Matthew Black and William Foxwell Albright, *The Scrolls and Christianity: Historical and Theological Significance* (London: SPCK, 1969), 62. Oepke and Heron are dissenters, but their sources fail to support their case; Albrecht Oepke, 'βάπτω', in Kittel, *TDNT*, 1:529–38; John Heron, 'The Theology of Baptism', *SJT* 8.1: 39–40. Neither Epictetus (CE 55–135) (*The Discourses*, 2.9) nor Sibylline Oracles 4 (CE 80) pre-date Christianity; Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church*, 67 n. 40, 85. The Pesachim and the Manual of Discipline (i.e. Rule of Community) fail to offer the definitive support they claim; Pesachim, 8 (available from: http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Talmud/pesachim8.html; accessed 14 September 2016); Community Rule, 4 (available from: http://www.yahwehsword.org/community/c-man-discipline.htm; accessed 14 September 2016).

[42] Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church*, 86–88; Ezek 36:25; Isa 1:16; 44:3; Zech 13:1; Ps 51:7, 10. Ben Witherington III sees a greater continuity between John's baptism and that practiced at Qumran; Ben Witherington III, *Troubled Waters: The Real New Testament Theology of Baptism* (Waco, TX : Baylor University Press, 2007), 27–28. But John's unoriginality would only strengthen my case that John's baptism was a rite of passage and not merely a purification rite.

of life, an offering of divine forgiveness, and likely an initiation into the renewed people of God.[43] Matthew Black suggests that John's baptism represent an entry into 'a new Covenanted Israel'.[44] That the language of baptism implies immersion or being overwhelmed suggests a full submission to God and perhaps even death as a metaphor for this passage in addition to that of washing.[45] But this promise of moral deliverance and inner transformation awaited fulfilment in the ministry of the coming Messiah who would accomplish the new exodus and baptise in the Holy Spirit. This supports the interpretation that to 'baptise' in the Holy Spirit in the gospels may refer to a soteriological and transformative initiation. This interpretation is strengthened when we consider the historical context of the gospel writers. By the time of the production of the Gospel according to Mark, presumably the earliest of the four canonical gospels, baptism was already well established as an initiation rite in Christian, and likely also Jewish, contexts. The literary use of 'baptise' in the gospels would have carried inescapably ritual and initiatory implications.[46]

The association of baptism with judgment in John's preaching may have a source in the OT and ANE concept of 'trial by water ordeal'. Witherington lists Noah's salvation through the flood and Israel's salvation through the Red Sea as OT examples of water ordeals which serve as types of Christian baptism throughout the NT.[47] 1 Corinthians 10:1–4 speaks about the

---

[43] Matt 3:9; par. Luke 3:8; Robert L. Webb, 'Jesus' Baptism: Its Historicity and Implications', *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 10.2 (2000): 284–5; Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church*, 93. Webb, followed by Ferguson, also suggests that as an alternative means of forgiveness it was an implicit critique of the temple establishment.
[44] Matthew Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament* (New York: Scribner's, 1961), 97. This was also true of circumcision in the case of the Qumran sect.
[45] Witherington, *Troubled Waters*, 34, 84; an association of baptism with death was already present in the secular usage of βαπτίζω for instances of drowning; Ferguson, *Baptism in the Early Church*, 58; also Beale, *NTBT*, 925. Cf. Mark 10:38.
[46] Dunn, *The Christ and the Spirit, Volume 2: Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998), 236.
[47] 1 Pet 3:20–21; 1 Cor 10:1ff; Witherington, *Troubled Waters*, 30.

Exodus in terms of baptism: 'all were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea and all ate the same spiritual food, and all drank the same spiritual drink. For they drank from the spiritual Rock that followed them, and the Rock was Christ'. Not only are the complementary salvation and judgment themes present, but Christ is claimed to be the source of the 'spiritual drink' in an expression that parallels the Johannine designations of Jesus as the source of the Spirit who is 'living water'.[48] Israel's passage through the sea is the divine act of deliverance that established the Sinai covenant. Note that the water ordeal is equated with being *baptised* into Moses, the covenant mediator. This makes way for a comparable reading of 1 Corinthians 12:13, in which members of the new covenant are said to be baptised 'in [ἐν] one Spirit … into [Christ's] body … and all were made to drink of one Spirit'. In chapters 10–11, the food and drink of the exodus is compared with the bread and cup of the Lord's supper.[49] Paul's exhortations appeal to their common experience of having been *baptised* into Christ, which entails both participating in his death and resurrection as well as being united with one another in his 'one body'. The clear implication is that Spirit baptism effects the new exodus and the new covenant in Christ. Note also that the death of Christ is described in the gospels as an 'exodus', a 'baptism' and a 'cup'.[50] The baptism-exodus of Christ initiates the new covenant and makes way for the baptism-exodus of the new Israel to participate in his resurrection life and communion with the Father through the Spirit. As God brought Israel, his 'son', out of Egypt, so he now brings his Son, along with all his covenant people, out of the sin-dominated, Satan-ruled, death-destined realm of participation in Adam, and into his

---

[48] John 4:10–14; 7:37; also 1:4. Given the association of the glory cloud with the Spirit and the sea with destruction, we can see here a possible parallel to John's 'Holy Spirit and fire'.
[49] 1 Cor 10:14–22; 11:17–34. The switch in the application of the drink metaphor from Spirit to blood and back to Spirit is not difficult, since both are commonly used to represent the life principle.
[50] Luke 9:31; 12:50; Mark 10:38–39.

kingdom of liberty and abundant life through Spirit baptism. The metaphorical link between

baptism and exodus supports the interpretation of Spirit baptism as covenant initiation.

7.2.2 Pentecost as the Inauguration of the New Covenant and Its Temple

An additional indicator of the initiatory function of Spirit baptism is the theophany on the day

of Pentecost, which alludes to the Sinai event and signals the establishment of the new

covenant, with the church as the glory-bearing temple of God. The Feast of Weeks

(Pentecost) was originally a harvest festival, but later became associated with covenant

renewal, beginning with Asa's reform. The association of the feast with covenant renewal was

later adopted by various Jewish groups, and likely by the Qumran community for their annual

covenant renewal.[51] Although the association of the Feast of Weeks with the giving of the

Law at Sinai is disputed,[52] that association is not essential to my argument. Its existing

association with covenant renewal makes it a fitting occasion for the establishment of the new

covenant.[53] And just as the institution of the Mosaic covenant was a process spanning from

the Passover to Sinai, so the institution of the new covenant begins with the Last Supper, but

is completed only with the giving of the Spirit at Pentecost.

---

[51] Lev 23:15–16; 2 Chr 15:10–12; Jubilees 6:17. The Passover was celebrated on the 14th day of the first month (Lev 23:5), and Pentecost falls near the middle of the third month; Turner, *Power from on High*, 280–1. 1QS 1:8–2:18; also 4Q266 lines 17–18; Turner, *Power from on High*, 280–1. 1QS available from: http://www.essene.com/History&Essenes/md.htm; accessed 7 July 2016; 4Q266 available from: http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/scrolls_deadsea/uncovered/uncovered06.htm#40.%20The%20Foundations%2 0Of%20Righteousness; accessed 7 July 2016. 4Q266 mentions a gathering in the third month to curse those who have departed from the Law.
[52] Menzies disputes this association; Menzies, *Development*, 233; Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 190–3. But see Jub 1:1–2; Turner, *Power from on High*, 281; http://wesley.nnu.edu/sermons-essays-books/noncanonical-literature/noncanonical-literature-ot-pseudepigrapha/the-book-of-jubilees/; accessed 21 March 2017.
[53] Or perhaps simply the post-resurrection renewal of the covenant that soon began to incorporate the Gentiles. Luke does not speak explicitly of a 'new covenant'; cf. Turner, *Power from on High*, 267–8, 353.

The fiery theophany at Pentecost alludes to various biblical precedents signalling both judgment and salvation. Fire is most commonly associated with divine judgment, beginning with the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah and ending with the eschatological lake of fire.[54] But in the exodus, fire, along with cloud, is a manifestation of the covenant presence of Yahweh that appeared at the call of Moses, then continued to accompany the Israelites through their deliverance and wilderness sojourn.[55] One can observe that these two symbolic uses of fire are complementary, since God's salvific presence with his people also functions to punish his enemies. In Matthew's and Luke's accounts of the Baptist's prophecy, the promise of baptism with the Holy Spirit and fire can easily be read in both of these senses. In light of Isaiah 4:4–5, it is quite plausible to view 'fire' as a means of the cleansing of national Israel and perhaps even of penitent individuals.[56] Regardless of whether purification is in view, the fiery theophany alludes to the new exodus, marking the day of Pentecost as a liminal event that brings the eschatological realities of the kingdom to God's people.

Acts 2:1–4 indicates that both wind and fire were present at Pentecost. The sound of wind may allude to the wind in Ezekiel's vision that revived the dead bones in the valley, symbolizing the restoration of Israel.[57] That the sound 'came from heaven' links the event to

---

[54] Gen 19; Rev 20:15; 21:8.

[55] Although the term 'Shekinah' (i.e. 'dwelling') is more commonly associated with the glory manifested in the tabernacle and temple, one can plausibly identify these with the fire in the theophanies at the call of Moses and at Sinai; Exod 3:2; 19:16–20; 24:15–18; cf. the covenant with Abraham; Gen 15:17.

[56] Turner, *Power from on High*, 301. The association of the Spirit with purification is also implied in Acts 15:8–9. As I suggested earlier, the omission of 'fire' in the parallel passages in Mark and John, besides signalling Q as its presumptive source, function to present the promise of the Holy Spirit in a more optimistic light. Given Luke's affinity for Joel, his inclusion of 'fire' in his gospel also highlights the threat of destruction and the call to repentance.

[57] Ezek 37:9–14; F. F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, Revised Edition, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 50.

Jesus' baptism, at which 'the heavens were opened' and the Spirit descended.[58] Wind and fire are also present in 1 Kings 19:11–12 and Ezekiel 1:4, where they symbolize God's sovereign rule and assures his covenant presence. The phrase 'tongues of fire' is closely associated with the temple in Isaiah and 1 Enoch.[59] At Mount Sinai, fire and other theophanic elements combine to indicate Yahweh's presence among his people.[60] The theophany at Sinai is perpetuated in the form of the Shekinah glory associated with both the tabernacle and the temple.[61] The Hebrew people are typical among the ancients in understanding the temple as God's palace and the ark as his 'throne'.[62] These various narratives share the common notion that God's presence and kingdom dwells among his people to grant salvation and peace. They strongly suggest that the advent of the Spirit at Pentecost initiates the community as the new temple of God and marks them as the people of the new covenant.[63]

In the gospels and Acts, the location of 'the temple' as God's dwelling shifts from the physical temple in Jerusalem to Jesus and finally to the church. In the gospels the internal corruption of the temple establishment, combined with their rejection of Jesus, leads to his symbolic cursing of the fig tree, foreshadowing the destruction of the temple.[64] The persecution of Jesus was instigated by the chief priests, ultimately leading to his crucifixion.[65]

---

[58] Luke 3:21–22; par. Matt 3:16; cf. Isa 64:1, which invokes the coming of God to render righteous judgment and salvation; Norval Geldenhuys, *Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951), 147.

[59] Isa 5:24–25; 30:27–30; 1 En. 14:8–25; 71:5; http://wesley.nnu.edu/index.php?id=2126; accessed 21 March 2017; Bock, *Acts*, 97–8.

[60] Exod 19:16–20; 24:15–18. Turner, *Power*, 274, 285.

[61] 1 Kgs 8:6–11; Lev 16:2; 1 Sam 4:22; Beale, *NTBT*, 608.

[62] 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; 2 Kgs 19:15. The ark is unique to Israel and in other nations may be replaced by an empty throne or other furnishings; *ISBE*, s.v. 'Ark of the Covenant', I:293. But the animals represented in the cherubim—the lion, the ox, the eagle and the human—are typical ornaments for ancient thrones and represent kingship; Ezek 1:5–14.

[63] Beale, *The Temple*, 205–6.

[64] Mark 11:12–25; Luke 13:6–9; 21:29–33; Matt 23:37–24:2;

[65] Matt 26:3–5; Mark 14:1–2; Luke 22:2. The Gospel of John gave the most negative depiction of the priestly establishment, repeatedly naming 'the chief priests and the Pharisees' as instigators of Jesus' arrest and

Jesus' reference to his body as a 'temple', reinforced by the tabernacle metaphors in John's prologue implies that the true dwelling place of God is now in the incarnate Son.[66] The tearing of the temple veil at his crucifixion not only indicated a new access to God's presence, but also implies the abandoning of the sanctuary as a location of special dwelling.[67] In Pauline and Petrine letters, the church and her members would be explicitly named as the temple of God.[68] The transition of God's dwelling from the physical temple to the church is narratively implied in Acts, beginning with the theophanic descent of the Spirit at Pentecost and continuing through repeated conflicts between the church and the establishment.[69] Stephen's sermon challenges the priestly assumption about the centrality of the Jerusalem temple and thereby heightens the conflict.[70] The dramatic scene in Acts 21:30, in which Paul was dragged out of the temple, is understood by some commentators as the final rejection of the gospel by the temple establishment and, being 'the last scene dealing with the temple in Acts', a sign that the Jerusalem temple has ceased to function as such.[71] Given the trajectory of the temple narrative in the book of Acts, it is reasonable to read the Pentecost theophany narrative as describing the descent of the Shekinah glory upon the church to inaugurate her as the new temple of God.[72]

---

crucifixion beginning in 7:32, but turning primary attention to the priests in the later sections; e.g. John 19:6. It also makes frequent references throughout to the hostile Jewish religious authorities as 'the Jews', the majority of which consistently opposed Jesus; e.g. John 5:18; 7:1; 9:22.

[66] John 2:19–22; cf. Matt 26:61; Mark 14:58; John 1:14; Acts 7:48; 17:24; Col 1:19; 2:9.

[67] Matt 27:51; Mark 15:38; Luke 23:45.

[68] 1 Cor 3:16–17; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; Eph 2:19–22; 1 Pet 2:5.

[69] Acts 2:2–4; 4:1–22; 5:17–42; 7:1; 22:30–23:11; 24:1; 25:2. This may be why Luke emphasises Jerusalem as the locale for Jesus' post-resurrection appearances and the inception of the church.

[70] Acts 7:48–50.

[71] Bruce, *Acts*, 410; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 652. The same may also be implied in the graphic imagery in this verse of the shutting of the temple gates.

[72] Beale argues extensively for this in chapter 6 of *The Temple*, pp. 201–44; also see G.K. Beale, 'The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost: Part 1: The Clearest Evidence', *TynBul* 56.1 (2005): 73–102; G.K. Beale, 'The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost: Part 2: Corroborating Evidence', *TynBul* 56.2 (2005): 63–90.

7.2.3 The Function of the Temple Metaphor

In arguing for Pentecost as the inauguration of the church as the temple, I do not deny that it was an empowering event, anointing the church to bear witness to Christ. But it can be viewed more holistically as a new covenant initiation event that joined the church to Christ in his sonship, shaping and sending. A brief survey of the temple metaphor in the NT shows that its usage spans these three aspects of the covenant. In 1 Peter 2 the temple-priesthood-people metaphors convey a covenantal identity as well as service and proclamation. In the Corinthian letters the holiness of the temple is at the fore, while Ephesians associates it with unity and divine dwelling.[73] The relevance of the temples is further reinforced by features shared with the *imago Dei*: the glory that dwells in the temple corresponds to the Spirit in the image; both the temple and the image mediate the divine presence on earth; the temple symbolises the throne of God, while the image is his kingdom agent.[74] Furthermore, symbolic parallels between creation and the temple suggest that the *imago Dei* functions as a priest in the 'temple' of the cosmos.[75]

7.2.4 Spirit Baptism in Paul

With these background concepts in view, we may proceed to examine the other NT materials regarding Spirit baptism. Roger Stronstad has observed that Dunn, Green and Stott all read Luke's narratives through the lens of Pauline theology, in which Spirit baptism is 'always initiatory and incorporative'.[76] He rightly argues that Luke, as a theologian in his own right,

---

[73] See n. 68 above.
[74] Middleton, *The Liberating Image*, 87.
[75] Beale, *Temple*, chaps. 2–3; Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty*, 61–3.
[76] Roger Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1984), 10; he cites Paul's only explicit reference to Spirit baptism in 1 Cor 12:13. The term 'always' is supplied by Stronstad, emphasising the perceived narrowness of his opponents' views.

has a distinctly 'charismatic rather than a soteriological theology of the Holy Spirit'.[77] But he provocatively denies the initiatory element. Menzies concurs, stressing that 'Luke never attributes soteriological functions to the Spirit … [but describes the Spirit] *exclusively* in charismatic terms as the source of power for effective witness'.[78] But while Lukan and Pauline theologies of the Spirit are certainly distinct, I question whether they are as exclusive as Stronstad and Menzies suppose. Note that Paul's reference to Spirit baptism occurs in the context of his discussion of the diversity and interdependence of spiritual gifts within the body of Christ. To be incorporated into the body is to receive a distribution of gifts which are empowered by the Spirit. Spirit baptism in 1 Corinthians 12:13 is not only 'soteriological', but also charismatic. For Paul, to be baptised in the Spirit into the body of Christ is to become a participant in a unified charismatic community.[79] Not only so, but in light of the Corinthian abuse of glossolalia, he also gives particular emphasis to the gift of prophecy, which is also prominent in Luke.[80] In this section, Paul does not dichotomize between salvation and service. Paul's insistence in chapter 13 on love as the ultimate criteria for the exercise of Spiritual gifts specifies the particular *shape* of the covenantal way of life and ministry in the body of Christ. Indeed, the larger context of 1 Corinthians 10–14 shows that the church's covenant life is one of loving charismatic service.[81] This is well in keeping with my understanding of the

---

[77] Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology*, 10–12; also 77–81.

[78] William W. Menzies and Robert P. Menzies, *Spirit and Power: Foundations of Pentecostal Experience* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 114; also p. 55; italics original. I have chosen to refer in the main text only to Robert Menzies, who wrote most of the chapters in the book, including the relevant chapters I am citing. William Menzies wrote chap. 1, the postscript in chap. 13 and the conclusion; see p. 11 n. 1. Also Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 237–8.

[79] 1 Cor 12:4–11. Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 154–5.

[80] 1 Cor 14; Stronstad also highlights prophecy as a characteristic activity of the Spirit in the Christian community; Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology*, 34–48, 54–56, 80–81.

[81] Romans exhibits the same pattern but uses different metaphors and address different contextual issues. The Spirit of adoption brings believers into union with Christ the Son, sharing (broadly) in his death and resurrection, (more narrowly) in his suffering and hope of glory, in his Spirit-directed, love-conditioned manner of living, and

covenantal structure as sonship, shaping and sending. The Spirit-baptised church, as the restored *imago Dei*, is a Spirit-constituted, Spirit-shaped and Spirit-empowered, Christoformic community. And the exaltation of Christ is a criterion for discerning the Spirit because the Spirit's mission is to glorify Christ.[82]

7.2.5 The Gift of the Spirit in Acts

This brings us to the question of Luke's pneumatology.[83] I agree with Stronstad and Menzies that the Spirit's work in charismatic empowerment is primary to Luke's pneumatology, as evidenced in the opening narratives of his gospel, in the ascension promises and in Peter's quotation of Joel 2 at Pentecost.[84] But the assertion that the Spirit in *exclusively* charismatic in Luke may be overstated. For instance, following Saul's conversion, it is said that 'walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort [παρακλήσει] of the Holy Spirit, [the church] multiplied'.[85] While the multiplication may be a consequence of the 'fear' and the 'comfort', these latter descriptions cannot justifiably be interpreted as charismatic empowerment. The similar statement in Acts 13:52, that 'the disciples were filled with joy and with the Holy Spirit', gives no hint of charismata or empowerment.[86] In his testimony, Stephen accused the council of resisting the Holy Spirit.[87] While this could potentially refer to resisting the Spirit-

---

in his grace-empowered service; Rom 6–8, 12–15. Rom 9–11 shows us that the central question in the book is about covenant and ethnicity.

[82] 1 Cor 12:3.

[83] In attempting to treat Luke-Acts as a corpus, it is natural to slip into language regarding Luke's perspectives and concerns. But such language should not be interpreted as an assumption that we have unmitigated access to the Luke's mind. What we have before us is the text, from which we can observe patterns and hope to discern a particular set of thoughts and perspectives. Therefore, such common expressions as 'Luke's theology' should be understood by the reader to mean 'the theology of the text'.

[84] Introduction: Luke 1:15–17, 41–45, 67–79, etc. Ascension: Luke 24:48–49; Acts 1:8. Pentecost: Acts 2:16–18.

[85] Acts 9:31.

[86] Jesus is also said to '[rejoice] in the Holy Spirit'; Luke 10:21.

[87] Acts 7:51.

anointed prophets, Luke makes little functional distinction between the Spirit and the human agents.[88] In this case, the council members, like their forefathers, were resisting the Spirit's call to repentance and covenant faithfulness, a call that could be seen as a purifying, or perhaps even a 'soteriological' function. I would not press the point here, since the Spirit's specific work can be seen as 'missional' (i.e. in anointing the messenger), even if the consequence is soteriological. But compare Acts 9:31, where the Spirit's specific work is to grant joy, with the consequence of missional advancement. A defence of Stronstad's and Menzies' thesis of an *exclusively* charismatic Lukan pneumatology in Acts 7:51 would defeat their case in 9:31.

I want to argue that for Luke, the gift of the Spirit is holistically covenantal, incorporating initiation, sanctification and mission.[89] It has been observed that in his two volumes, Luke places the anointing and ministry of the Spirit upon the church in conscious correspondence with the anointing and ministry of the Spirit upon Christ. We can note briefly that at his baptism Jesus was anointed with the Holy Spirit for his messianic ministry. But this anointing was accompanied by an affirmation that he is God's Son and that he pleases God.[90] The three covenantal aspects of sonship, shaping and sending can be discerned in the scene and associated with the Spirit. In my treatment of the narratives in Acts, I will begin with the events on the day of Pentecost, followed by Cornelius' conversion, since these events are marked by the key phrase 'baptized with the Holy Spirit' and may be suggestive of how Luke is using such language. I will then proceed to examine other narratives of Spirit reception in Acts that lack the explicit use of the language of Spirit baptism.

---

[88] Cf. Acts 5:3–4; cf. Luke 9:48; Matt 25:40. Also see my discussion of concursus (above) and of passive representation in Chapter 4.
[89] Cf. Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 158.
[90] Luke 3:21–22. See my discussion on this in Chapter 5.

7.2.5.1 Spirit Baptism in Acts

In Acts 1:4–5, Jesus refers to the promise of the Spirit in John's preaching. Although the Spirit is clearly associated with empowerment in v. 8, there are other notable features in the narrative. First, the resurrection of Christ and the coming of the kingdom of God are eschatological themes indicating salvation and judgment and the new creation, and are each associated with the Spirit in various NT texts.[91] Second, John's promise of the Spirit indicated a momentous historical event, depicted in all four gospels as a new exodus. I noted earlier that John used baptism as a one-time rite of passage rather than a routine washing. It anticipated Spirit baptism as the actual threshold experience that marked this passage. Third, the apostles' question in v. 6 regarding the restoration of Israel was not wholly misguided. While they misunderstood the nature of the kingdom and of what was about to transpire in their time, they rightly understood that the Father's promise of the Spirit entailed an advent of the kingdom and a restoration of Israel.[92] As I argued earlier, John's promise of the Spirit was rooted in Isaianic and other OT texts, indicating a purification of Israel and her restoration to the covenant. Isaiah uses both exodus and creation motifs to describe this restoration. Note also that the replacement of Judas in the second half of Acts 1 is vitally important because the twelve apostles are to be the 'twelve patriarchs' of the restored Israel in Christ.[93] These considerations suggest that while Luke depicts the Spirit as charismatic, he does so in the context of the advent of a new era, specifically, of a new covenant in which God's repentant people are forgiven, purified and anointed with the Spirit of prophecy. The rescue of Israel from the exile and the accompanying establishment of the new covenant results in a Spirit-

---

[91] E.g. Luke 3:16–17; Rom 1:4; 8;11; 14:17; Matt 3:1–12; 12:28; John 3:5; 5:25–26; cf. 6:63; 7:37–39. Isa 32 also associates the Spirit with kingdom and with life, as discussed earlier. The association of Spirit with life is pervasive in the OT and the NT.
[92] Max Turner, *Power from on High*, 300–1. Wright, *RSG*, 654.
[93] Bruce, *Acts*, 44; cf. Turner, *Power from on High*, 301.

anointed *imago Dei* community. Acts 2:1–4 narrates the fulfilment of the promise in 1:4–5 and, as I argued earlier, indicates an inauguration of the church as the temple of the new covenant, with the indwelling Spirit as its glory, so that she becomes the covenantal agent of the kingdom and the restored *imago Dei*. These various themes and metaphors confirm that Pentecost is an initiatory event, meriting the designation 'baptise with the Holy Spirit' in 1:4. But it is also an empowerment narrative, as evidenced by Peter's preaching.

In Acts 2, Peter preaches the Pentecost sermon and quotes from Joel the promise of the Spirit. Although the Spirit is associated with prophecy, the outpoured Spirit also signals the imminence of 'the day of the Lord', which is the day of judgment and salvation.[94] We must keep in mind that his audience is composed of Jews and God-fearers. Luke indicates that they were 'from every nation', but were 'dwelling in Jerusalem'. This could be a subtle indication that, though physically post-exilic, they were still in spiritual exile. Like Jews of the exilic era, Peter's audience was already God's people, yet were in need of 'salvation'. Indeed, his quotation of Joel promises salvation and the gift of the charismatic Spirit.[95] The reference to 'you and your children', and the exhortation to 'Save yourselves from this crooked generation' both allude to Israel's exodus and wilderness experience.[96] Therefore, the promise of the Spirit is inseparably combined with the offer of salvation in the context of a new exodus from their spiritual exile. Note also that he does not describe separate methods for receiving each offer. As with salvation, the way to receive the Spirit is to 'repent and be

---

[94] Acts 2:16–21; cf. Luke 3:4–17.
[95] Acts 2:17–21, 38–39. Here we can see the common elements shared by Joel, Luke, John the Baptist and Peter: threat of judgment, call to repentance, offer of salvation and the promise of the Spirit.
[96] Deut 32:5; cf. Matt 17:17.

baptized'.[97] This narrative account of an apostolic instruction suggests that Spirit reception should normally be associated with covenant initiation, specifically with the event of conversion and baptism.[98] We can also note that water baptism is the normative rite of repentance and faith in response to the gospel.

The giving of the Spirit to Cornelius' household is explicitly compared with the apostles' experience at Pentecost, and likewise recalls the promise of Spirit baptism.[99] The event marks the crossing of the Jewish gospel into the Gentile world, transcending the ultimate cultural barrier in the NT. Peter's hesitation to preach to Gentiles is anticipated by the vision and dialogue before he receives the invitation to Cornelius' house. His comments in verses 28–29 betray a reluctant obedience. After the event, he faces open criticism from 'the circumcision party' in Jerusalem for associating with Gentiles.[100] In light of Acts 1:8 and the trajectory of the book's narrative, the Cornelius event raises a critical issue that would not be officially resolved until the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15.[101] Cornelius was a devout God-fearer who was already aware of Jesus' ministry.[102] But Peter announces the death and resurrection of Jesus, calling the household to believe in Jesus for the forgiveness of sins.[103] At this point, the Holy Spirit 'fell on' his hearers, and they began 'speaking in tongues and extolling God'.[104] It is without dispute that they received the Spirit at the time of their conversion. What is in dispute is whether this Spirit reception is exclusively charismatic, or also soteriological. We

---

[97] Acts 2:38.
[98] Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 226.
[99] Acts 11:16.
[100] Acts 11:2–3.
[101] See also Romans, Galatians and Ephesians for a Pauline perspective.
[102] Acts 10:2, 37.
[103] Acts 10:38–43.
[104] Acts 10:44–46.

can observe that Peter's sermon and the subsequent call for baptism are soteriological elements in the text, while their speaking in tongues is charismatic.[105] Peter's account in Acts 11:4–17 clearly emphasises the soteriological nature of the experience. Verses 15–17 compare the Gentiles' experience with that of the apostles at Pentecost. But note that neither in verse 17, nor anywhere else, does Peter speak of the gift of the Spirit as a *charismatic* anointing. Rather, he associates the gift with the moment of belief: 'when we believed in the Lord Jesus Christ'. Peter did not say, as we should expect given an exclusively charismatic Lukan pneumatology, '… when we were anointed as prophets', or even '… *after* we had believed'.[106] Peter's words, 'when we believed', indicates that he was comparing the Gentiles' *conversion* experience with their own.[107] In light of Stronstad's and Menzies' claim, Luke the 'charismatic theologian' is strangely complicit in this apparent conflation of conversion and anointing. This raises a problem for those who appeal to the Pentecost narrative in support of a theology of Spirit baptism as a subsequent empowerment experience. Peter gives another account of the Cornelius incident at the Jerusalem Council, which was provoked by the claim that circumcision is required for salvation.[108] Peter appeals to the incident as evidence that God has chosen to include the Gentiles, citing the gift of the Holy Spirit as evidence. Once again, there is no mention in the text of anointing or empowerment. Rather, the Spirit is evidence of Gentile equality, indicating that they too have been

---

[105] Although glossolalia is a charismatic manifestation, this alone does not imply a vocation 'anointing'. Prophetic speech here and elsewhere in Luke-Acts appear to be primarily doxological; e.g. Luke 1:46–55; Acts 2:11; see Turner, *Power from on High*, 272.

[106] Other options more likely than the text: '… when we were empowered to be his witnesses'; '… when we were filled with the Spirit on the day of Pentecost'.

[107] Montague: 'The aorist *pisteusai* (*epi*), used here, always in Acts means the decisive act of faith, by which one becomes a Christian'; George T. Montague, *Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1976), 293; Anthony C. Thiselton, *The Holy Spirit—In Biblical Teaching, Through the Centuries, and Today* (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013), 65.

[108] Acts 15:1.

incorporated into the covenant.[109] We can certainly infer that, as covenant participants, the Gentiles share the same covenant mission. But in this incident Spirit baptism clearly functions as soteriological evidence.

Peter's words in Acts 11:17 leaves us with a problem of chronological discrepancy that demands explanation: Although the apostles had already believed, with growing conviction during Christ's ministry and definitively upon witnessing his resurrection, this text associates their act of believing with their Spirit baptism at Pentecost.[110] In light of Luke's conscientiousness regarding historical detail, a flagrant lapse in this regard is unlikely. I suggest that the distinct events of the resurrection, ascension and Pentecost were fused together in this account because they are theologically unified.[111] The resurrection of Christ was the foundational achievement of the new creation-exodus. The ascension represents the consummate exaltation of Christ that complements the resurrection, but also makes way for his sending of the Spirit at Pentecost.[112] Pentecost brings the reality of the new creation-exodus into the history and experience of the church. A reconciliation of this discrepancy is difficult to achieve within a multi-stage reading of Pentecost and Spirit baptism as a non-soteriological event distinct from 'conversion-initiation'.

---

[109] Acts 15:7–11.

[110] Nothing in the Pentecost narrative warrants this association; Acts 1–2. Regarding the association of belief with the resurrection, see Luke 24:25, 37–43. I have not yet found a commentary that addresses this apparent chronological discrepancy, having consulted Bruce, *Acts*, Bock, *Acts*, I. Howard Marshall, *Acts*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Downers Grove: IVP and Nottingham: IVP, 1980), Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998), Ajith Fernando, *Acts*, *NIVAC* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998) and John Stott, *The Spirit, the Church and the World: The Message of Acts* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1990).

[111] This hypothesis should not be difficult once it is agreed that Luke is 'a theologian in his own right'; Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology*, 13–14.

[112] Acts 2:31–33; 5:30–32; Beale, *NTBT*, 239–40, 247–8; Wright, *RSG*, 655. This theologically informed fusion of historical events is somewhat reminiscent of the 'Johannine Pentecost' (John 20:19–23); on which see Beasley-Murray, *John*, 381–2. Also see sect. 6.1.1.

Regarding the Cornelius texts Menzies writes, 'Since according to Luke reception of the Spirit is the exclusive privilege of "the servants" of God and generally results in miraculous and audible speech, by its very nature the gift provides demonstrative proof that the uncircumcised members of Cornelius's household have been incorporated into the community of salvation'.[113] He admits that the reception of the Spirit functions in this text to prove the incorporation of the Gentiles into the covenant. But this is only the case because the charismatic Spirit is 'the exclusive privilege' of God's people, meaning that it is *available*, but not de facto *received*. He rightly rejects Dunn's overstated 'equation' of Spirit reception with 'repentance unto life'.[114] But Dunn clearly meant that the former is evidence of the latter and that the two are usually contemporaneous. Menzies makes a distinction between Spirit reception and salvation, arguing that 'elsewhere "repentance" is a *prerequisite* for receiving the Spirit (2:38–39) and is clearly distinguished from the gift itself'.[115] The point is valid, but proves too little. Note that 'repentance' is also a *prerequisite* for salvation, and is theologically distinct but not separable from salvation. Simply distinguishing repentance from Spirit reception does not prove that they are theologically separable.[116] His judgment that the event is charismatic and not soteriological is dependent on the prior assumption that Luke's pneumatology is *exclusively* charismatic. I would argue against Menzies that Acts 11:17–18

---

[113] Menzies and Menzies, *Spirit and Power*, 80–1. Although two authors are cited, the material I cite is written by Robert Menzies, who writes in first person singular pronoun throughout; see p. 11 n. 1.

[114] Menzies and Menzies, *Spirit and Power*, 81; James D.G. Dunn, 'Baptism in the Spirit: A Response to Pentecostal Scholarship on Luke-Acts', *JPT* 3 (1993):14, commenting on Acts 11:17–18.

[115] Menzies and Menzies, *Spirit and Power*, 81.

[116] Menzies and Menzies, *Spirit and Power*, 86 n. 49. Menzies cites Acts 5:31–32, which associates repentance with forgiveness, and Spirit reception with obedience. But it is ineffective because repentance and obedience are inseparable. Stronstad presents a weaker argument for the charismatic nature of Spirit reception in this case, based solely on his prior assumption that the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost is exclusively charismatic; Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology*, 67.

does associate Spirit reception with salvation.[117] That Cornelius' household was baptised in the Spirit prior to water baptism deviates from the norm of Acts 2:38.[118] It shows that Christ in his sovereignty is able to pour out the Spirit upon the inwardly repentant, without strict adherence to baptism as a means. The text also implies that Peter would have been hesitant to baptise the Gentiles without the sign of covenantal incorporation. Therefore, we can suggest that faith and baptism is the normative means of receiving the Spirit without insisting on a strict dependence on the sacrament.[119]

Based on the preceding analysis, I would conclude that the two events in the book of Acts specifically associated with the language of Spirit baptism, namely the Pentecost and Cornelius narratives, both indicate an initiation into the new covenant.[120] Pentecost completes the historical institution of the pneumatological new covenant between Jesus and his church. Cornelius's Gentile household was incorporated into Israel's new covenant, evidenced by the gift of the Holy Spirit.

7.2.5.2 Other Instances of Spirit Reception

Paul's conversion narrative in Acts 9 contains a single promise in v. 17, delivered via Ananias, that he would 'be filled with the Holy Spirit'. There is no mention of his receiving the Spirit prior to Ananias' visit. Ananias is told that Paul is 'a chosen instrument', which suggests that mission, and possibly empowerment, may be in view.[121] But Dunn rightly points

---

[117] Twelftree, *People of the Spirit*, 47.
[118] Also Acts 2:1–4; 8:12, 14–17.
[119] Sullivan, *Charisms*, 70–2; Smail, *Reflected Glory*, 87–8, 141, 147–52.
[120] Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 158; Michael Green, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004), 180–91; Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 92.
[121] Here, 'baptised' is most likely used in reference to water baptism. The use of πλησθῇς ('filled') is suggestive. I will later argue that the πληρόω word group is consistently used by Luke to indicate influence, leading to

out that Paul's conversion-initiation is complete only at the moment of his baptism.[122] Given

his own testimony in Acts 22:16, which associates his baptism with the washing away of sins

and calling on Jesus' name, the event is clearly initiatory. From a theological perspective, this

supports an integration of initiation, sanctification and mission. In affirming Luke's

distinctively charismatic pneumatology, we need not posit that it *conflicts* with Paul's by

completely dissociating the Spirit from salvation. But given Paul's special function in the

book of Acts, we should be cautious about extrapolating a general pattern for all.

Acts 19 reports Paul's encounter with some Ephesian 'disciples', in which they received the

Holy Spirit. The incident is *prima facie* a case of post-conversion Spirit reception. But there

are indications in the text that the situation may be anomalous. Paul's question in verse 2

suggest that the expected norm is Spirit reception at the moment of faith, in keeping with Acts

2:38. That the Ephesian disciples had 'not even heard that there is a Holy Spirit' is

unexpected in light of the promise through John the Baptist that Jesus would baptise with the

Spirit. But it is possible that not everyone baptised by John has heard this discourse. The

implied connection in verse 3 between Spirit reception and baptism should not be missed.[123]

Two facts in the account suggest that these 'disciples' were not yet fully Christians. First,

while they were expecting a Messiah to come after the Baptist, Paul had to inform them that

this Coming One is Jesus (19:4). Second, unlike the Samaritans and Apollos, these Ephesians

---

direction, transformation or empowerment by the Spirit. See sect. 7.2.6. Although he is still named 'Saul' at this point, I have chosen to refer to him as 'Paul' for ease of identification.
[122] Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 73–8; Turner concurs; *Power*, 375.
[123] That they were baptised 'into John's baptism' could lead to the assumption that these disciples had heard the preaching of Apollos, who had been in Ephesus and 'knew only the baptism of John'. But to the contrary, the same text also tells us that Apollos 'taught accurately the things concerning Jesus' (18:25), which is not evidenced in these Ephesians.

needed to be rebaptised.[124] It seems most likely that the 'Ephesian twelve' were 'almost Christians' until this event, at which point Paul brought them to an adequate understanding of the gospel and a full initiation into Christ through baptism and Spirit reception.[125] It also seems likely that their reception of the Spirit, accompanied by glossolalia and prophecy, is both initiatory and charismatic.

The case of the Samaritans in Acts 8 is the incident most likely to support the two-stage empowerment model, particularly its thesis that Spirit baptism occurs *subsequent* to conversion.[126] But it is also the most notoriously difficult to interpret, not least because Simon Magnus is clearly significant to the story, yet his relevance to the pentecostal doctrine under examination is opaque. We can observe that Luke records only one impartation of the Spirit in this narrative. Although the Samaritans' reception of the Spirit is delayed, the comment in verse 16 suggests that the delay is anomalous, and that Spirit reception is normally a part of initiation. Indeed, the event appears to be a direct contradiction of Peter's teaching in 2:38! Turner rightly argues on the basis of verse 16 against the 'Confirmationist and classical Pentecostal models', which require that 'Luke's readers will assume *this* sequence as normative'.[127] Dunn's various arguments for the defectiveness of the Samaritans' faith founder on the fact that the apostles seemed to have accepted the report of their conversion and, upon their arrival, neither clarified the gospel nor rebaptised them.[128] Given that the

---

[124] Turner, *Power*, 390.
[125] Turner, *Power*, 392.
[126] Hence the title of Max Turner's article: 'Interpreting the Samaritans of Acts 8: Waterloo of Pentecostal Soteriology and Pneumatology?' *Pneuma* 23.2 (2001): 265–86.
[127] Turner, *Power from on High*, 360. Also see Bock, *Acts*, 331.
[128] Acts 8:14–17. For more extensive discussions, see Turner, *Power from on High*, 362–7; cf. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 63–8. Also Bock, *Acts*, 328, 331.

evangelisation of the Samaritans represents a significant stage in Luke's narrative regarding the advance of the gospel,[129] the anomaly may be due to the need for apostolic ratification of the Samaritan ministry. Stott and Turner have plausibly suggested that God deliberately withheld the Spirit from the Samaritans for this purpose.[130] Regarding the purpose of Spirit reception we can observe, against both types of empowerment models, that the text gives no mention of empowerment, but implicitly associates the Spirit with baptism.[131] If empowerment were the primary purpose, we would expect Simon to ask that he might personally receive the Spirit, rather than to mediate the Spirit to others.[132] It appears that, from Luke's perspective, the Samaritan reception of the Spirit is not a case of 'subsequence', but of an *anomalously extended initiation process*. The reason for the delay is not given in the text. But Spirit reception remains the Lukan sign of incorporation into the new covenant.

Note that, while Philip is seen baptising both the Samaritans and the Ethiopian, he does not mediate Spirit reception in either text. Simon's attempt to purchase this privilege is met with the threat of a curse. In light of Peter's prominence in the narratives of Pentecost, Samaria, Cornelius' house and the Jerusalem Council, one may even discern an emphatically 'Petrine' ratification of the Samaritan conversion through Spirit reception. The Holy Spirit may be given through Peter's mediation as one of a series of Lukan affirmations of Peter's apostolic authority.[133]

---

[129] Acts 1:8; cf. Acts 10:1–11:18.
[130] Stott, *The Spirit, the Church and the World*, 158; Turner, 'Interpreting the Samaritans of Acts 8', 278.
[131] Acts 8:16–17; cf. 2:38.
[132] Note that the text does not tell us that Simon had received the Spirit as the Samaritans did.
[133] Acts 2, 8, 10, 15. Paul's first missionary journey in Acts 13 begins a shift in attention, completed in Acts 15, from Peter to Paul. Having narrated the crossing of the cultural barriers with the gospel, Luke gives full attention to Paul's Gentile mission, punctuated by the rejection of the temple establishment; Acts 21–23.

Finally, the strangeness of the narrative may be related to the role of Simon Magnus, who is known in church history to be a heresiarch. Luke makes much of Simon's attempt to purchase spiritual ability, and Peter's denunciation of him. If it had been the case that Simon rejected the gospel while the Samaritans believed, or that they exhibited clear signs of Spirit reception while he did not, Luke would have had more ways to discredit him. While stating no clear differences in experience, Luke carefully sets him apart from the rest. The comparisons between Simon and the Samaritans, and possibly the anomalies within the Samaritan narrative, may be Luke's way of further alerting the reader against Simon's influence given the lack of visible differences between their genuine experience and his questionable one.[134] The alleged desire to minimise their similarity would also explain why external signs, though presumably present, were not mentioned.[135] Note also that the integrity of the covenantal aspects of sonship, shaping and sending, if maintained, provides us with a criteria for faithful performance of the *imago Dei* role. Each component is indispensable to the others. The absence of Spirit-shaped intentions in Simon not only disqualifies him from the ministry of the Spirit, but also calls into question his covenantal status.[136]

7.2.5.3 Signs and the Roles of Peter and Paul

It has been well observed that Acts 1:8 provides an outline of the advance of the gospel beginning in Jerusalem, and crossing geographical and cultural boundaries into Judea,

---

[134] Acts 8:12–13, 17–24.
[135] This account stands in contrast to Turner's, who denies that Luke can have knowledge of the later traditions about Simon Magnus. But because the incident occurs early in the history of Acts, Simon's disruptive activities would have had time to develop by the time of Luke's writing. It is not unreasonable that Luke would have heard reports of Simon from early (pre-patristic) sources.
[136] Acts 8:21–23; Bock, *Acts*, 333–5. cf. 2 Cor 3:3, 6–8, 18; 4:1–2.

Samaria, and finally into Gentile territory.[137] The trajectory that runs from Jerusalem through

Antioch to its 'destination' in Rome is of strategic and historical importance.[138] But the

program of Acts 1:8 is more significant culturally and theologically, and is accented by Spirit-

reception narratives. Pentecost marks the beginning of the Spirit-bearing church and her

mission. Samaria represents the crossing of the first cultural barrier, while Cornelius' Gentile

household represents the second. Perhaps we can think of these as the three 'liminal'

narratives of the missiological trajectory in Acts. Each of these three narratives give special

attention to Spirit reception, with Peter as the primary mediator. The Pentecost and Cornelius

narratives are distinguished by explicit reference to John's promise as well as the presence of

tongues. Visible evidence is implied in the Samaria narrative, but were either historically

minimal or intentionally minimised by Luke.[139] The same Lukan attentiveness to the barrier-

crossing advance of the gospel may also explain the lack of concern for visible signs of Spirit

reception in the other conversion narratives. Most of these narratives contain no mention of

the Spirit, possibly because there was no question regarding the inclusion of these groups.[140]

A complication with this hypothesis is that Spirit reception is also noted in the conversion

narratives of Paul and of the Ephesians.[141] These fall outside the Acts 1:8 programme. But

noting the centrality of Peter in the three liminal narratives, we can identify the other two as

Paul-centred narratives. The first involves the initiation of Paul,[142] the apostle to the Gentiles,

---

[137] Bruce, *Acts*, 36–7; Marshall, *Acts*, 60–1; Bock, *Acts*, 64; Stott, *Baptism and Fullness*, 32; Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 49; Green, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 181.
[138] E.g. Bock, *Acts*, 413, 750, 759.
[139] See my discussion in sect. 7.2.5.2.
[140] Acts 2:37–41; 8:36–39; 16:14–15; 16:30–33; 18:8. The offer of the Spirit in Acts 2:38–39 is necessitated by the context of the Day of Pentecost and Peter's sermon.
[141] Acts 9:17–18; 19:1–7.
[142] In the case of Paul, the only explicit sign is the restoration of his sight. Could this be symbolic of the 'healing' of Israel's blindness? Does Paul represent repentant Israel, in contrast to the priests and Sadducees, who

while the second gives an instance of Paul's mediation of Spirit impartation in an implicit

comparison with Peter's work at Samaria.[143] This suggests that the external signs of Spirit-

reception serve to highlight not only the advance of the gospel across the cultural boundaries,

but also Peter and Paul in their respective roles as the boundary-crossing Jerusalem apostle

and the boundary-crossing apostle to the Gentiles. The Lukan concern for inclusion, equality

and church unity shines through in the structure of Acts and its use of the two major apostles

and the signs accompanying their mediations of Spirit-impartation.

7.2.6 The Language of Spirit Baptism and Fullness

Having established the initiatory nature of the Spirit-reception narratives in Acts, I will now

address Luke's use of the language of Spirit baptism and fullness. I have argued that the

quotations of John's promise of Spirit baptism in Acts 1:5 and 11:16 both refer to new

covenant initiation experiences. Neither the disciples in Acts 2 nor Cornelius' household had

a prior Spirit-reception experience in Luke. The language of Spirit baptism in Acts is

complicated by the fact that in each case, the corresponding narratives use a different

expression to indicate the Spirit-reception experience: 'filled with the Holy Spirit' and 'Holy

Spirit fell on …'.[144] Classical Pentecostals have inferred from this variation that these

expressions are somewhat synonymous with Spirit baptism, although they reserve the latter

term for the concept of a non-repeatable post-conversion empowerment experience. Turner

rightly argues that Peter's appeal to the memory of the Baptist's promise likely indicates that

---

represent unrepentant Israel? If so, this represents Paul's return from exile in order to become a light to the
nations. We can only speculate.
[143] Turner also suggests that the signs given at the conversion of the Ephesian Twelve may be an indication to
Paul that it was appropriate time for ministry in Ephesus after being forbidden in 16:6 and uncertain in 18:21.
The parallel to the Samaritan incident may also be an effort to present Paul as unified with Peter and the Twelve;
Power from on High, 396–7.
[144] Acts 2:4; 10:44.

the terminology 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' was not in common use in his time.[145] This

suggests that these occurrences of 'baptised with the Holy Spirit' refer simply to Spirit

reception experiences without any technical meaning. Although Luke uses a variety of Spirit-

reception language, the initiatory incidents in Acts 8, 9 and 19 could also be rightly referred to

as 'Spirit baptism'. But given the initiatory and liminal implications of the term 'baptised', it

seems inappropriate to apply it to subsequent repeatable empowerment experiences.[146]

Luke's use of the πληρόω ('to fill') word group also exhibits a discernible pattern. Turner

observes that πληρόω and its cognates are used frequently in Luke-Acts to speak of persons

being filled with some quality, such as wisdom, rage, amazement, jealousy, grace and power,

deceit and villainy, etc.[147] 'To say that someone is "full of X" is to say that *that quality clearly*

marks the person's life or comes to visible expression in his or her activity'. He understands

'full of the Holy Spirit' to indicate 'that the Spirit was the immediate inspiration of the speech

event specified'.[148] Atkinson cites Turner's observation in support of his suggestion that the

Spirit can be conceived functionally, and in some sense, impersonally.[149] But note that, while

the Spirit sometimes appears to be depicted functionally, such expressions are better

understood as referring to the visible effects of the Spirit.[150] To restate Luke's use of the

---

[145] Turner, *Power from on High*, 386–7.
[146] E.g. Acts 4:31, 13:9.
[147] E.g. Luke 2:40; 4:28; Acts 3:10; 5:17; 6:8; 13:10; Turner, *Power from on High*, 165–6.
[148] Turner, *Power*, 167.
[149] William P. Atkinson, *Trinity after Pentecost* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2013), 49–58. While Turner cautions against a precocious inference from the texts to the theological affirmation of the Spirit's personhood, Atkinson may be too quick to move in the other direction to affirm the Spirit's impersonhood. See below for my discussion of the language of the Spirit's 'presence'.
[150] E.g. Acts 2:33, '[Jesus] has poured out this that you yourselves are seeing and hearing'. Note that the pronoun 'this' refers not to the invisible Spirit, but to the manifestations. We can grant that impersonal metaphors are used more regularly and more directly of the Spirit than of the Son. But consider that the Son is also portrayed as 'word', 'gate', 'bread', etc. These are metaphors and should be understood as such.

πληρόω word group in a way that closely follows Turner, I propose that we understand such expressions in terms of *visible or effective influence*, whether it is by a person or by some quality or emotion. In Acts 5:3, πληρόω is used in active voice with Satan as the subject, without a reference to any quality: 'why has Satan filled your heart to lie …'.[151] Therefore, 'full of X' may be understood simply to mean that the subject is *influenced by* X (e.g. wisdom, rage, Spirit, Satan), whether consistently so as to produce a characteristic quality, or momentarily so as to produce a particular activity. This allows us to maintain the uncompromised personhood of the Spirit, reading the impersonal expressions as metaphors arising from the etymology of 'spirit' and the as the residue of OT imagery.

Reading Acts in this light, we can see that references to being 'filled with' or 'full of' the Spirit consistently describe an influence of the Spirit that often results in some Spirit-directed behaviour or quality.[152] Being 'filled with the Holy Spirit' in Acts 2:4 resulted not only in xenolalia, but also in Peter's powerfully effective preaching.[153] In 4:8 the Spirit fills him to boldly confront the high priest and rulers, proclaiming Christ. In 4:31 the apostolic group was filled to continue preaching boldly. In Acts 6:3, the seven chosen men were required to be 'full of the Spirit and of wisdom'. Stephen was said to be 'full of faith and of the Holy Spirit', and later, to be 'full of grace and power … doing great wonders and signs'.[154] Likely, the

---

We could even suggest that the persons of the Triune God possess 'true personhood', while human creatures possess 'derivative personhood'. Hence the various perfections of the Son and the Spirit are more properly personal than their human counterparts.

[151] Turner does not treat this particular usage.

[152] This agrees with Turner's observation that being 'full of the Spirit' is associated in Luke with some expression of the Spirit's graces and gifts; *Power from on High*, 169. Michael Green has made a very similar observation, but emphasises 'control', with 'witness-bearing' as the result; Green, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 192–9.

[153] Some observers thought they were under the *influence* of 'new wine'; Acts 2:13.

[154] Acts 6:5, 8; 7:55.

influence of the Spirit in their lives produced wisdom, and in Stephen, also faith, grace and power, enabling him to perform the same kind of signs as did the apostles.[155] In 7:55, he was full of the Spirit and saw a heavenly vision to sustain him in martyrdom. In 9:17, Saul was filled in order to 'carry [Christ's] name before the Gentiles'. In 13:9, he was filled to confront Elymas, who was subsequently struck blind. In 11:24, Barnabas is said to be full of the Spirit and faith, empowered to encourage and add converts to the church in Antioch. Every relevant occurrence of πληρόω can be read as an influence of the Spirit, and most of these describe some empowering or preparatory influence.[156]

7.2.7 Summary

With the preceding in view, I want to propose that the term 'Spirit baptism' is rightly used in reference to the covenant initiation experience of being united with Christ through Spirit-reception, which confers upon the participant the covenantal identity of *imago Christi* with its concomitant benefits and responsibilities. In associating the term 'Spirit baptism' with covenant initiation, I do not exclude the Pentecostal notion of post-conversion empowerment experiences. What I propose is a holistic understanding of covenant that includes relationship, transformation and empowerment, each of which can include both continuous progress and repeatable experiences subsequent to conversion. Although post-conversion empowerment experiences are certainly found in the Lukan narratives, they tend to be associated with the language of being *filled* with the Spirit, and appear to be repeatable. The state of being *full* of

---

[155] Cf. Acts 2:43.
[156] For examples in the Gospel, see Luke 1:15–17, 41–45, 67–79, etc.
In Acts 13:52, it is said that the disciples, not Paul and Barnabas, were 'filled with joy and with the Holy Spirit'. There is no stated connection to missional empowerment here. But it appears that the Spirit's influence gave joy; cf. 6:3.

the Spirit is also associated with preparedness for ministry.[157] What is excluded is a division of the Christian experience into discrete stages, entailing a post-conversion passage into a stage of empowerment. Without imposing a rigid nomenclature, I nevertheless recommend this Lukan use of the terminology, which is also compatible with the very limited occurrences in Paul.[158]

Regarding sacramental initiation practices, I propose that water baptism is the formal ritual response to the gospel, and is therefore a normative part of one's initiation into the covenant community. The laying on of hands in three key narratives suggests that it is also a normal practice in completing the baptismal initiation rite. It is in this indirect sense that baptism is associated with Spirit reception. But the lack of a uniform pattern in the texts cautions against establishing a strict causal relationship between the two.

7.3 Holiness: The Presence of the Holy Spirit

Having examined the initiatory work of the Spirit, we now turn to that of sanctification, which corresponds to the second aspect of the *imago Dei* covenant identity. The coming of the Spirit at Pentecost to unite the church with Christ's resurrection life not only brings the church into filial relationship with the Father, but also sets her apart as his holy people and begins to shape her in conformity to Christ's likeness. To be baptized in the Spirit, then, is to participate

---

[157] For repeatable post-conversion fillings, see Acts 4:31–32.
My premise is that if some level of consistency can be discerned in the usage of a term in a particular corpus, e.g. Luke-Acts, then those relevant meanings can be associated with the term in reading the corpus. Also, if there is a discernible difference in usage between two terms, then a distinction between them can be made.
[158] E.g. Sullivan allows for repeated empowerment experiences, for which he allows a variety of terms, including 'baptised in the Spirit', though with reservations; Sullivan, *Charisms*, 73–75. Cf. G. S. McLean's attempt to outline a 'threefold ministry' of the Spirit using the prepositions 'with', 'in' and 'upon'; Glen S. McLean, *The Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (Eston, SK: FGBI Publications, 1991), 13–21. These prepositions can have a wide range of meanings and may not adequately support such rigid distinctions. Also note the various terminology describing similar experiences of the Spirit in Acts 2:4, 10:44 and 19:6.

in the new covenant with the Holy God as a Spirit-bearing member of his holy people. It is an expected part of the filial relationship that the son should be like his father.[159] It is also natural that in order to serve adequately in representing God, his embodied image should be conformed to his character and will. Hence, 'shaping' is the natural consequence of 'sonship' and the prerequisite for 'sending'. The Spirit is the primary agent in transforming the redeemed humanity into the likeness of the New Adam.[160] In this section I will argue that the language of the presence and fullness of the Spirit can be understood in terms of relational influence. Correspondingly, I will propose that the Spirit shapes the church into a holy, loving community by means of communion and communication, particularly in the context of mission and tribulation.

7.3.1 The Presence and Fullness of the Spirit

In order to safeguard the personhood of the Spirit, we may read the 'fluid' language (e.g. 'pour out', 'filled') commonly applied to the Spirit as metaphors for his life-giving work and his influence upon the subjects involved.[161] It is the Spirit's influence that directs and shapes the actions and character of the church, thus sanctifying her. Mark Cartledge describes the presence, or 'the coming' of the Spirit as 'an *intensification* of the Spirit's work in creation … directed toward the eschatological goal of salvation in, with and through Christ'.[162] In this

---

[159] See sect. 4.1.2, esp. p. 138.
[160] 'Owen interprets the conformity with Christ as being effected by the agency of the Holy Spirit, just as the Holy Spirit creates in the humanity of Christ the divine image by energizing, sanctifying and perfecting it. The operation of the Holy Spirit is in this way seen as constitutive both for the renewal of the divine image in Christ and for the transformation of the Christian life into conformity with Christ and thus into the likeness of the divine image'; Schwöbel, 'Introduction', in *Persons, Divine and Human*, ed. Schwöbel and Gunton, 21.
[161] Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 2:83–4; e.g. Isa 44:3–4; Acts 2:17–18.
[162] Cartledge, *Mediation of the Spirit*, 65; cf. Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality*, 134; also Andrew K. Gabriel, 'Intensity of the Spirit in a Spirit-Filled World: Spirit Baptism, Subsequence, and the Spirit of Creation', *Pneuma* 34.3 (2012): 365–382.

case, the presence of the Spirit has to do with particular kinds of the Spirit's kingdom-oriented activity. Coordinating this with another NT metaphor, we can suggest that the essence of the New Creation is the kingdom; and conversely, the fruit of the kingdom is the New Creation. Where God dwells and reigns, he brings creation to fulfilment by the transformative influence of the Spirit. This coheres with Beale's thesis regarding the extension of the temple to include the cosmos, as well as Macchia's notion of the eschatological Spirit baptism of the cosmos à la Moltmann.[163]

Perhaps such terms as 'presence' and 'indwelling' are best understood in personal and relational terms, rather than in physical terms of 'fluid' and 'container'. I propose that while the *general presence* of the Spirit refers to the Spirit's sustaining interaction with all creation, his *communal presence* can be understood as the Spirit's intensified relational engagement with creation in general and persons in particular.[164] The OT concept of 'presence' (לְפְנֵי; lit.

'to the face of') implies favour.[165] The language of presence can designate the favourable relation and loving involvement of the Spirit with God's people, mediating communion with God.[166] Such presence is the relational self-giving interaction of the Spirit with his people that imparts life and leads them in holy living and loving relations, resulting in their transformation into Christ's likeness.[167] Hence the general presence of the Spirit sustains creatures ontologically, and may at times direct them providentially. But his communal presence is intensely relational and moves creatures towards teleological fulfilment.

---

[163] Rev 21–22; cf. Beale, *Temple*, chaps. 4, 10, 12, passim. Beale is less pneumatological in emphasis, but see p. 387. Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 84–85; cf. Moltmann, *The Spirit of Life*, 9–10.
[164] Cartledge, *Mediation of the Spirit*, 65, 74.
[165] E.g. Isa 55:6–7. To 'seek God's face' is to seek his favour by God-pleasing action.
[166] Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 2:83–4; also Badcock, *House*, 140.
[167] Eph 4:24; cf. 4:32–5:2. Regarding the self-giving nature of his relational interaction, see Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, 2:83–4.

Spirit reception and indwelling speaks of a distinct *qualitative turn* within the Spirit's existing

communal interaction with the person, resulting in sustained transformative, *covenantal*

communion with God. Given the covenantal context, a ready analogy would be the marriage

union, at which initiation two people begin to relate to one another in a distinctly new,

covenantally-conditioned manner. I would further propose that the language of 'fullness', so

applied, is an intensification of communal presence, with a view towards *influence*.[168] To be

'filled' with the Spirit is to be influenced, or in some cases, effectively controlled by the

Spirit, whether momentarily or habitually, so that the person's action and/or character takes

on the shape of the Spirit's desire. These are overlapping but distinct concepts: Indwelling

refers to the *covenantal nature* of the relationship,[169] while filling refers to the *dynamic of*

influence. Admittedly, the term 'controlled' can endanger human agency by connoting a

relationship that is more deterministic than communal. Yet there are biblical narratives in

which the Spirit 'comes upon' a person with such force that 'control' may be a more fitting

description than 'influence'.[170] For the sake of safeguarding human agency, perhaps it is

preferable to conceive of the Spirit-human relationship in terms of influence, even if it can

often be an effective influence, or even an extraordinary, overwhelming influence.[171]

Given this relational model of the Spirit's presence, indwelling and fullness, as well as the

notion that the Spirit mediates the Christian's relationship with God who is 'eternal life',

loving communion with God is the means by which the Spirit shapes the character of the

---

[168] This is in keeping with my previous discussion of the Lukan usage of the πληρόω word group; see sect. 7.2.6.
[169] Cf. John 15:4–11; 17:20–23.
[170] E.g. 1 Sam 19:20–24.
[171] This may be the reason why many Pentecostals traditionally have preferred reading the language of Spirit baptism as a physical metaphor of being 'immersed in' or 'overwhelmed by' the Spirit.

Christian community. As the Spirit brings the church into transformative communion with God, the church is 'inspirited' to live in Spirit-dependent submission to God's will and in Christ's cruciform and anastatic way of life. This is fittingly complemented by Vanhoozer's account of God's providential activity as being 'communicative', which opens the way for a corresponding 'communicative' model of the Spirit's sanctifying work.[172] Not only does the Spirit communicate love and life by mediating Trinitarian communion, but he also guide the performance of human actors by communicating various cognitive, affective, imaginative and directive content.[173] Repetitive actions function as 'liturgies' that shape imaginations and educate desires.[174] As the actor habitually participates in such Spirit-directed Christoformic action, she is being shaped into the *imago Christi*, becoming more adept at both discerning further cues from the Spirit and improvising in a fitting manner.[175]

7.3.2 The Transforming Presence

The earlier sections of Romans hold out the gospel as the power for salvation and the 'hope of the glory of God'.[176] In Romans 8, the term 'glory' refers to the destiny of God's people, which is specified as conformity to the image of his Son.[177] The indwelling Spirit who constitutes the *imago Dei* in humanity is also the transformative agent by which Christians participate in Christ's death and his resurrection life in present suffering, and will participate in the glory of Christ in the eschaton, when their true nature as 'sons of God' will be

---

[172] Vanhoozer, *Remythologizing Theology*, 317–9.
[173] E.g. Rom 8:5–6, 12–17; Acts 13:2; 16:6–10.
[174] Smith, *Desiring*, 71, 80, 86, 109.
[175] Gal 5:22–25.
[176] Rom 1:16; 5:2.
[177] Rom 8:2, 11, 17, 23, 29–30 (and passim); cf. 5:2; 1 Jn 3:2; Eph 1:13–14; Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 254–5.

revealed.[178] The same pattern of transformation is most fully developed in 2 Corinthians 3–4.

Paul describes the new covenant using allusions to the exodus and the promise of the Spirit,

leading to the identification of Christ as 'the image of God' and the locus of 'the knowledge

of the glory of God'.[179] Reading the text theologically, one could say that the church is a

Spirit-inscribed communication, bearing his transforming presence in their hearts. The

indwelling Spirit mediates the face of Christ to the church's imagination, transforming their

heart's desires, shaping their life, love and service, so that they become a Christoformic

community whose manner of speech and action faithfully testifies to the gospel of the God

they have encountered.[180] But note that this transformation takes place within a missional

context, shaping the church into the *imago Christi* so that she may be God's embodied

communication to the world. And it is in the midst of shared suffering that the apostle and the

church experience the Father's comfort, behold the face of Christ, are transformed through the

Spirit, and become God's communicative community in the world.[181]

7.3.3 The Spirit and Sanctification in Luke-Acts

Despite the emphasis on the Spirit's charismatic function in Luke-Acts, there is nevertheless a

sanctification element. Luke assigns a greater role to the Holy Spirit in his temptation

narrative than either Matthew or Mark: 'And Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the

Jordan and was led by the Spirit in the wilderness for forty days, being tempted by the

---

[178] Rom 8:1–30; cf. Rom 5:3–5; 6:1–23.
[179] 2 Cor 4:4–6. Balla, '2 Corinthians', 755.
[180] 2 Cor 3:1–4:6; cf. Ezek 11:19; 36:26–27; Jer 31:31–34; Exod 31:18; 32:15–16; 34:1, 27–28. Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality*, 134.
[181] 2 Cor 1:3–10; 4:7–18 (esp. vv. 10–11, 17); cf. Acts 7:55–56. Hughes, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 156–8.

devil'.[182] Note that the Spirit guided Jesus for the duration of his forty day temptation.[183] This implies that the Spirit aided Jesus' *ethical* behaviour of obeying God and resisting the devil.[184] In Matthew and Mark, the anointing of the Spirit and the blessing of the Father is followed immediately by the temptation narrative in which Christ triumphs over Satan, thus linking sanctification with sonship and empowerment.[185] But Luke inserts the genealogy before the temptation in order to link Jesus to Adam, and compensates with stronger verbal links to the preceding anointing scene. Not only does Luke extend the Spirit's involvement into a continuous activity during the temptation, he also adds the phrases, 'full of the Holy Spirit' and 'in the power of the Spirit', preceding his temptation and his teaching in Galilee respectively.[186] This arrangement emphasises that it is the Spirit who accompanies and empowers the second Adam to succeed in both the temptation and the mission where the first Adam had failed.[187] The 'shaping' of the Son prepares him for the 'sending'.

---

[182] The Greek text for 'and was led … forty days': καὶ ἤγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἡμέρας τεσσεράκοντα; Luke 4:1–2; cf. Matt 4:1.

[183] The passive verb ἤγετο in this clause is likely a progressive imperfect ('was being led'), given the use of ἐν ('in') with τῇ ἐρήμῳ and the duration marker 'forty days'; Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 543. Compare Matthew 4:1 and Mark 1:12, which both use εἰς (*into* the wilderness) and separates the preposition from the duration marker 'forty days'. Menzies dismisses Luke's use of ἐν as merely stylistic, but he cites only examples related to the instrumental use of ἐν with πνεῦμα rather than the spatial use with a noun of place; Menzies, *Development*, 156–7.

[184] Turner, *Power from on High*, 208–9; contrary to Menzies, *Development*, 160–1. Menzies' failure to adequately address Luke 4:1 (see my discussion in the previous note) supports Turner's suspicion that his denial of the Spirit's ethical function here is due to his prior assumption that the Spirit in Luke is exclusively charismatic. Also see Shelton, *Mighty in Word and Deed*, 58–61; Yuri Phanon, 'The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Conception, Baptism and Temptation of Christ: Implications for the Pentecostal Christian, Part II', *AJPS* 20.1 (2017): 60–3; http://www.apts.edu/aeimages//File/AJPS_PDF/17_1_Phanon_Part_2.pdf; accessed 30 March 2017.

[185] Matt 3:13–4:1; Mark 1:9–12.

[186] Luke 4:1, 14.

[187] Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 29–30; cf. Luke 11:21–22.

In the book of Acts, the Holy Spirit is not specified as a sanctifying agent. But as the gift promised to God's covenant people, the Spirit is implicitly associated with sanctification. The barrier that impeded the advance of the gospel into Gentile territory was the notion that Gentiles are 'unclean' and therefore ineligible for salvation. Peter had to be convinced otherwise by means of a vision.[188] Defending his actions before the Jerusalem leaders, he testifies that God had made the Gentiles clean, and implies that Spirit baptism is the means.[189] In his testimony at the Jerusalem Council, Peter interpreted the giving of the Holy Spirit to the Gentiles as a sign that they had been cleansed. Although he specifies faith as the means of cleansing and the Spirit as the sign, one may infer that the Spirit also mediates the cleansing signified.[190] The passage shows that cleansing is a part of covenant initiation, and that the gift of the Spirit to the Gentiles confirms their covenant status and hope of salvation.[191] This passage confirms the inclusively covenantal function of the Spirit in Luke.

Following this trajectory and consciously supplementing Luke with Paul and John, we can envision a dynamic and holistic salvation experience that moves from covenant initiation through sanctification towards the eschatological hope of an all-encompassing final deliverance from sin, alienation and death, into the fullness of life and blessing under the kingdom of the holy God of Israel.[192] As Gentiles are made 'clean' by grace through faith and bestowed with the Spirit of adoption, they are incorporated into the drama under the direction

---

[188] Acts 10:14–16, 28, 34–35.
[189] Acts 11:9, 15–16.
[190] Acts 15:8–9; Turner, *Power*, 387. Note that here, as in Romans and Galatians, both 'faith' and 'the Spirit' replace various functions of 'the law'.
[191] Acts 15:11.
[192] E.g. Luke 19:11–27; 20:9–18; Acts 17:31; 24:25; Rom 5:1–5; 8:11, 18–30; Eph 1:11–14; 1 Jn 3:2; John 3:5; Rev 1:5–7; 11:15–19; 19:1–8.

of the Spirit for God-pleasing performance. Thus, the Spirit of the new covenant is also grace for covenant living, empowering the enactment of what is already true by appointment. As the 'Spirit of adoption', he also directs the 'sons of God' in dramatic performance until the grand finale, when they will be fully conformed to the image of the Son.[193]

7.3.4 Unity and Universality

As the Holy Spirit conforms the church to Christ, not only is holiness a primary outcome, but also love. Just as the eternal communion of the Triune God is characterised by perichoretic unity and perfect love, so the Spirit-shaped church manifests a corresponding unity that reflects her 'one faith, one baptism, one God …'.[194] On this basis the Ephesian church is exhorted to walk in love by putting on the new self that is created after God. It is in the context of this paraenesis of love and unity in Ephesians that we find the only Pauline reference to being 'filled with the Spirit'.[195] It is placed in contrast to being drunk with wine, suggesting the notion of being influenced or controlled by the Spirit, and is immediately followed by the participial phrase, 'addressing one another …', thereafter leading into the 'household code'. The shaping of the *imago Dei* by the Spirit, according to the recreated self in Christ, will be manifested in culture-transcending, loving relationships in the church, the home and the workplace. The overriding passion of the Spirit here, as in Galatians 5 and 1 Corinthians 11–14, is to create community by continually animating the redeemed humanity with life and love.

---

[193] Rom 8:2, 8–9, 13–15, 29.
[194] Eph 4:1–6; 5:1; John 17:20–26; 1 Jn 4:8.
[195] Eph 5:18. For a thorough discussion and competent defence of the Pauline authorship of Ephesians, see Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 2–61.

There is widespread agreement that the *imago Dei* is the basis for universal human dignity and human equality. As one reads Joel 2 and Peter's exposition in Acts 2, the same theme of equality stands at the heart of the new covenant and the promised Holy Spirit. This is a key theme for Luke, that the Spirit is poured out on 'all flesh', regardless of gender, ethnicity or social status. The OT affirmation that all human beings are valued as God's image-bearers is reaffirmed as God pours out his Spirit on Jews, Samaritans and Gentiles, making his covenant with all without distinction. Middleton titled his work *The Liberating Image* because the text of Genesis 1 affirms all humankind as image-bearers, contrary to ANE convention which reserves the designation for monarchs.[196] The same theme of liberation is repeated in the NT, but is now effected by covenantal union with Christ through the indwelling Spirit.[197] Furthermore, the summary passages in Acts of early church life, although primarily concerned with the gospel's progress, also demonstrate concern for the unity of the church. The extraordinary acts of generosity to the poor among her community is highlighted in Acts 4:32–37, the longest of the summary passages. Luke does not seem to attribute prayer and unity exclusively to the Spirit, since these were present before Pentecost.[198] But they seemed to be intensified after the coming of the Spirit. We can infer that the Spirit is responsible for the shape of the early church community, including the κοινωνία (fellowship) within the church.[199]

---

[196] Middleton, *The Liberating Image*, 204–5.

[197] Also see Murray W. Dempster, 'Pentecostal Social Concern and the Biblical Mandate of Social Justice', *Pneuma* 9.1 (Fall 1987): 129–153.

[198] Acts 1:14.

[199] 'To what should the sudden emergence of this "fulfilment" of Jesus' hopes be attributed if not to the Spirit by which he extends his rule over Jacob and purgingly "baptizes" Zion?'; Turner, *Holy Spirit*, 54. Turner attributes this to the 'Spirit of prophecy', mediated through the charismatic teaching of the apostles and other prophetic figures; p. 54.

7.3.5 Summary

The Holy Spirit mediates the communal presence of God with his people, by which they are transformed into the likeness of Christ to be a fitting embodied representative community of God to the world. The particular mode of the Spirit's sanctifying influence is communal and communicative. Its context is the church's faithful performance of her mission and faithful endurance of suffering in the world. And the particular shape of the resultant *imago Dei* community is emphatically holiness and love that mirrors the Triune God revealed in Jesus Christ.

7.4 Empowerment: Filled with the Holy Spirit

The third aspect of the *imago Dei* covenant identity is the mission of God's people and the accompanying empowerment through the Holy Spirit. United with Christ through the Spirit, the church takes on, along with the *imago Dei* role, the mission to embody and extend God's kingdom blessing to the world by the power of the Spirit. The Spirit who (1) grants communion to the covenant people of God, and (2) transforms the holy people of God, also (3) empowers the missional people of God. Empowerment is the corollary of mission and is actualised by the Spirit. At conversion-initiation, the believer is 'baptised' in the Spirit and initiated into covenant life, which includes a 'sending' into the world to bear witness to Christ and the kingdom. The indwelling Spirit directs and empowers the church in her Christ-imitating communicative speech that mediates God's kingdom to the world. To be 'commissioned' is to be *sent with* authority and implies, in this case, that she is *sent with* the empowering Spirit.[200]

---

[200] John 20:21–22.

Regarding the terminology of Spirit reception, Stronstad proposes a distinction between the terms 'anointed' and 'baptized' on the one hand, and 'filled', 'clothed', and 'empowered' on the other hand. The former set designates the once-for-all 'consecrating work of the [Spirit]', while the latter designates 'the actual equipping by the Spirit', which is repeatable.[201] These distinctions are useful, and I would propose for our own theological use, the terms 'baptism' for consecration and 'fullness' for empowerment.[202] But what I dispute is Stronstad's implicit separation of consecration for ministry from covenant initiation. As I have argued throughout the present work, covenant relationship is accompanied by kingdom mission. At the moment of genuine faith, one is liminally 'baptised in the Spirit into the body of Christ' to participate in the charismatic ministry of the church as one anointed and gifted by the Spirit for the benefit of others and the glorification of Christ.[203] And the one, holy, catholic, apostolic church, indwelt and transformed by the Spirit into the *imago Christi*, becomes a 'letter from Christ' to be the embodied manifestation of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.[204] Although Paul was speaking about his apostolic ministry, the apostolic church shares in the role of the *imago Dei*, continuing the mission of Christ and the apostles until the end of the age.[205]

---

[201] Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology*, 81. Stronstad is speaking of the Lukan use of the terms. I want to address the question of contemporary theological use.

[202] Turner rightly cautions against reading the terminology 'baptised in the Holy Spirit' as established technical language in Luke; Turner, *Power*, 386–7. But we can nevertheless use the biblical texts to address the contemporary usage of these terms. I have already argued my case for this usage. My use of 'fullness' terminology is close to Turners, and is also justified above.

[203] 1 Cor 12:3–13. God is free, of course, to withhold or delay Spirit reception for whatever reason, as in the Samaritan case. And 'genuine faith' cannot be readily discerned. But we can nevertheless associate faith with Spirit reception; e.g. Gal 3:2.

[204] 2 Cor 3:1–4:6.

[205] I resort to using Paul here because Luke, for all his emphasis on the charismatic Spirit, emphasises the empowerment and charismatic ministry of a few prominent church leaders such as Peter, Stephen, Philip and Paul, and is virtually silent about the charismatic ministry of the common believers!

Luke presents the experience of being 'filled with the Spirit' as a repeatable experience of transformation and empowerment. When the apostles were 'filled with the Spirit', they proclaimed the gospel with boldness and power.[206] The Spirit's power was manifested not only in miraculous signs and the conversion of many in response to the apostles' preaching, but also in their *manner* of preaching—i.e. boldness. While Luke certainly presents boldness as a matter of missional empowerment, we may also observe that it is a character trait associated with Jesus and lacking in the apostles before Pentecost.[207] Paul's only use of 'filling' terminology implies a continuous experience of abiding Spiritual influence and consequent progress in love and effective service.[208] He proceeds to describe the transformed manner of relating in the contexts of congregational, familial and master-slave relationships.[209] Whatever one makes of the contrast between Luke and Paul, these concepts can be integrated into a coherent theological construct in which continuous as well as discrete experiences of the Spirit's influence can result in transformation and empowerment.[210] Such experiences of divine life and vitality consist of Spirit-mediated transformative encounters with the Triune God. While the particular experiences may vary greatly, they all lead along the pathway of communion with God towards the goals of conformity to Christ and Spirit-empowered service. The extent to which one is 'full of the Spirit' (i.e. influenced and directed) in a particular moment and a particular act will determine to a large degree the

---

[206] Acts 4:31, 33; cf. Acts 2:4; 4:8; also Paul in 9:13; 13:9. Note that 'boldness' is a result not only of empowerment, but also transformation. This shows that shaping and sending cannot be abruptly demarcated.
[207] Although Luke does not use the term 'boldness' in his gospel, he depicts Jesus as fearless before the 'authorities', the crowds and threatening circumstances; e.g. Luke 5:20–24; 8:22–25. Luke's preferred word for this was 'authority' (ἐξουσία). For Peter, see Luke 22:55–62; Acts 2:14ff; 4:13.
[208] Eph 5:18; cf. 1 Cor 12–14. The present tense in Greek—here, πληροῦσθε ('be filled')—indicates a progressive aspect; Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 514.
[209] Eph 5:18–6:9.
[210] Cf. Yong, *Spirit Poured Out*, 118–9.

power of the Spirit that accompanies the act. This assumes that one's participation in what the Spirit desires to do is the occasion for experiencing his empowerment for that task.[211] This is because the Spirit's empowerment is naturally directed towards his kingdom objectives. Such an account implies a close connection between the Spirit's sanctifying influence and his empowering influence. Anointing implies consecration for the service of the *holy* God.[212]

Being '*full* of the Spirit' describes not a momentary *experience* of the Spirit's influence, but a dynamic *state* of active submission to the Spirit's direction. What is decisive is not whether one has had a past experience to be recalled in assurance of having moved into a stage of empowerment.[213] Experiences of being 'filled' are avenues towards the state of being 'full', and therefore ready to serve the divine mission. Critical to missional fulfilment is a present, continuous state of being effectively influenced, shaped, directed and empowered by the Spirit in serving God's kingdom purposes.[214] Both sanctification and sustained empowerment come from being habituated in speaking and acting in accord with the Spirit's direction, that is, being 'led by the Spirit' and 'keeping in step with the Spirit'.[215] Therefore, sanctification is the normative presupposition for empowerment.[216] But while empowerment is normatively linked to sanctification and trusting submission to the Spirit, it does not necessarily constitute evidence of sanctification or divine approval. Consider the warning of Jesus against those who perform signs in his name, but lack a genuine relationship with him.[217] History is

---

[211] Chan, *Pentecostal Theology*, 69–70.
[212] Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 82–3.
[213] Cf. Turner, *Power from on High*, 454; Turner, *Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 167.
[214] Turner, *Power from on High*, 169.
[215] Rom 8:14; Gal 5:24.
[216] Chan, *Pentecostal Theology*, 64–5.
[217] Matt 7:21–23; also 1 Cor 13:2.

familiar with powerfully gifted personalities whose character and actions bring shame and reproach to the name of Christ.[218] Furthermore, sanctification does not guarantee particular forms of empowerment, since spiritual gifts are diverse in kind.

7.4.1 The Prophethood of All Believers

The prophecy of Joel, that God would 'pour out [his] Spirit on all flesh', signals the abolishment of class stratifications and the vocation of God's people to be a prophetic community through the endowment of the Spirit.[219] The anointing of the Spirit, along with the prophetic mission, is part and parcel with participation in the new covenant. I argued earlier that while Luke and Paul have contrasting emphases on charismatic and soteriological elements respectively, their pneumatologies are multidimensional and inclusively covenantal. The dichotomisation of soteriology and mission that has characterised the conversation between subsequentialist Pentecostals and their critics can perpetuate their misreadings of Luke and Paul.[220] The way forward is to recognise the complexity of biblical covenants, which is reflected in both corpuses. I have proposed that biblical covenants be summarised in three distinct but integrated elements: sonship, shaping and sending. By reading through this threefold covenantal lens, we can do better exegetical justice to the relevant passages in the Lukan and Pauline corpuses.

---

[218] Phil 1:15–17; cf. 2 Cor 4:2. Consider King Saul who not only prophesied but was also capable of attempted murder and consulting a necromancer. Simon Magnus, whose conversion is questionable and whose 'magic' can safely be attributed to another source, nevertheless comes to mind. Balaam was a similar character. In more recent history, powerfully gifted Christian leaders have been publicly exposed for committing adultery and fraud. On the other hand, such cases are the minority and we should be careful not to exaggerate their prevalence.

[219] Joel 2:28–32; cf. Acts 2:17–21. Leslie C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 98–99. Regarding the corporate prophetic function, see sect. 6.5.1.

[220] E.g. Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology*, 82. 'Subsequentialist pentecostals' refers to those who hold to multi-stage empowerment models; see chap. 2.

In this full-orbed covenantal reading, we can also affirm that not only is the 'Spirit of prophecy' *available*, but it is *already* resident in all the covenant people of God.[221] Stronstad's declaration of 'the prophethood of all believers' seems inconsistent with his position that not all believers have yet received the Spirit of prophecy. If the prophetic anointing occurs in a post-conversion experience, it certainly follows that not all have yet shared in the 'prophethood'. The potentially negative outcome of the multi-stage model is that the church is divided between two or three classes of members, depending on how many distinct 'stages' are identified.[222] But neither Joel nor Luke envisioned a people so divided. By associating the prophetic anointing with the impartation of the Spirit at the moment of conversion, we can affirm that all believers are participants in the church's prophetic mission to proclaim the gospel of Christ. Menzies notes the difference between Luke 11:9–13 and Matthew 7:7–11, in which Luke substitutes 'Holy Spirit' for 'good gifts'. He concludes, 'He crafts his narrative so as to encourage his church—indeed, the *entire* church—to pray that they, too, might be empowered by the Pentecostal gift'.[223] But Luke, the evangelist, could also be encouraging his readers to receive the offer of salvation in Christ and so participate in the new covenant through the promised Holy Spirit. He could also be assuring the church of the indwelling Spirit and instructing her to offer the same gift of the Spirit and salvation to the unevangelised. Menzies' assumption that the audience is a *church without the gift of the Spirit* is problematic from both theological and exegetical perspectives.

---

[221] Cf. Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers*, 57–9.
[222] Turner, *Power*, 159.
[223] Menzies, *Pentecost: This Story is Our Story*, Loc. 1628–9.

Turner rightly argues that Luke does not envision all partakers of the Spirit to be 'prophets'. Appealing to the intertestamental concept of the 'Spirit of prophecy', he argues for a broader variety of associated functions, such as wisdom, revelation and the transforming presence of God.[224] Even Joel's prophecy lists various groups and charismatic functions, implying that these will be selectively rather than universally distributed.[225] But as I argued in Chapter 6, the church's proclamation of the gospel may be understood as a broadly defined prophetic function that imitates Christ's prophetic office. Consequently, the church is a prophetic community and individual Christians participate in her corporate witness through the exercise of their various gifts by the power of the Spirit.[226] Furthermore, although there are a limited number of 'prophets', narrowly defined, all covenant members bear the 'Spirit of prophecy' and the latent ability to prophesy.[227] Similarly, Turner views the empowered 'witnesses' of Acts 1:8 as referring exclusively to the apostles.[228] This is difficult to deny in light of Acts 1:22 and the summary texts that highlight the apostles' powerful works.[229] The apostles bore authoritative witness to the teachings and works of Christ, and particularly his resurrection. But Luke also mentions Stephen, Philip, and likely Barnabas, as those who preached and performed signs of power.[230] This suggests that while empowerment for witness in the official apostolic sense is restricted, other forms of empowerment are not. The 'Spirit of prophecy'

---

[224] Turner, 'Does Luke Believe', 15–17; Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 42–43; Turner, *Power from on High*, 90.

[225] Joel 2:28–29; Acts 2:17–18.

[226] Turner notes that Paul never refers to his own proclamation of the gospel as 'prophecy'; Turner, *Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 211. But we need not be restricted to Pauline use of terms.

[227] Turner, *Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 212; Wayne Grudem, *The Gift of Prophecy* (Westchester: Crossway, 1988), 198–9, 212. Acts 19:6 may be an instance of non-prophets engaging in the activity of prophesying. Also see Turner, *Power from on High*, 394–7; Turner, 'Does Luke Believe', 15–17.

[228] Turner, 'Does Luke Believe', 11–12; Turner, *Power from on High*, 398–9.

[229] E.g. Acts 2:43; 3:1–10; 4:33; 5:12–16.

[230] Acts 6:8; 8:6, 13; 14:3; 15:12. I omit Paul from this list because he is universally regarded as an apostle. But note that Barnabas is also called an 'apostle'; Acts 14:14.

residing in believers carries the potential for Spirit-empowered performance of prophecy and miraculous signs.[231] Drawing more broadly from other NT sources, we can affirm that the Holy Spirit grants a diversity of gifts and functions to equip and empower the church for its corporate 'witness', including evangelists, pastors and teachers, as well as service, giving and mercy.[232] An ordinary act of kindness, for instance, may become a prophetic communicative act when accompanied by the Spirit's illumination in the heart of a non-believer. Recognising the aforementioned distinctions, we can affirm the 'prophethood of all believers' in this qualified sense of participation in the church's corporate witness.

7.5 Tongues as Sign and Sacrament

Before bringing this chapter to a close, a word is needed regarding the pentecostal practice of glossolalia and its role in the Spirit's empowerment of the church's covenant performance. Macchia, Chan and Cartledge have suggested that tongues be viewed as a 'sacramental sign' of Spirit baptism, a notion that may be more useful than that of 'evidence' in exploring the function of tongues.[233] Evidence is a modernistic, humanly-imposed criterion for belief, while signs are divinely-initiated gifts. Evidential tongues are associate with Spirit baptism because of the Classical Pentecostal doctrine of subsequence. Proponents of the NACP model hold that Spirit baptism as a post-conversion empowerment experience is evidenced by glossolalia. This is based on the judgment that evidential tongues is the normal pattern in the Spirit-reception narratives in the book of Acts as well as the inference that this pattern signals a

---

[231] Elsewhere in the NT we see discussions on the diversity of gifts
[232] Eph 4:11–14; Rom 12:6–8; 1 Cor 12; 1 Pet 4:10–11.
[233] Macchia, 'Sighs Too Deep for Words: Towards a Theology of Glossolalia', *JPT* 1 (1992): 53; Macchia, 'Tongues as a Sign: Towards a Sacramental Understanding of Pentecostal Experience', *Pneuma* 15.1 (1993): 64; Simon Chan, *Pentecostal Theology and the Christian Spiritual Tradition* (London and New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 52–3; Mark J. Cartledge, *Charismatic Glossolalia: An Empirical-Theological Study* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), 195–7.

didactic intent on Luke's part.[234] Tongues is present in three of the five Spirit-reception

narratives in Acts, with an additional implicit but undisclosed external sign in the Samaritan

narrative.[235] That tongues is present in the majority of these narratives suggest that it may be

viewed as a common, or perhaps even normal, occurrence. But given its absence from the

other narratives, normativity is unlikely.[236] Furthermore, Spirit reception in Acts is also

accompanied by praise and prophecy. That praise was the content of earlier incidents of

Spirit-inspired prophecy suggests that the same may be true in Acts 19.[237] It also shows that

Spirit reception may be accompanied by a variety of signs, notably doxological utterance, and

suggests that tongues is at least closely associated with, or perhaps identified as a type of,

doxological prophetic speech.[238]

Given my clarification of the terms 'baptism' as an initiatory experience and 'filling' as an

experience of transformative and empowering influence, I propose that glossolalia is properly

a sign of being *filled* with the Spirit and that its sign value be accordingly reassessed.

Construing tongues as evidence of a liminal experience of Spirit baptism can potentially

obscure the value of ongoing glossolalic prayer. But because Spirit filling is a repeatable

experience and Spirit fullness is a progressive and renewable experiential state, such a

reassignment of the sign value of glossolalia encourages its continued practice. This is

---

[234] Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology*, 6–9.

[235] Acts 2:4; 10:46; 19:6. Here I include the instance of xenolalia in Acts 2, which does not require a separate treatment.

[236] Gordon D. Fee, *Gospel and Spirit: Issues in New Testament Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 99; Turner, *Power*, 396–7. Chan has pointed out the failure of Menzies' studies to conclusively establish glossolalia as the initial evidence and 'the limits of a strictly biblical theology approach to establishing doctrine'; Chan, *Pentecostal Theology*, 43.

[237] Acts 2:11; 10:46; 19:6. Note that 'telling … the mighty works of God' was the content of xenolalia in Acts 2:11.

[238] Turner, *Power*, 271, 441.

relevant to a second function of glossolalia, which is absent from Luke, but present elsewhere in the NT.

Paul presents glossolalia not only as a sign, but also as a means of edification in 1 Corinthians 14. That Paul contrasts praying 'with my spirit' with praying 'with my mind' implies that the former is unintelligible and could be identified as glossolalia.[239] From this Fee infers that the expressions in Ephesians 6:18 and Romans 8:26–27, which attribute a special role to the Spirit in prayer ($\pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ – 'by the Spirit'), likely refer to glossolalia as well, though not exclusively so in the Romans text.[240] To these we may add the similar expression in Jude 20, 'building yourselves up in your most holy faith and praying in the Holy Spirit'.[241] There is scholarly support for reading this as a reference to glossolalia, and the content closely matches Paul's view on the subject.[242] Each of these texts, to varying degrees of certainty, attribute self-edifying value to glossolalia. Stott contends that, since '"edification" in the New Testament is invariably a ministry which builds up others', and since all spiritual gifts are for service to others, Paul's comment regarding the self-edifying value of tongues is to be taken ironically rather than literally.[243] But this is difficult to sustain in light of Paul's positive

---

[239] 1 Cor 14:2, 4, 13–15. In light of Paul's mention of unintelligible prayer, Fee is certain that glossolalia is in view, and renders the phrase 'with my S/spirit', meaning that 'his own spirit is praying as the Holy Spirit gives the utterance'; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 670.

[240] Fee, *God's Empowering Presence*, 582, 730–1. Fee also cites Paul's desire that all would pray in tongues; 1 Cor 14:5.

[241] Gk.: ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι.

[242] The majority of commentators understand Jude 20 as either a reference to glossolalia or at least inclusive of glossolalia among other varieties of charismatic prayer; Peter H. Davids, *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, PNTC (Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2006), 95; Richard J. Bauckham, *WBC Vol. 50: Jude, 2 Peter* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), 285; Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 246; Robert Harvey and Philip H. Towner, *2 Peter and Jude*, The IVP New Testament Commentary (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2009), 225–6. Harvey and Towner claim a 'strong consensus' for this view. But see: Douglas J. Moo, *2 Peter and Jude*, NIVAC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 285; Gene L. Green, *Jude & 2 Peter*, BECNT, (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 121. Also see Rodolfo Galvan Estrada III, 'The Spirit in Jude 19–20', *JPT* 25 (2016): 54–6. The case is difficult to assess due to the lack of comparable material in Jude's very small corpus.

[243] Stott, *Baptism and Fullness*, 114–5.

comments on tongues in verses 2 and 5, and Jude 20 makes it clear that self-edification is not a self-contradictory notion.[244]

Citing the concept of the Spirit as the bond of love between the Father and the Son, Chan writes,

> The same Spirit also binds the church to Christ its head and creates the same character of obedience, humility and self-surrender, the same 'active passivity' in the believers' relationship with God. Glossolalia which is also an active passivity can be said to symbolize this basic relationship: we speak, yet it is a speech that comes from yieldedness and surrender to the will of God.[245]

This suggests that glossolalia not only facilitates communion with God, but also symbolizes the believer's surrender to the influence of—i.e. 'filling' with—the Spirit, a surrender that reflects the covenantal shape of the relationship. Note that bodily actions and mental states, as well as affections, can mutually influence one another, and that participation in sacraments both issue from faith and, in turn, reinforce faith. Similarly, glossolalia may be both a reflection and a means of being filled with the Spirit, resulting in growth in holiness and empowerment. That is, speaking in tongues may be seen as both a sign and a sacrament of the Spirit's work in the believer.[246]

Note that tongues can be a means of grace because it opens up a new channel of communion that supplements prayer in a known language. For Paul, the primary positive function of tongues is edification, which result from Spirit-inspired communication with God.[247] David

---

[244] Admittedly, the exhortation is a plural participial phrase (ἐποικοδομοῦντες). But the choice of the reflexive pronoun 'yourselves' instead of 'one another' suggests that self-edification rather than mutual edification is in view. This is confirmed by the second participial phrase, 'praying (προσευχόμενοι) in the Holy Spirit', and the main clause, 'keep [τηρήσατε] yourselves in the love of God', which indicate that such actions benefit the actors.
[245] Chan, *Pentecostal Theology*, 51.
[246] See Chan, *Pentecostal Theology*, 78; also pp. 41–2. Chan also links glossolalia and empowerment with growth in intimacy and holiness; pp. 63–4.
[247] Rom 8:26–27; 1 Cor 14:2, 4, 14–15.

Hilborn, making use of John Searle's taxonomy of speech-acts, classify glossolalia as 'Expressive illocutions', which 'at once denote and realise the psychological state of the speaker(s)' without necessarily carrying propositional content.[248] Although uninterpreted tongues may not communicate intelligible content to others, they can serve as self-edification by bringing the speaker into heightened levels of communion with God. This may possibly be achieved through the expression of affects and passions originating in either the speaker or the Spirit. But in either case, what results is both a deeper sharing of affect between the speaker and the Spirit and a consequent shaping of the speaker's affections by the Spirit.[249] Consider also that psalms of various types, including praise and lament, may serve similar functions reflecting at once the psalmist's thoughts and emotions and the Spirit's inspiration, as well as shaping and transforming the psalmist. And while the psalms, unlike glossolalia, may carry intelligible propositional content, and usually contain other types of illocutions, they often share with glossolalia the basic traits of expressive illocutions. Such a comparison with the psalms shows how glossolalia can potentially express and realise inner realities of the speaker, bring her into deeper communion with the Spirit, communicate the thoughts and desires of the Spirit, and transform the speaker. Communion in the context of suffering and testing, as in the case of lament psalms, becomes an intensified vehicle of transformation.[250]

---

[248] David Hilborn, 'Glossolalia as Communication: A Linguistic-Pragmatic Perspective', in *Speaking in Tongues: Multi-disciplinary Perspectives*, ed. Mark J. Cartledge (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2012), 120–1.

[249] Rom 8:26–30; 1 Cor 14:2, 4; cf. Gal 5:16–18, 25. Also see Mark J. Cartledge, 'The Symbolism of Charismatic Glossolalia', *Journal of Empirical Theology* 12.1 (1999); 48–9; Mark J. Cartledge, *Encountering the Spirit: The Charismatic Tradition* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2006), 29. Simon Tugwell has described entrance into pentecostalism as a 'breakthrough into communication'; Tugwell, 'The Speech-Giving Spirit', in Simon Tugwell et al., *New Heaven? New Earth? An Encounter with Pentecostalism* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1976), 139. Cardinal Suenens likewise suggests that glossolalia 'helps us cross a threshold … in our surrender to God'; Léon Joseph Suenens, *A New Pentecost?* trans. Francis Martin (New York: Seabury Press, 1975), 102. Also Chan, *Pentecostal Theology*, 56.

[250] Rom 5:3–5; Jas 1:2–4; Rom 8:26; Eph 6:18.

The understanding of tongues as a vehicle for communion with the divine gives rise to the function of tongues as a symbol of transcendence and divine-human encounter.[251]

Simon Chan has observed that silence and tongues have the same function within the Christian mystical and the pentecostal traditions respectively, each signalling some experience of intimacy with God.[252] One can argue that signs and their functions are tied to the contexts of particular traditions. The 'seven signs' performed by Jesus in the Gospel of John were communicative precisely because of the historical-covenantal context of the Jews.[253] Consider that in the contemporary world, whether east or west, rich or poor, people are attracted to multifarious displays of power: spiritual, physical, political, economic and rhetorical. This attraction is not unlike the Jewish quest for signs and Gentile quest for wisdom among Paul's audience.[254] While such powers can incite awe, fear and utilitarian desire, they alone can inspire neither sincere trust nor growth, especially in light of the prevalence of corruption wherever power is found. It could be that the signs of truth and love are pre-eminently needed and foundational to the function of the signs of power. To his demanding but misdirected audience, Paul preached 'Christ crucified … [who is] the power of God and the wisdom of God'. Paul's proclamation called his audience to the same humble dependence on God's grace that he himself exhibited.[255] He faithfully stewarded the gospel of

---

[251] Cartledge, 'Symbolism', 48.

[252] Simon Chan, *Pentecostal Theology*, 41. Also Richard A. Baer, Jr., 'Quaker Silence, Catholic Liturgy, and Pentecostal Glossolalia—Some Functional Similarities', in *Perspectives on the New Pentecostalism*, ed. Russell P. Spittler (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1976), 152–4.

[253] The seven signs depict Jesus as: the fruitful vine and true Israel (John 2:1–11; 15; Isa 5); mediator of life (John 4:46–54; Gen 1–2; Isa 55; Jer 2:13); the Sabbath (John 5:1–18; Gen 2:1–3); the manna (John 6:5–14); tamer of the sea/serpent (6:16–24); sight for Israel's blindness (9:1–41; Isa 6:9–10); life from the dead (11:1–45; Isa 26:19). Each of these were invested with theological meaning from the OT and readily accessible to the Jews.

[254] 1 Cor 1:22–23.

[255] 1 Cor 1:18–2:5; 3:5–9.

self-giving love demonstrated in the cross of Christ, which is also the gospel of divine wisdom and power vindicated in the resurrection of Christ.[256] Correspondingly, the contemporary context calls for a presentation of the gospel that is: (1) a faithful representation of the crucified and resurrected Christ, (2) accompanied by both the wisdom and the power of God, and (3) proclaimed with integrity and love. By intensifying the church's transformative, empowering communion with God, the pentecostal sacrament of glossolalia does not merely function as evidence, but renders substantial assistance to her performance of the *imago Dei* role.

7.6 Summary

In this chapter, I gave an exposition of the integral role of the Spirit in the initiation, transformation and empowerment of the church, restoring her as the *imago Dei* in covenantal union with Christ. I argued that Pentecost is the event at which the church is corporately ushered into the new era of the Spirit, and that Spirit baptism is her experiential participation in this initiation. The minimal requirement for Spirit baptism seems to be genuine repentance and faith, while the maximal normal practice also includes water baptism and the laying on of hands. I contended that covenant should be viewed holistically, to include sonship, shaping and sending, so that these aspects are integrated and not bifurcated. I also argued that it is through Spirit-mediated encounter and communion with the Triune God that the church is shaped in conformity to Christ as well as empowered for her mission. I further suggested that the language of 'fullness' is to be identified with such interaction and influence. Finally, I suggested that glossolalia, as a sacramental sign of being filled with the Spirit, serves to advance the Spirit's work in the believer by intensifying the subject's communion with God.

---

[256] 1 Cor 4:1–5; 1 Cor 9, 13, 15.

In this manner, glossolalia functions not merely evidentially, but substantially in contributing to covenantal life.

Such revisions offer the following pastoral advantages. First, a holistic view of the covenant, paired with the *imago Dei* identity, encourages a missional orientation. All who are adopted as children of God are simultaneously sent as representatives of Christ's gospel to the world. Second, this holistic view also encourages the imitation of Christ. Holy living and Christlike character are inherent to the covenant relationship and vital for mission and empowerment. Third, this view encourages ongoing submission to the influence and leading of the Spirit. Empowerment is linked not to a past experience of being baptised in the Spirit, but to a current state of being directed by the Spirit. Finally, the practice of glossolalia as communion and submission is encouraged, in view of the expectation that it will bear the fruit of sanctification and empowerment.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION: TOWARDS A THEODRAMATIC MODEL OF SPIRIT BAPTISM

This study began with the question: *what is the place of Spirit baptism within the larger drama of the Christian canon?* In light of my proposal that Pentecost is the dramatic moment of the re-creation of the *imago Dei* through Christ's outpouring of the Spirit, I advanced the thesis that *Spirit baptism is the initiation of the new covenant people of God through the Spirit's mediation of the eschatological kingdom whereby they are recreated as the* imago Dei *to participate in the sonship, shaping and sending of Christ.* It may be helpful at this point to summarise my argument which flows along the plot of the drama to its arrival at this conclusion. I will then proceed to discuss the significance, challenges and implications of the project.

8.1 Summary of the Argument

In chapter 1, I noted that both the doctrine of Spirit baptism and the related orientation towards mission are among important elements of the pentecostal identity. I suggested that this missional orientation may be a significant contribution to the larger Christian community that complements relationship and transformation in forming a Christian identity. Observing that one's identity is largely derived from inhabiting a story, I proposed that Spirit baptism can contribute more effectively to identity formation if it is located within the larger drama of the Bible structured around the *imago Dei* motif. And in light of the affinity of pentecostals for narrative and participation, as well as their desire to ground their experience in the Bible, the concept of a canonical theodrama provides a fitting framework for pentecostal theology. In preparation for the project, I briefly traced the history of the development of the pentecostal doctrine of Spirit baptism.

The next two chapters consisted of reviews of the relevant literature on Spirit baptism and the *imago Dei*. Chapter 2 provided an overview of the various constructive theological models of Spirit baptism and offered an original typology as a tool for understanding and assessing these models. I described representative contributions for each of the types as well as relevant sections from doctrinal statements of some prominent pentecostal denominations. I proceeded to identify critical issues raised by the study. Chapter 3 presented a wide-ranging survey of the theological interpretations of the *imago Dei*, which reflects the longer history and greater variety within that conversation in contrast to that of Spirit baptism. My adjustments of existing typologies support a clearer understanding of the views, their historical development, and their contributions. I also highlighted the contextual nature of these interpretations and the mutual compatibility of select insights they contribute. The critically appreciative nature of this survey makes way for constructing a complex view of the *imago Dei*.

Chapter 4 developed a covenantal *imago Dei* Spirit anthropology that constitutes Act 1 of the drama and prepares the way for the subsequent acts. I proposed that the *imago Dei* be construed as a dramatic role that is assigned to humankind, to be the primary actor on the stage of creation, the embodied Spirit-bearing representative agent of God's kingdom on earth. The immediate advantage of viewing the image as a role is that it can be assumed by subsequent characters in the drama, namely Christ and the church. I demonstrated that the OT story draws a discernible analogy between the creation narrative and the exodus, and frames them in a covenantal context. I proposed a simplified structure of sonship, shaping and sending through which we can view the *imago Dei* as God's covenant partner, which covenant and components are mediated through the Spirit. Upon the misperformance of the *imago Dei* by humankind, Act 2 recounts the reassignment of the role in a limited manner to the nation of Israel, who also misperformed.

Chapter 5 offered an *imago Dei* Spirit Christology that corresponds with Act 3, depicting the incarnation of the Son of God as the Spirit-anointed Messiah to take up the *imago Dei* role and bring it to ultimate fulfilment through his redemptive performance. I argued that through the Spirit, Christ performs the *imago Dei* and elevates it to divine-human fulfilment in his filial relationship to the Father, his conformity to the divine will, and his faithfulness to his mission. I also argued that his decisive redemptive performance is specifically located in his death and resurrection. In his death, humankind is liberated from Adam's heritage of sin, corruption and condemnation. In his resurrection, he inaugurates the new creation and becomes the progenitor of the new humanity, so that all who are covenantally joined to Christ through the Spirit are incorporated.

In Chapter 6, I outlined an *imago Dei* Spirit ecclesiology, representing Act 4, which resumes the drama with the ascension of Christ and the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost to create the Spirit-baptised church. The bodily absence of Christ is the occasion for the mediation of his presence and activity through the Spirit and the church. As the church is united with Christ through the Spirit, she becomes the new humanity, the recreated *imago Dei* who participates in the sonship, shaping and sending of the Son of God and so bodily represents Christ and God upon the stage of creation. She participates in the eschatological kingdom through the Spirit and becomes its embodied agent in the world.

Chapter 7 presented a theodramatic model of Spirit baptism that highlights the pneumatological nature of the church's participation in the new covenant. I argued that the event of Pentecost is depicted in Acts as part of a new exodus, and is therefore a liminal event that initiates the church into the new covenant and joins her to Christ. Despite their different emphases, Luke and Paul both present salvation, sanctification and mission as integrated

facets of the Spirit-mediated covenant, and do not theologically separate Spirit baptism from covenantal initiation. I also demonstrated that the Lukan language of being 'filled with the Spirit', which can be theologically understood in terms of communion and influence, is consistently associated with empowering and transformative experiences. Consequently, missional empowerment is not a once-for-all experience, but results from repeatable encounters as well as a continuing state of communion with and submission to God through the Spirit. Correspondingly, glossolalia, as a sign and sacrament of the fullness and communion of the Spirit, contributes to the substance of covenantal life and is not merely evidential in value. My theodramatic reading affirms pentecostal pneumatological experience and honours the pentecostal affinity for Luke-Acts, but incorporates them in a more exegetically faithful and theologically coherent manner that completes the case for the argument that the Holy Spirit is the active constitutive agent of the sonship, shaping and sending of the *imago Dei*.

8.2 The Drama of the Spirit-Baptised Image

My theodramatic model of Spirit baptism surpasses previous models in addressing the pentecostal impulses for biblically-based doctrine and for participatory narrative. Its use of the canonical drama meets the first impulse by expanding the scope of biblical engagement beyond earlier models to incorporate a broad range of literary corpuses. In response to the second impulse it provides a more adequate narrative backdrop by presenting Spirit baptism in theodramatic form and by locating it in the larger canonical story.

As a model of the *imago Dei* it moves beyond previous models by offering a natural way to integrate various elements across two planes. First, by plotting the theme in a covenantal-narrative fashion, this model organically links protology with eschatology and anthropology with Christology and ecclesiology. Second, by conceiving of the *imago Dei* as a dramatic

343

role, it naturally integrates the relational, ethical, functional and, to some extent, the structural aspects of the *imago Dei* into a multifaceted model. Moreover, by emphasising the constitutive role of the Spirit, it rectifies the previous neglect of the pneumatological nature of the *imago Dei*.

Yale OT scholar Brevard Childs once mourned that 'an iron curtain separated Bible from theology' and hoped for a return to the day when 'biblical scholars and theologians found themselves engaged in a common enterprise'.[1] This study utilises the theodramatic method in a manner that engages substantially with biblical texts and scholarship, particularly in its reading of Genesis and Luke-Acts, but also in its use of John, Paul, Isaiah and other corpuses. It demonstrates a sensitivity to the historical and literary concerns of biblical scholarship while incorporating them into a constructive theology that informs contemporary Christian thought in a systematically coherent manner.

This account of Spirit baptism is distinctively pentecostal because it affirms the missional empowerment of the church by the Holy Spirit through the charismatic gifts. It emphasises the missional nature of the covenant in which the church participates, as well as the priority of encounter and communion as the soil from which mission grows. It also supports the pentecostal expectation of extraordinary workings of the Spirit in keeping with the missional purposes of the Triune God. But although it is pentecostal, this model is also intertraditional in significant ways. By eschewing the NACP multi-staged model with its insistence on evidential glossolalia, it avoids dividing the church along the lines of tradition-specific experience. Affirming the value of glossolalia, it also accommodates a rich variety of the Spirit's work in and through the larger ecclesial community. Its triplex structure of spirituality

---

[1] Childs, *Biblical Theology*, xvi.

as sonship, shaping and sending can be gainfully incorporated into various traditions because it is adaptable to a variety of practices and experiences.

This natural integration of relationship, holiness and mission encourages the participant to continue seeking progress in holy living and effective ministry. It helps to prevent two potential pitfalls. First, it guards the church from a parochial neglect of mission by emphasising that mission is the natural accompaniment of salvation and covenant participation. All members of the kingdom community are, by virtue of covenant membership, sent into the world as Spirit-anointed kingdom agents. Second, it also prevents the work of the church from being dissociated from the loving communion and holy living that gives life to all of her activities. The pneumatological mission of the church is rooted in her communion and transformation, which are equally pneumatological.

8.3 Challenges

One could potentially challenge my reading of the *imago Dei* as a dramatic role. Such a constructive reading moves beyond the exegetical 'meaning' of the term, and may be objectionable to those who prefer a more literal reading. But it is evident from the biblical texts that simple definitions are not available, and equally evident from a survey of the literature that such an exegetical meaning cannot be established definitively. My aim is to provide a broad framework that plausibly integrates the relevant texts in a manner that is coherent on the whole, compatible with the parts, stimulating to the academy and ultimately useful to the church.

The project could also be critiqued for moving away from the tenets of North American Classical Pentecostalism. But such a critique is met with Allan Anderson's assessment of the diversity of global pentecostal movements as I noted in chapter 1. Although the NACP multi-

staged model is certainly influential worldwide, its use as a litmus test of true pentecostalism would be an injustice to significant sectors of pentecostalism in other contexts. My exposition of the theological models of Spirit baptism in chapter 2 also illustrates a diversity that is to be respected.

Another potential deficit is that the insights of personal-relational ontology could have been more fully integrated. Although my use of those materials is not as prominent or explicit as some may prefer, it is nevertheless present. My affirmation of communion as the basis and community as the shape of covenant life, and indeed the very notion of covenant that frames my proposal, builds implicitly on the primacy of relationship contributed by contemporary personalism. Similarly, one could fault my lack of engagement with Wesleyan-Holiness and Holiness-Pentecostal sources. But such engagement would have shifted the dialogue into entire sanctification and away from Spirit baptism proper.

Some may also find the chapter treatments of anthropology, Christology and ecclesiology too brief. But this project is not a full systematic theology, nor were these chapters meant to be complete systematic treatments of these topics. They serve the purpose of sketching the trajectory of the *imago Dei* along the plot of the canonical drama towards the goal of constructing a new model of Spirit baptism. A full treatment of anthropology, for instance, must await a future project.

8.4 Future Research

In light of the achievements of this thesis, as well as its limitations, some directions for future research may be suggested. The project could be extended into an exposition of eschatological consummation. Such themes as death and resurrection, the final judgment and the final state can be explored in light of the conditions outlined in this thesis, including embodiment,

responsibility, presence and kingdom. They can also be developed along the metaphors of exodus and the promised land. What will be the role of Jesus as the *imago Dei* in the new earth? How will the role of the redeemed *imago Dei* community be played out? What will glorification entail? How will the Spirit continue to work in the consummated new creation?

The use of *imago Dei* as an organising theme for the theodrama and a context for Spirit baptism required that we move through the various acts from anthropology, through Christology to ecclesiology. Each of these three traditional theological loci could be further developed into full-length projects. There is a potential for developing a series of volumes that include: *imago Dei* Spirit anthropology, *imago Dei* Spirit Christology and *imago Dei* Spirit ecclesiology. Much could also be said about creation and providence along the trajectory of the present study.

While much more work is yet to be done in developing a complete systematic theology based on my pneumatological theodramatic model, this thesis stands complete in defining the canonical-dramatic trajectory of the *imago Dei* and locating Spirit baptism as the eschatological restoration in Christ of the *imago Dei* as the Spirit-bearing embodied agent of the kingdom of God on the stage of creation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alders, G. Charles. *The Book of Genesis*. Bible Student's Commentary. 2 vols. Trans. William Heynen. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981.

Alexander, Kimberly E. 'The Pentecostal Healing Community'. In Thomas, *Pentecostal Ecclesiology*, 183–206.

Allen, Leslie C. *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.

Allison, Gregg R. *Historical Theology: An Introduction to Christian Doctrine*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011.

Anderson, Allan Heaton. *An Introduction to Pentecostalism: Global Charismatic Christianity*. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

———. 'Varieties, Taxonomies, and Definitions'. In Anderson et al., *Studying Global Pentecostalism*, 13–29.

Anderson, Allan, Michael Bergunder, Andre F. Droogers, and Cornelis van der Laan, eds. *Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theories and Methods*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010. ProQuest Ebook Central, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/bham/detail.action?docID=570667; accessed 20 October 2016.

Anderson, Gordon. 'Baptism in the Holy Spirit, Initial Evidence, and a New Model'. *Enrichment Journal* 10.1 (2005): 70–78.

Aquinas, Thomas. *The Commentary of St. Thomas Aquinas on Aristotle's Treatise on the Soul*. Trans. R. A. Kocourek. N.p.: The College of St. Thomas, 1946.

———. *Summa Theologica*. Trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province. New York: Benzinger, 1947; PDF ebook, Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa.pdf; accessed 23 Oct 2013.

Archer, Kenneth J. 'The Fivefold Gospel'. In Thomas, *Pentecostal Ecclesiology*, 7–43.

———. *The Gospel Revisited: Towards a Pentecostal Theology of Worship and Witness*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2011.

———. *A Pentecostal Hermeneutic for the Twenty First Century: Spirit, Scripture and Community*. London and New York: T & T Clark, 2004.

Arnold, Bill T. '1144 בכר'. In VanGemeren, *NIDOTTE*, 658–9.

Arrington, French L. 'The Indwelling, Baptism, and Infilling with the Holy Spirit: A Differentiation of Terms'. *Pneuma* 3.1 (1981): 1–10.

Assemblies of God Great Britain. 'Statement of Faith'. Email attachment to author, 25 February 2013.

Athanasius. *Tome to the Antiochenes*. In *NPNF* 2-04:991–1002.

Atkinson, William P. *Baptism in the Spirit: Luke-Acts and the Dunn Debate*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2011.

———. 'Pentecostal Responses to Dunn's Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Luke-Acts'. *JPT* 3.6 (1995): 87–131.

———. 'Pentecostal Responses to Dunn's Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Pauline Literature'. *JPT* 3.7 (1995): 49–72.

———. *Trinity After Pentecost*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2013.

Austin, J.L. *How to Do Things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962, 1975, Oxford Scholarship Online, October 2011, doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198245537.001.0001.

Augustine. *The Confessions of Saint Augustine*. Trans., with an introduction and notes by John K. Ryan. New York: Doubleday, 1960.

———. *On Genesis: Two Books on Genesis Against the Manichees, and; On the Literal Interpretation of Genesis: An Unfinished Book*. Trans. Roland J. Teske. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1991.

———. *On the Spirit and the Letter*. In *NPNF* 1-05:301–95.

———. *On the Trinity: Books 8–15*. Ed. Gareth B. Matthew. Trans. Stephen McKenna. Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy. Ed. Gareth B. Matthews. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Ayres, Lewis. *Augustine and the Trinity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010; doi:10.1017/CBO9780511780301; accessed 24 July 2017.

———. *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; Oxford Scholarship Online, 2005; doi:10.1093/0198755066.001.0001; accessed 7 July 2017.

———. 'Remember That You Are Catholic (*serm*. 52.2): Augustine on the Unity of the Triune God', *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 8.1 (2000): 39–82.

Badcock, Gary D. *The House Where God Lives: The Doctrine of the Church*. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009.

———. *Light of Truth and Fire of Love: A Theology of the Holy Spirit*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Baer, Richard A. Jr. 'Quaker Silence, Catholic Liturgy, and Pentecostal Glossolalia—Some Functional Similarities'. In Spittler, *Perspectives on the New Pentecostalism*, 150–64.

Balla, Peter. '2 Corinthians'. In Beale and Carson, *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 753-83.

Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *Theo-Drama: Theological Dramatic Theory*. 5 vols. Translated by Graham Harrison. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988–98.

Barmby, J., and C. Jerdan. *The Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews*. In Spence and Exell, *The Pulpit Commentary*, vol. 21.

Barnes, Michel René. 'Rereading Augustine's Theology of the Trinity'. In Davis, Kendall and O'Collins, eds. *The Trinity*.

Barr, James. 'The Image of God in the Book of Genesis: A Study of Terminology'. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 51/1 (1968): 11-26.

Barrett, David B. Todd M. Johnson, and Peter F. Crossing, 'Missiometrics 2008: Reality Checks for Christian World Communions', *International Bulletin for Missionary Research* 32:1 (2008): 27–30.

Barry, John D., et al. *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016. Logos Bible Software ebook.

Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics*. 14 vols. Edited by G.W. Bromiley and T.F. Torrance. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1956–81.

———. *Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5*. Trans. T.A. Smail. New York: Collier, 1962.

Bauckham, Richard J. *Word Biblical Commentary Volume 50: Jude, 2 Peter*. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983.

Bauer, Walter, William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Second Edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Baumert, Norbert. '"Charism" and "Spirit-Baptism": Presentation of an Analysis'. *JPT* 12.2 (2004): 147–179.

Beale, Gregory K. *The Book of Revelation*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1999.

———. 'Colossians'. In Beale and Carson, *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 841–70.

———. 'The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost: Part 1: The Clearest Evidence'. *TynBul* 56.1 (2005): 73–102.

———. 'The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost: Part 2: Corroborating Evidence'. *TynBul* 56.2 (2005): 63-90.

———. *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.

———. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 17. Downers Grove: InterVarsity; Leicester: Apollos, 2004.

Beale, G.K., and D.A. Carson, eds. *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker; Nottingham: Apollos, 2007.

Beasley-Murray, G.R. *Baptism in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962.

Beilby, James K. and Paul Rhodes Eddy, eds., *Justification: Five Views*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011.

Behr, John. *Asceticism and Anthropology in Irenaeus and Clement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

———. 'The Promise of the Image'. In Howard, *Imago Dei*, 15–38.

Berkouwer, G.C. *Man: The Image of God*. Trans. Dirk W. Jellema. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962.

Black, Matthew. *The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament*. New York: Scribner's, 1961.

Black, Matthew, and William Foxwell Albright. *The Scrolls and Christianity: Historical and Theological Significance*. London: SPCK, 1969.

Blocher, Henri. 'Calvin's Theological Anthropology'. In Chung, *John Calvin and Evangelical Theology*, 66–84.

———. *In the Beginning: The Opening Chapters of Genesis*. Trans. David G. Preston. Leicester / Downers Grove: IVP, 1984.

———. 'Karl Barth's Anthropology'. In Chung, *Karl Barth and Evangelical Theology*, 96–135.

Block, Daniel I. *The God of the Nations: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern National Theology*. ETS Monograph Series. Jackson, MS: Evangelical Theological Society, 1988.

Boersma, Gerald P. *Augustine's Early Theology of Image: A Study in the Development of Pro-Nicene Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016; Oxford Scholarship Online, 2016; doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190251369.001.0001; accessed 24 July 2017.

Boethius. *The Theological Tractates*. Trans. H.F. Stewart and E.K. Rand. London: Heinemann; New York: Putnam, 1609; PDF ebook, Grand Rapids: CCEL; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/boethius/tracts.pdf; accessed 31 March 2017.

———. 'A Treatise against Eutyches and Nestorius'. In Boethius, *Theological Tractates*, 30–46.

Bock, Darrell L. *Acts*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Creation and Fall: A Theological Interpretation of Genesis 1–3*. First English Edition. Trans. John C. Fletcher. London: SCM Press, 1959.

Brand, Chad, ed. *Perspectives on Spirit Baptism: Five Views*. Nashville: B & H, 2004.

Breasted, James Henry, trans. and ed. *Ancient Records of Egypt*. 3 vols. Urbana / Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2001.

Briggman, Anthony. 'The Holy Spirit as the Unction of Christ in Irenaeus'. *Journal of Theological Studies*, NS, 61.1 (April 2010): 171–193.

———. *Irenaeus of Lyons and the Theology of the Holy Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012; Oxford Scholarship Online, 2012; doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199641536.001.0001; accessed 24 July 2017.

Briggs, Richard S. 'Humans in the Image of God and Other Things Genesis Does Not Make Clear'. *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 4.1 (2010): 111–26.

Bromiley, Geoffrey W., gen. ed. *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. 4 vols. Fully Revised Edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979–88.

Brown, Colin, ed. *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. Translated, with additions and revisions, from the German *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament*, ed. Lothar Coenen, Erich Beyreuther and Hans Bietenhard. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986.

Bruce, F.F. *The Book of the Acts*. Revised Edition. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

———. *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.

———. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Revised Edition. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

Brueggemann, Walter. *Genesis*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982.

———. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.

Bruner, Frederick Dale. *The Christbook: A Historical/Theological Commentary*. Waco, TX: Word, 1987.

———. *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970.

Brunner, Emil. *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption: Dogmatics, Vol. II*. Trans. Olive Wyon. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952.

———. *Man in Revolt: A Christian Anthropology*. Trans. Olive Wyon. London and Redhill: Lutterworth Press, 1939.

Bryant, Herschel Odell. *Spirit Christology in the Christian Tradition: From the Patristic Period to the Rise of Pentecostalism in the Twentieth Century*. Cleveland: CPT Press, 2014.

Bucer, Martin. *Enarrationes*, in *Sacra Quator Evangelia*. Strasbourg: Ulricherus, 1530. http://www.mdz-nbn-resolving.de/urn/resolver.pl?urn=urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10142729-3; accessed 21 March 2017.

Burgess, Stanley M. and Eduard M. van der Maas, gen. eds. *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*. Expanded and Revised Edition. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002.

Cairns, David. *The Image of God in Man*. Revised Edition, with introduction by David E. Jenkins. London and Glasgow: Collins, 1973.

Calvin, John. *Commentary on Galatians, Ephesians*. Trans. William Pringle. PDF ebook; Grand Rapids: CCEL; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom41.pdf; accessed 21 March 2017.

———. *Commentary on Genesis*, vol. 1. Trans. John King. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1847; PDF ebook; Grand Rapids: CCEL; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom01.pdf; accessed 24 June 2014.

———. *Commentary on Hebrews*. Trans. John Owen. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1853; PDF ebook; Grand Rapids: CCEL; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom44.pdf; 16 June 2014.

———. Commentary on the Psalms, vol. 1. Trans. James Anderson. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1845; PDF ebook; Grand Rapids: CCEL; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom08.pdf; 14 June 2015.

Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion.* 2 vols. Library of Christian Classics, vols. XX–XXI. Ed. John T. McNeill. Trans. Ford Lewis Battles. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960.

———. *Calvin's Commentaries*. 22 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979.

Cartledge, Mark J. *Charismatic Glossolalia: An Empirical-Theological Study*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.

———. *Encountering the Spirit: The Charismatic Tradition*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2006.

———. *Mediation of the Spirit: Interventions in Practical Theology*. Pentecostal Manifestos. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2015.

———. *Practical Theology: Charismatic and Empirical Perspectives*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2003.

———. 'Renewal Theology and the "Common Good"'. *JPT* 25.1 (2016), 90-106.

———. 'A Response to Frank D. Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology*', Presentation, Annual SPS Conference, 2007.

———. 'The Symbolism of Charismatic Glossolalia', *Journal of Empirical Theology* 12.1 (1999): 37–51.

Cartledge, Mark J., ed. *Speaking in Tongues: Multi-disciplinary Perspectives*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2012.

Chan, Simon K. 'Mother Church: Toward a Pentecostal Ecclesiology'. *Pneuma* 22.2 (Fall 2000): 177–208.

———. *Pentecostal Ecclesiology: An Essay on the Development of Doctrine*, JPT Supplement Series 38. Blandford Forum: Deo Publishing, 2011.

———. 'Evidential Glossolalia and the Doctrine of Subsequence'. *AJPS* 2.2 (1999): 195–211.

———. *Pentecostal Theology and the Christian Spiritual Tradition.* London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Chandler, Diane J. *Christian Spiritual Formation: An Integrated Approach for Personal and Relational Wholeness*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2014.

Charette, Blaine. '"And Now for Something Completely Different": A "Pythonic" Reading of Pentecost?' *Pneuma* 33.1 (2011): 59–62.

———. 'Reflective Speech: Glossolalia and the Image of God'. *Pneuma* 28.2 (2006): 189–201.

Childs, Brevard S. *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

———. *Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Cho, Youngmo. *Spirit and Kingdom in the Writings of Luke and Paul: An Attempt to Reconcile these Concepts*. Bletchley: Paternoster, 2005.

Christenson, Larry, ed. *Welcome, Holy Spirit: A Study of Charismatic Renewal in the Church*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1987.

Chung, Sung Wook, ed. *John Calvin & Evangelical Theology: Legacy and Prospect*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2009.

Chung, Sung Wook, ed. *Karl Barth and Evangelical Theology*. Bletchley: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

Ciampa, Roy E., and Brian S. Rosner. '1 Corinthians'. In Beale and Carson, *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, 695–752.

Clark, Stephen B. *Confirmation and the 'Baptism of the Holy Spirit'*. Pecos, NM: Dove, 1969.

Clement of Alexandria. *Paedagogus*. In *ANF* 02: 450–637.

Clifton, Shane. 'The Spirit and Doctrinal Development: A Functional Analysis of the Traditional Pentecostal Doctrine of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit'. *Pneuma* 29.1 (2007): 5–23.

Clines, D. J. A. 'The Image of God in Man', *TynBul* 19 (1968): 53–103.

Collins, C. John *Genesis 1 – 4: A Linguistic, Literary, and Theological Commentary*. Phillipsburg: P & R Publishing, 2006.

Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*. 3 vols. Trans. David Smith. New York: Seabury; London, Chapman, 1983.

Craigie, Peter C. *The Book of Deuteronomy*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.

———. *Word Biblical Commentary Volume 19: Psalms 1–50*. Waco, TX: Word, 1983.

Crouzel, Henri. *Origen*. Trans. A.S. Warall. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989.

Cullmann, Oscar. *Baptism in the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1950.

Cunningham, Mary B., and Elizabeth Theokritoff, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Orthodox Christian Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Curtis, Edward M. 'Image of God (OT)'. In David Noel Freedman et al., eds., *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 3:389–91.

Davids, Peter H. *The Letters of 2 Peter and Jude*, PNTC. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2006.

Davies, Oliver. *The Creativity of God: World, Eucharist, Reason*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Davis, Stephen T., Daniel Kendall and Gerald O'Collins, eds. *The Trinity: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Trinity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. Ebook, Oxford Scholarship Online, 2003; doi: 10.1093/0199246122.001.0001; accessed 7 July 2017.

Dawson, Gerrit Scott. *Jesus Ascended: The Meaning of Christ's Continuing Incarnation*. London: T & T Clark; Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R, 2004.

Dayton, Donald W. 'A Final Round with Larry Wood'. *Pneuma* 28.2 (2006): 265–270.

———. 'John Fletcher as John Wesley's Vindicator and Designated Successor? A Response to Laurence W. Wood'. *Pneuma* 26.2 (2004): 355–61.

———. 'Rejoinder to Laurence Wood'. *Pneuma* 27.2 (2004): 367–375.

———. *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*. Metuchen, NJ / London: The Scarecrow Press, 1987.

Del Colle, Ralph. *Christ and the Spirit: Spirit Christology in Trinitarian Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

———. 'Spirit-Christology: Dogmatic Foundations for Pentecostal-Charismatic Spirituality'. *JPT* 1.3 (1993): 91–112.

Demarest, Bruce. *The Cross and Salvation: The Doctrine of Salvation*. Foundations of Evangelical Theology. Wheaton: Crossway, 1997.

Dempster, Murray W. 'Christian Social Concern in Pentecostal Perspective: Reformulating Pentecostal Eschatology'. *JPT* 1.2 (1993): 51–64.

———. 'Pentecostal Social Concern and the Biblical Mandate of Social Justice'. *Pneuma* 9.1 (1987): 129–153.

Dempster, Stephen G. *Dominion and Dynasty: A Theology of the Hebrew Bible*. Leicester / Downers Grove: IVP, 2003.

Driel, Edwin Chr. van. *Incarnation Anyway: Arguments for Supralapsarian Christology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Dumbrell, William J. *Covenant and Creation: A Theology of Old Testament Covenants*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1984.

Dunn, James D.G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. London: SCM, 1970.

———. 'Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Yet Once More—Again'. *JPT* 19.1 (2010): 32–43.

———. 'Baptism in the Spirit: A Response to Pentecostal Scholarship on Luke-Acts'. *JPT* 1.3 (1993): 3–27.

———. *The Christ and the Spirit*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998.

———. *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Carlisle: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

———. *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997; originally published by London: SCM Press, 1975.

Edwards, Mark Julian. *Origen Against Plato*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.

Ellingworth, Paul. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1993.

Elwell, Walter A., ed. *Baker Theological Dictionary of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996.

———. *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.

Emery, Gilles, and Matthew Levering, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011; Oxford Handbooks Online, 2012; doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199557813.001.0001; accessed 28 April 2014.

Erickson, Millard J. *Christian Theology*. Second Edition. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998.

Ervin, Howard M. *Conversion-Initiation and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Critique of James D. G. Dunn's* Baptism in the Holy Spirit. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1984.

———. *Spirit Baptism: A Biblical Investigation*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1987.

Estrada, Rodolfo Galvan, III. 'The Spirit in Jude 19-20'. *JPT* 25 (2016): 43–57.

Eusebius. *Ecclesiastical History*. In Schaff and Wace, *NPNF* 2-01:3–1039.

Everts, Janet Meyer, and Jeffrey S. Lamp, eds. *Pentecostal Theology and the Theological Vision of N.T. Wright: A Conversation*. Cleveland, TN: CPT, 2015.

Farrow, Douglas. *Ascension and Ecclesia: On the Significance of the Doctrine of the Ascension for Ecclesiology and Christian Cosmology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Faupel, D. William. *Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought*. JPT Supplement Series 10. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Fee, Gordon D. 'Baptism in the Holy Spirit: The Issue of Separability and Subsequence'. *Pneuma* 7.2 (1985): 87–99.

———. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.

⸻. *Gospel and Spirit: Issues in New Testament Hermeneutics*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.

⸻. *Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study.* Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 2007.

⸻. *To What End Exegesis? Essays Textual, Exegetical, and Theological*. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans; Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 2001.

Ferguson, Everett. *Baptism in the Early Church: History, Theology, and Liturgy in the First Five Centuries*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

Fernando, Ajith. *The NIV Application Commentary: Acts*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998.

Frame, John M. *The Doctrine of God.* A Theology of Lordship. Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Publishing, 2002.

Freedman, David Noel et al., eds. *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Frei, Hans W. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics*. New Haven / London: Yale University Press, 1974.

Gaebelein, Frank E., gen ed. *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: With the New International Verison of the Holy Bible*. 12 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976–92.

Gabriel, Andrew K. 'Intensity of the Spirit in a Spirit-Filled World: Spirit Baptism, Subsequence, and the Spirit of Creation'. *Pneuma* 34.3 (2012): 365–382.

⸻. 'Review Essay: Frank Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology*'. *CJPCC* 1 (2010): 116–30.

Garr, Randall W. '"Image" and "Likeness" in the Inscription from Tell Fakhariyeh'. *Israel Exploration Journal* 50.3/4 (2000): 227–234.

⸻. *In His Own Image and Likeness: Humanity, Divinity, and Monotheism*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Geldenhuys, Norval. *The Gospel of Luke*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

Gelpi, Donald L. *Charism and Sacrament: A Theology of Christian Conversion*. London: SPCK, 1977.

Gess, J. 'χαρακτήρ'. In Brown, *NIDNTT*, 2:288–9.

Goldingay, John. *Psalms: Volume 1: Psalms 1–41*. Baker Commentary on the Old Testament Wisdom and Psalms. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

Green, Gene L. *Jude & 2 Peter*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

Green, Joel B., gen. ed. *Dictionary of Scripture and Ethics*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.

Green, Joel B., ed. *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995.

Green, Joel B., and Max Turner, eds. *Between Two Horizons: Spanning New Testament Studies and Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2000.

Green, Michael. *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*. Revised Edition. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004.

Gregory of Nyssa. *Five Homilies on the Lord's Prayer*. http://www.orthodoxprayer.org/Articles_files/Lord%27s%20Prayer/3.%20Hallowed%20Be.pdf; accessed 5 April 2013.

⸻. *On the Holy Spirit*. In Schaff, *NPNF* 2-05:497–515.

⸻. *On the Making of Man*. In Schaff, *NPNF* 2-05:605–73.

Gregory Palamas. *The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters*. Ed. and trans. Robert E. Sinkewicz. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1988.

Grenz, Stanley J. 'Jesus as the *Imago Dei*: Image-of-God Christology and the Non-Linear Linearity of Theology'. *JETS* 47.4 (December 2004): 617–28.

———. *The Social God and the Relational Self: A Trinitarian Theology of the Imago Dei*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

———. *Theology for the Community of God*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994.

Gresham, John L., Jr. 'The Social Model of the Trinity and Its Critics', *SJT* 46.3 (1993): 325–43.

Grudem, Wayne. *The Gift of Prophecy*. Westchester: Crossway, 1988.

Gunton, Colin E. *Act and Being: Towards a Theology of the Divine Attributes*. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003.

———. *The Christian Faith: An Introduction to Christian Doctrine*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.

———. *The One, the Three and the Many: God, Creation and the Culture of Modernity*. The Brampton Lectures 1992. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

———. 'Salvation'. In Webster, *Cambridge Companion to Karl Barth*, 143–58.

———. 'Trinity, Ontology and Anthropology: Towards a Renewal of the Doctrine of the *Imago Dei*'. In Schwöbel and Gunton, *Persons, Divine and Human*, 47–61.

———. *The Triune Creator: A Historical and Systematic Study*. Edinburgh Studies in Constructive Theology. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998.

Gunton, Colin E., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Christian Doctrine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Habets, Myk. *The Anointed Son: A Trinitarian Spirit Christology.* Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2010.

———. 'Spirit Christology: Seeing in Stereo'. *JPT* 11.2 (2003): 199–234.

Habets, Myk, ed. *The Spirit of Truth: Reading Scripture and Constructing Theology with the Holy Spirit*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2010.

Hagner, Donald A. *Word Biblical Commentary Volume 33A: Matthew 1–13*. Nashville: Nelson, 1993.

Hahn, Scott. 'Covenant'. In Barry, *Lexham Bible Dictionary*.

Hall, Douglas J. *Imaging God: Dominion as Stewardship*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2004.

Hamilton, Victor P. *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17*. NICOT Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

Harder, G. 'ὑπόστασις'. In Brown, *NIDNTT*, 1:710–4.

Harrison, E.F. 'Glory'. In Elwell, *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, 443–4.

Harrison, Nonna Vera. *God's Many-Splendored Image: Theological Anthropology for Christian Formation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.

———. 'The Human Person as Image and Likeness of God'. In Cunningham and Theokritoff, *Cambridge Companion to Orthodox Christian Theology*, 78–92.

———. 'Women, Human Identity, and the Image of God: Antiochene Interpretations'. *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 9:2 (2001): 205–49.

Hart, I. 'Genesis 1:1–2:3 As a Prologue to the Book of Genesis', *TynBul* 46.2 (1995): 315–36.

Hart, Larry D. 'A Critique of American Pentecostal Theology'. PhD dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, 1978.

———. 'Spirit Baptism: A Dimensional Charismatic Perspective'. In Brand, *Perspectives*, 105–69.

———. *Truth Aflame: Theology for the Church in Renewal.* Revised Edition. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.

Hart, Trevor. 'Revelation'. In Webster, *Cambridge Companion to Karl Barth*, 37–56.

Hartel, Joseph F. *Femina ut Imago Dei in the Integral Feminism of St. Thomas Aquinas*. Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1993.

Hartley, John E. *The Book of Job*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

Harvey, Robert, and Philip H. Towner. *2 Peter and Jude*. The IVP New Testament Commentary. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2009.

Hawk, L.D. 'Son'. In Bromiley, *ISBE*, 4:570-1.

Haya-Prats, Gonzalo. *Empowered Believers: The Holy Spirit in the Book of Acts*. Edited by Paul Elbert. Translated by Scott A. Ellington. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2011.

Healy, Nicholas M. *Church, World and the Christian Life: Practical-Prophetic Ecclesiology*. Cambridge / New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Heron, Alasdair I.C. *The Holy Spirit: The Holy Spirit in the Bible in the History of Christian Thought and in Recent Theology*. London: Marshall Morgan and Scott, 1983.

Heron, John. 'The Theology of Baptism'. *SJT* 8.1 (1955): 36–52.

Hick, John. *Evil and the God of Love*. Revised Edition. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

Hilborn, David. 'Glossolalia as Communication: A Linguistic-Pragmatic Perspective'. In Cartledge, *Speaking in Tongues*, 111–146.

Hittinger, F. Russell. 'Toward an Adequate Anthropology: Social Aspects of *Imago Dei* in Catholic Theology'. In Howard, *Imago Dei*, 39–78.

Hocken, Peter D. *Baptised in the Spirit: The Origins and Early Development of the Charismatic Movement in Great Britain.* PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 1984.

Hoekema, Anthony A. *Created in God's Image*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.

Hoehner, Harold W. *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.

Hollenweger, Walter J. *The Pentecostals: The Charismatic Movement in the Churches*. Third Edition. Trans. R. A. Wilson. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988.

Horne, Brian L. 'Person as Confession: Augustine of Hippo'. In Schwöbel and Gunton, *Persons, Divine and Human*, 65–73.

Horton, Michael S. *The Christian Faith: A Systematic Theology for Pilgrims on the Way*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011.

———. *Covenant and Eschatology: The Divine Drama*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.

———. *Covenant and Salvation: Union with Christ*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007.

———. 'Image and Office: Human Personhood and the Covenant'. In Lints, Horton, and Talbot, *Personal Identity*, 178–203.

———. *Lord and Servant: A Covenant Christology*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.

———. *People and Place: A Covenant Ecclesiology*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.

———. 'Post-Reformation Reformed Anthropology'. In Lints, Horton and Talbot, *Personal Identity*, 45–69.

Horton, Stanley M., ed. *Systematic Theology: A Pentecostal Perspective.* Revised Edition. Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 1994.

Hummel, Charles E. *Fire in the Fireplace: Contemporary Charismatic Renewal*. Oxford: Mowbrays, 1979.

Howard, Thomas Albert, ed. *Imago Dei: Human Dignity in Ecumenical Perspective*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013.

Hughes, Philip E. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.

———. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962.

Hunter, Harold D. *Spirit Baptism: A Pentecostal Alternative.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1983.

Irenaeus. *Against Heresies*. In Roberts and Donaldson, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 1:841–1391.

———. *The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*. Ed. Robinson Armitage. London: SPCK, 1920; PDF ebook, Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/irenaeus/demonstr.pdf; accessed 21 October 2013.

———. *Fragments from the Lost Writings of Irenaeus*. In Roberts and Donaldson, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 1:1392–1450.

———. *On the Apostolic Preaching*. Trans. John Behr. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997.

Jacobsen, Anders Lund. 'Genesis 1–3 as Source for the Anthropology of Origen', *Vigiliae Christianae* 62 (2008): 213–32.

Jacobsen, Douglas G. *Thinking in the Spirit: Theologies of the Early Pentecostal Movement*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2003.

Jacobsen, Douglas, ed. *A Reader in Pentecostal Theology: Voices from the First Generation.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006.

Jenson, Robert W. 'Anima Ecclesiastica'. In Soulen and Woodhead, *God and Human Dignity*, 59-71.

———. *Systematic Theology*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997–9.

Johns, Cheryl Bridges. *Pentecostal Formation*. JPT Supplement Series, 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

Jónsson, Gunnlaugur A. *The Image of God: Genesis 1:26-28 in a Century of Old Testament Research*. Trans. Lorraine Svendsen. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1988.

Kärkkäinen, Veli-Matti. *Christ and Reconciliation*. A Constructive Christian Theology for the Pluralistic World, vol. 1. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013.

———. *Christology: A Global Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.

———. *Creation and Humanity*. A Constructive Christian Theology for the Pluralistic World, vol. 3. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2015.

———. *Hope and Community*. A Constructive Christian Theology for the Pluralistic World, vol. 5. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2017.

———. *One with God: Salvation as Deification and Justification*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2004.

———. *Pneumatology: The Holy Spirit in Ecumenical, International, and Contextual Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.

———. *The Spirit and Salvation*. A Constructive Christian Theology for the Pluralistic World, vol. 4. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2016.

———. *Toward a Pneumatological Theology: Pentecostal and Ecumenical Perspectives on Ecclesiology, Soteriology, and Theology of Mission*. Ed. Amos Yong. Landham, MD: University Press of America, 2002.

———. *Trinity and Revelation*. A Constructive Christian Theology for the Pluralistic World, vol. 2. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2014.

Kärkkäinen, Veli-Matti, ed. *Holy Spirit and Salvation*. The Sources of Christian Theology. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010.

———. *The Spirit in the World: Emerging Pentecostal Theologies in Global Contexts.* Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009.

Kasper, Walter. *Jesus the Christ*. Trans. V. Green. Kent: Burns and Oats; Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1976.

Kaufmann, Walter, and Forrest E. Baird. *From Plato to Nietzsche*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1994.

Kay, William K., and Anne E. Dyer. *Pentecostal and Charismatic Studies: A Reader*. London: SCM Press, 2004.

Keener, Craig. *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts: Divine Purity and Power*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.

———. 'One New Temple in Christ (Ephesians 2:11–22; Acts 21:27–29; Mark 11:17; John 4:20–24)'. *AJPS* 12.1 (2009): 75–92; http://www.apts.edu/aeimages//File/AJPS_PDF/09_-1_Craig_keener_3.pdf; accessed 1 October 2012.

Kelsey, David H. *Eccentric Existence: A Theological Anthropology*. 2 vols. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.

———. 'The Human Creature'. In Webster, Tanner and Torrance, *Oxford Handbook of Systematic Theology*, 121-39.

Kilby, Karen. 'Perichoresis and Projection: Problems with Social Doctrines of the Trinity', *New Blackfriars* 81 (2000): 432–45.

Kilner, John F. 'Humanity in God's Image: Is the Image Really Damaged?' *JETS* 53.3 (2010): 601–17.

King, Joseph Hilary. *From Passover to Pentecost*. In Douglas Jacobsen, *Reader in Pentecostal Theology*, 109–22.

Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 vols. Trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76.

Kline, Meredith G. *Images of the Spirit*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1999.

Konkel, August H. '1948 דמה (*dmh* I)'. In VanGemeren, *NIDOTTE*, 1:967–70.

Köstenberger, Andreas J. *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples According to the Fourth Gospel: With Implications for the Fourth Gospel's Purpose and the Mission of the Contemporary Church*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

———. 'What Does It Mean to be Filled with the Spirit?" *JETS* 40.2 (1997): 229–40.

Köstenberger, Andreas J., and Scott R. Swain. *Father, Son and Spirit: The Trinity and John's Gospel*. Downers Grove: IVP, 2008.

Köster, Helmut. 'ὑπόστασις'. In Kittle and Friedrich, *TDNT*, VIII:572-89.

Knutson, F.B. 'Flesh'. In Bromiley, *ISBE*, 313–5.

Kuyper, Abraham. *The Work of the Holy Spirit*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1946; PDF ebook, Grand Rapids: CCEL; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/kuyper/holy_spirit.pdf; accessed 21 March 2017; also http://biblehub.com/library/kuyper/the_work_of_the_holy_spirit/xxi_not_like_unto_us.htm, 30 Jan 2016.

Land, Steven J. 'Be Filled with the Spirit: The Nature and Evidence of Spiritual Fullness'. *Ex Auditu* 12 (1996): 108–20.

———. *Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom*. Cleveland: CPT Press, 2010.

Laurentin, René. *Catholic Pentecostalism*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1977.

Lawson, John. *The Biblical Theology of St. Irenaeus*. London: Epworth Press, 1948.

Lederle, Henry I. *Treasures Old and New: Interpretations of Spirit Baptism in the Charismatic Renewal Movement*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1988.

———. *Theology with Spirit: The Future of the Pentecostal-Charismatic Movements in the 21st Century*. Tulsa, OK: Word and Spirit Press, 2010.

Levison, John R. *Filled with the Spirit.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

Levison, John R. 'Filled with the Spirit: A Conversation with Pentecostal and Charismatic Scholars'. *JPT* 20.2 (2011): 213 –231.

Lindbeck, George. *The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age*. Philadelphia: Westminstser Press, 1984.

Lints, Richard, Michael S. Horton and Mark R. Talbot, eds. *Personal Identity in Theological Perspective*. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2006.

Linzey, Verna M. *The Baptism with the Holy Spirit: The Reception of the Holy Spirit as Confirmed by Speaking in Tongues*. Maitland, FL: Xulon, 2004.

Lipiński, Edward. *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics*, vol II. Leuven: Peeters, 1994; https://books.google.ca/books?id=ra0QmH4np4kC; accessed 1 June 2015.

Lodahl, Michael E. *Shekhinah Spirit: Divine Presence in Jewish and Christian Religion*. Studies in Judaism and Christianity. New York / Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1992.

Loder, Allan T. 'An Examination of the Classical Pentecostal Doctrine of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit in Light of the Pentecostal Position on the Sources of Theology'. Master's thesis, Wycliffe College, University of Toronto, 2000.

Lord, Andrew Michael. *Network Church: A Pentecostal Ecclesiology Shaped by Mission*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

———. 'Network Church: A Pentecostal Ecclesiology Shaped by Mission'. PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 2010. http://etheses.bham.ac.uk/1246/1/Lord10PhD_A1b.pdf; accessed 21 March 2017.

———. *Spirit-Shaped Mission: A Holistic Charismatic Missiology*. Bletchley: Paternoster, 2005.

Lossky, Vladimir. *In the Image and Likeness of God*. London & Oxford: Mowbrays, 1975.

———. *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. Crestwood NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Pess, 1976.

———. *The Vision of God.* Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1983.

Lubardić, Bogdan. 'Orthodox Theology of Personhood: A Critical Overview (Part 1)'. *The Expository Times* 122, no. 11 (July 2011): 521–30. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0014524611410281; accessed 30 April 2014.

———. 'Orthodox Theology of Personhood: A Critical Overview (Part 2)', *The Expository Times* 122, no. 12 (Sept 2011): 573–581. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0014524611415586; accessed 21 March 2017.

Ludlow, Morwenna. *Gregory of Nyssa: Ancient and (Post)modern*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007; ebook Oxford Scholarship Online, 2008; doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199280766.001.0001; accessed 15 Nov 2016.

Luther, Martin. *Luther's Works, vol. 1: Lectures on Genesis Chapters 1–5*. Ed. Jaroslav Pelikan. St. Louis: Concordia, 1958.

———. *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe, vol. 43*. Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1912.

Lyotard, Jean-Francois. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Theory and History of Literature, Volume 10. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Macchia, Frank D. *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006.

———. 'Baptized in the Spirit: Reflections in Response to My Reviewers'. *JPT* 16.2 (2008): 14–20.

———. 'Baptized in the Spirit: Toward a Global Theology of Spirit Baptism'. *The Spirit in the World: Emerging Pentecostal Theologies in Global Contexts.* Ed. Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009, 3–20.

———. 'Groans too Deep for Words: Toward a Theology of Tongues as Initial Evidence', *AJPS* 1.2 (1998): 149–73; http://www.apts.edu/aeimages//File/AJPS_PDF/98-2-macchia.pdf; accessed 13 February 2013.

———. 'Justification and the Spirit: An Appreciative Interaction with N.T. Wright'. In Everts and Lamp, *Theological Vision of N.T. Wright*, 76–84.

———. *Justified in the Spirit: Creation, Redemption, and the Triune God.* Pentecostal Manifestos. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010.

———. 'Salvation and Spirit Baptism: Another Look at James Dunn's Classic'. *Pneuma* 24.1 (2002): 1–6.

———. 'Sighs Too Deep for Words: Towards a Theology of Glossolalia'. *JPT* 1 (1992): 47-73.

———. 'The Spirit-Baptised Church'. *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church* 11.4 (2011): 256–68; http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1474225X.2011.628510; accessed 17 September 2015.

———. 'Spirit Baptism: A Response to My Reviewers'. *CJPCC* 1 (2010): 176–83.

———. 'The Spirit of Life and the Spirit of Immortality: An Appreciative Review of Levison's *Filled with the Spirit*'. *Pneuma* 33.1 (2011): 69–78.

———. 'Tongues as a Sign: Towards a Sacramental Understanding of Pentecostal Experience'. *Pneuma* 15.1 (1993): 61–76.

MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. Third Edition. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007.

Marshall, I. Howard. *Acts*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove / Nottingham: IVP, 1980.

———. *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. Third Edition. Downers Grove: IVP, 1988.

Martens, Elmer A. *God's Design: A Focus on Old Testament Theology*. Second Edition. Grand Rapids: Baker; Leicester: Apollos, 1994.

Maspero, Giulio. *Trinity and Man: Gregory of Nyssa's* Ad Ablabium. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2007.

Mathews, Kenneth A. *Genesis 1-11:26*. New American Commentary, vol. 1a. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1996.

McConville, Gordon J. '1382 בְּרִית'. In VanGemeren, *NIDOTTE*, 1:747-55.

McCormack, Bruce. 'Grace and Being: The Role of God's Gracious Election in Karl Barth's Theological Ontology'. In Webster, *Cambridge Companion to Karl Barth*, 92-110.

McCormack, Bruce L., ed. *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic; Edinburgh: Rutherford House, 2006.

McDonnell, Kilian. *Charismatic Renewal and Ecumenism.* New York: Paulist Press, 1978.

———. 'The Holy Spirit and Christian Initiation'. In *The Holy Spirit and Power*, 57–85.

———. *Other Hand of God: The Holy Spirit as the Universal Touch and Goal.* Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003.

McDonnell, Kilian, ed. *The Holy Spirit and Power: The Catholic Charismatic Renewal.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975.

———. *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents of Charismatic Renewal.* Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1980.

McDonnell, Kilian, and Arnold Bittlinger. *The Baptism in the Holy Spirit as an Ecumenical Problem.* Notre Dame: Charismatic Renewal Services, 1972.

McDonnell, Kilian, and George Montague. *Christian Initiation and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries.* Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991.

———. *Fanning the Flame: What Does Baptism in the Holy Spirit Have to Do with Christian Initiation?* Booklet. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991.

McFadyen, Alistair I. *The Call to Personhood: A Christian Theory of the Individual in Social Relationships*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

McFarland, Ian A. *The Divine Image: Envisioning the Invisible God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

McFarland, Ian A., ed. *Creation and Humanity*. The Sources of Christian Theology. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.

McGee, Gary B., ed. *Initial Evidence: Historical and Biblical Perspectives on the Pentecostal Doctrine of Spirit Baptism.* Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 1991.

McGrath, Alister E. *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

McKnight, Scot. 'Covenant'. In Vanhoozer, *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation*, 141–3.

McLean, G.S. *The Baptism in the Holy Spirit.* Eston, SK: FGBI Publications, 1991.

McLeod, Frederick G. *The Image of God in the Antiochene Tradition*. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1999.

Medley, Mark S. *Imago Trinitatis: Toward a Relational Understanding of Becoming Human*. Lanham, MD and Oxford: University Press of America, 2002.

Menzies, Allan, ed. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 3, *Latin Christianity: Its Founder, Tertullian: I. Apologetic; II. Anti-Marcion; III. Ethical*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1885-96; PDF ebook, Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf03.pdf; accessed 21 September 2016.

Menzies, Robert P. *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

———. *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

———. 'Luke's Understanding of Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Pentecostal Dialogues with the Reformed Tradition'. *JPT* 16.2 (2008): 86–101.

———. 'Luke and the Spirit: A Reply to James Dunn'. *JPT* 2.4 (1994): 115–38.

———. *Pentecost: This Story is Our Story*. Kindle ebook. Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 2013.

———. 'The Spirit of Prophecy, Luke-Acts and Pentecostal Theology: A Response to Max Turner'. *JPT* 7.15 (1999): 49–74.

Menzies, William W., and Robert P. Menzies. *Spirit and Power: Foundations of Pentecostal Experience.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000.

Middleton, J. Richard. *The Liberating Image: The* Imago Dei *in Genesis 1*. Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2005.

Mikkelsen, Hans Vium. *Reconciled Humanity: Karl Barth in Dialogue*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Millard, A.R., and P. Bordreuil. 'A Statue from Syria with Assyrian and Aramaic Inscriptions'. *The Biblical Archaeologist* 45.3 (1982): 135–41.

Minns, Denis. *Irenaeus*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1994.

Mitchell, C. Ben. 'The Audacity of the *Imago Dei*: The Legacy and Uncertain Future of Human Dignity'. In Howard, *Imago Dei*, 79–112.

Mittelstadt, Martin W. *Reading Luke-Acts in the Pentecostal Tradition.* Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2010.

Moltmann, Jürgen. *God in Creation: An Ecological Doctrine of Creation: The Gifford Lectures 1984-1985*. London: SCM, 1985.

———. *The Spirit of Life: A Universal Affirmation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

———. *Trinity and the Kingdom of God: The Doctrine of God*. London: SCM, 1981.

Montague, George T. *Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition.* Peabody: Hendrickson, 1976.

Moo, Douglas J. *The Letters to the Colossians and to Philemon*, PNTC. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans; Nottingham: Apollos, 2008.

———. *The NIV Application Commentary: 2 Peter and Jude*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Moreland, J. P. *The Recalcitrant Imago Dei: Human Persons and the Failure of Naturalism*. London: SCM Press, 2009.

Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to John*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.

———. 'Hebrews'. In Gaebelein, *The Expositor's Bible Commentary, Volume 12: Hebrews–Revelation*, 1–158.

Moulaison, Jane Barter. 'Review Essay: Frank Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology*'. *CJPCC* 1 (2010): 151–7.

Moulton, James Hope, and George Mulligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament: Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1929.

Nellas, Panayiotis. *Deification in Christ: Orthodox Perspectives on the nature of the Human Person*. Trans. Norman Russell. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1987.

Nestle, Eberhard, Kurt Aland et al., eds. *Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th Revised Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.

Niskanen, Paul. The Poetics of Adam: The Creation of אדם in the Image of אלהים'. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128.3 (2009): 417–36.

O'Brien, Peter T. *The Letter to the Hebrews*. PNTC. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans; Leicester: Apollos, 1999.

O'Collins, Gerald, and Oliver P. Rafferty. 'Roman Catholic View'. In Beilby & Eddy, eds., *Justification*, 265–308.

O'Connor, Edward D. *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church*. Notre Dame: Ave Maria Press, 1971.

Olson, Roger E. *The Story of Christian Theology: Twenty Centuries of Tradition and Reform*. Downers Grove: IVP, 1999.

O'Meara, Thomas F. *Thomas Aquinas Theologian*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997.

Oepke, Albrecht. 'βάπτω, βαπτίζω, βαπτισμός, βάπτισμα, βαπτιστής'. In Kittel, *TDNT*, 1:529–46.

Origen. *Homilies on Genesis and Exodus.* Trans. Ronald E. Heine. The Fathers of the Church, a New Translation, vol. 71. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1982.

———. *Commentary on the Gospel of John*. In Schaff, *ANF* 09:538–789.

———. *Origen on First Principles*. Trans. G.W. Butterworth. London: SPCK, 1936.

Osborn, Eric. *Irenaeus of Lyons*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Palma, Anthony. 'Spirit Baptism: Before and After'. *Enrichment Journal* 10.1 (2005); http://enrichmentjournal.ag.org/200501/200501_093_SptBaptsm.cfm; accessed 5 October 2012.

Papanikolaou, Aristotle. 'Contemporary Orthodox Currents on the Trinity'. In Emery and Levering, *Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*; 14 pp.; doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199557813.003.0024.

Payne, J.B. 'Shekinah'. In Elwell, *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, 1010–1.

Pearlman, Myer. *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible.* Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 1937.

Penney, John Michael. *The Missionary Emphasis of Lukan Pneumatology.* JPT Supplement Series 12. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Perrin, N., and R.B. Hays, eds. *Jesus, Paul and the People of God: A Theological Dialogue with N.T. Wright*. Downers Grove: IVP, 2011.

Peters, Ted. *God—The World's Future: Systematic Theology for a New Era*. Second Edition. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.

Phanon, Yuri. 'The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Conception, Baptism and Temptation of Christ: Implications for the Pentecostal Christian, Part I'. *AJPS* 20.1 (2017): 37–55. http://www.apts.edu/aeimages//File/AJPS_PDF/17-1_Phanon_Part_1.pdf; accessed 30 March 2017.

———. 'The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Conception, Baptism and Temptation of Christ: Implications for the Pentecostal Christian, Part II'. *AJPS* 20.1 (2017): 57-66. http://www.apts.edu/aeimages//File/AJPS_PDF/17_1_Phanon_Part_2.pdf; accessed 30 March 2017.

Philo of Alexandria. *Allegorical Interpretation*. http://www.earlyjewishwritings.com/text/philo/book4.html; accessed 2 December 2015.

Pinnock, Clark H. *Flames of Love: A Theology of the Holy Spirit*. Downers Grove: IVP, 1996.

———. 'Review of Frank D. Macchia's *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology'. JPT* 16.1 (2008): 1–4.

Plato. *The Republic*. In Kaufmann and Baird, *From Plato to Nietzsche*, 83–130.

———. *Parmenides*. In Kaufmann and Baird, *From Plato to Nietzsche*, 130–7.

Poirier, John C. 'Narrative Theology and Pentecostal Commitments', *JPT* 16 (2008): 69–85.

Postell, Seth D. *Adam as Israel: Genesis 1-3 as the Introduction to the Torah and Tanakh*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2011.

Price, Constance M. 'Review Essay: Frank Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology*'. *CJPCC* 1 (2010): 131–7.

Quash, Ben. *Theology and the Drama of History*. Cambridge / New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Ramsey, Paul. *Basic Christian Ethics*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993.

Ranaghan, Dorothy. 'Baptism in the Holy Spirit'. In Ranaghan and Ranaghan, *As the Spirit Leads Us*, 4–16.

Ranaghan, Kevin, and Dorothy Ranaghan. *Catholic Pentecostals.* Paramus, NJ: Paulist Press, 1969.

Ranaghan, Kevin and Dorothy Ranaghan, eds. *As the Spirit Leads Us.* Paramus, NJ: Paulist Press, 1971.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Time and Narrative*, 3 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Robeck, Cecil M., Jr., and Amos Yong, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Pentecostalism*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Robinson, Dominic. *Understanding the 'Imago Dei': The Thought of Barth, von Balthasar and Moltmann*. Farnham / Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011.

Roman Catholic Church, International. *Charismatic Renewal and Social Actions: A Dialogue — Malines Document III*. In McDonnell, ed. *Presence, Power, Praise*, 3:291–357.

———. *Ecumenism and Charismatic Renewal: Theological and Pastoral Orientations: Malines Document II*. In McDonnell, ed. *Presence, Power, Praise*, 3:82–174.

———. *Theological and Pastoral Orientations on the Catholic Charismatic Renewal: Malines Document I*. In McDonnell, ed. *Presence, Power, Praise*, 3:13–70.

Ross, Allen P. *A Commentary on the Psalms: Volume 1: 1–41*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2011.

Rybarczyk, Edmund J. *Beyond Salvation: Eastern Orthodoxy and Classical Pentecostalism on Becoming Like Christ*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004.

———. 'Reframing Tongues: Apophaticism and Postmodernism'. *Pneuma* 27.1 (2005): 83–104.

Roberts, Alexander, and James Donaldson, eds. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*. Buffalo: Christian Literature, 1885–96; PDF ebook, Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf01.pdf; accessed 18 August 2013.

———. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 2, *Fathers of the Second Century: Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria (Entire)*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; PDF ebook, Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf02.pdf; accessed 21 March 2017.

———. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 9, *The Gospel of Peter, The Diatessaron of Tatian, The Apocalypse of the Virgin and Sedrach … Origen's Commentary on John, Books 1–10, and Commentary on Matthew, Books 1, 2, and 10–14*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1896; PDF ebook, Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf09.pdf; 27 June 2014.

Sands, Paul. 'The *Imago Dei* as Vocation'. *EQ* 82.1 (2010): 28–41.

Schaff, Philip, ed. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, First Series, vol. 5, *St. Augustine: Anti-Pelagian Writings*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1887; PDF ebook, Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf105.pdf; accessed 6 March 2017.

———. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, vol. 5, *Gregory of Nyssa: Dogmatic Treatises, Etc.* Trans. William Moore and Henry Austin Wilson. New York: Christian Literature Publishing, 1892; PDF ebook, Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library. http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf205.html; accessed 14 June 2011.

Schaff, Philip, and Henry Wace. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, vol. 1, *Eusebius Pamphilus: Church History, Life of Constantine, Oration in Praise of Constantine*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1890; PDF ebook, Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library. http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf201.pdf.

———. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, vol. 4, *Athanasius: Select Works and Letters*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1891; PDF ebook, Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library.

The Formula of Concord, 1577. In Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, 1:278–353.

Schaff. *Creeds of Christendom*, vol. 1. PDF ebook; Grand Rapids: CCEL; http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/creeds1.pdf; accessed 23 March 2017.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *The Christian Faith*. English translation of the second German edition, with preface by Paul T. Nimmo. London / New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016.

Schreiner, Thomas R. *Romans*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.

Schweitzer, Don. 'Review Essay: Frank Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology*'. *CJPCC* 1 (2010): 138–50.

Schwöbel, Christoph. 'Human Being as Relational Being: Twelve Theses for a Christian Anthropology'. In Schwöbel and Gunton, *Persons, Divine and Human*, 141–165.

Schwöbel, Christoph, and Colin E. Gunton, eds. *Persons, Divine and Human*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991.

Seifrid, Mark A. *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*. PNTC. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2014.

Sepúlveda, Juan. 'Reflections on the Pentecostal Contribution to the Mission of the Church in Latin America'. *JPT* 1.1 (1992): 93–108.

Seymour, William J. 'The Apostolic Faith Movement'. *The Apostolic Faith* 1.1 (1906): 2. http://pentecostalarchives.org/digitalPublications/USA/Independent/Apostolic%20Faith%20%28Azusa%20Street%29/Unregistered/1906/FPHC/1906_09.pdf; accessed 7 Oct 2013.

———. 'The Way into the Holiest'. *The Apostolic Faith* 1.2 (1906): 4. http://pentecostalarchives.org/digitalPublications/USA/Independent/Apostolic%20Faith%20%28Azusa%20Street%29/Unregistered/1906/FPHC/1906_10.pdf; accessed 7 Oct 2013.

Shelton, James B. *Mighty in Word and Deed: The Role of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.

———. 'A Reply to James D.G. Dunn's 'Baptism in the Spirit: a Response to Pentecostal Scholarship on Luke-Acts''. *JPT* 2.4 (1994): 139–143.

Sherman, Robert. *King, Priest, and Prophet: A Trinitarian Theology of Atonement*. New York and London: T & T Clark, 2004.

Shuster, Marguerite. *The Fall and Sin: What We Have Become as Sinners*. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004.

Smail, Thomas A. *The Forgotten Father: Rediscovering the Heart of the Christian Gospel*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1996.

———. *The Giving Gift: The Holy Spirit in Person.* London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1988.

———. *Reflected Glory: The Spirit in Christ and Christians.* London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1975.

Smith, James K.A. *Desiring the Kingdom: Worship, Worldview, and Cultural Formation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009.

———. *Imagining the Kingdom: How Worship Works*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.

———. *Thinking in Tongues: Pentecostal Contributions to Christian Philosophy.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Snell, Jeffrey T. "Beyond the Individual and into the World: A Call to Participation in the Larger Purposes of the Spirit on the Basis of Pentecostal Theology." *Pneuma* 14.1 (1992): 43-57.

Soulen, R. Kendall & Linda Woodhead, eds. *God and Human Dignity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

Spence, H.D.M., and Joseph S. Exell. *The Pulpit Commentary*, vol. 21, *I & II Thess., Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Hebrews, James*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950.

Spittler, Russell P., ed. *Perspectives on the New Pentecostalism*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1976.

Stackhouse, John G. Jr. *Evangelical Futures: A Conversation on Theological Method*. Downers Grove: IVP; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000.

Steenberg, Matthew C. *Irenaeus on Creation: The Cosmic Christ and the Saga of Redemption*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

———. *Of God and Man: Theology as Anthropology from Irenaeus to Athanasius*. London: T & T Clark, 2009.

Stephenson, Lisa P. *Dismantling the Dualisms for American Pentecostal Women in Ministry: A Feminist-Pneumatological Approach*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Stott, John R.W. *Baptism and Fullness: The Work of the Holy Spirit Today*. Second Edition. London: IVP, 1975.

———. *Christian Mission in the Modern World*. Downers Grove: IVP, 1975.

———. *The Contemporary Christian: Applying God's Word to Today's World*. Downers Grove: IVP, 1992.

———. *The Spirit, the Church and the World: The Message of Acts*. Downers Grove: IVP, 1990.

Strong, T.B. 'The History of the Theological Term "Substance": Part II'. *JTS* 3.9 (1901): 22-40.

Stronstad, Roger. *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke.* Peabody, MS: Hendrickson, 1984.

———. 'Forty Years On: An Appreciation and Assessment of *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* by James D.G. Dunn'. *JPT* 19.1 (2010): 3–11.

———. *The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology.* JPT Supplement Series 16. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

———. 'The Prophethood of Believers'. *Pentecostalism in Context: Essays in Honor of William W. Menzies.* Ed. Wonsuk Ma and Robert P. Menzies. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997, 60–77.

———. 'Review of John R. Levison's, *Filled with the Spirit* Part III, Early Christian Literature Chapter 3, "Filled with the Spirit and the Book of Acts"'. *JPT* 20.2 (2011): 201–206.

———. 'They Spoke in Tongues and Prophesied'. *Enrichment Journal* 10:1 (2005); http://enrichmentjournal.ag.org/200501/200501_081_tongues.cfm; accessed 6 March 2013.

Studebaker, Steven M. *From Pentecost to the Triune God: A Pentecostal Trinitarian Theology*. Pentecostal Manifestos. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.

———. 'Pentecostal Soteriology and Pneumatology'. *JPT* 11.2 (2003): 248–270.

Studebaker, Steven M., ed. *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism: Classical and Emergent.* Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2008.

Stuhlmueller, Carroll. *Creative Redemption in Deutero-Isaiah*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1970.

Suenens, Léon Joseph. *A New Pentecost?* Trans. Francis Martin. New York: Seabury Press, 1975.

Sullivan, Fancis A. *Charisms and Charismatic Renewal: A Biblical and Theological Study.* Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1982.

Sullivan, John Edward. *The Image of God: The Doctrine of St. Augustine and Its Influence* Dubuque, Iowa: Priory Press, 1963.

Suurmond, Jean-Jacques. *Word and Spirit at Play: Towards a Charismatic Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Swanson, Reuben, ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Luke*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Tertullian. *Against Marcion*. In Menzies, *ANF* 03, 569–1037.

———. *Against Praxeas*. In Menzies, *ANF* 03, 1334–1411.

Theodore of Mopsuestia. *The Commentaries on the Minor Epistles of Paul*. Trans. with an introduction by Rowan A. Greer. Atlanta: SBL, 2010.

Thiselton, Anthony C. 'Flesh'. In Brown, *NIDNTT*, 671–82.

———. *The Holy Spirit—In Biblical Teaching, Through the Centuries, and Today*. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013.

Thomas, John Christopher. 'A Celebration of and Engagement with James D.G. Dunn's *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* Forty Years On'. *JPT* 19.1 (2010): 19–24.

Thomas, John Christopher, ed. *Toward a Pentecostal Ecclesiology: The Church and the Fivefold Gospel*. Cleveland: CPT Press, 2010.

Thompson, J.A. 'Covenant (OT)'. In Bromiley, *ISBE*, 1:790-3.

———. *Deuteronomy: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Leicester / Downers Grove: IVP, 1974.

Tiessen, Terrance L. *Who Can Be Saved? Reassessing Salvation in Christ and World Religions*. Downers Grove: IVP, 2004.

Toorn, Karel van der, ed. *The Image and the Book: Iconic Cults, Aniconism, and the Rise of Book Religion in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.

Torr, Stephen Charles. *A Dramatic Pentecostal/Charismatic Anti-Theodicy: Improvising on a Divine Performance of Lament*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2013.

———. 'A Dramatic Pentecostal/Charismatic Anti-Theodicy: Improvising on a Divine Performance of Lament'. PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 2012. http://etheses.bham.ac.uk/3681/1/Torr12PhD.pdf; accessed 21 March 2017.

Torrance, Thomas F. *Calvin's Doctrine of Man*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.

———. *Incarnation: The Person and Life of Christ*. Ed. Robert T. Walker. Carlisle: Paternoster; Downers Grove: IVP, 2008.

Treier, Daniel J. *Introducing Theological Interpretation of Scripture: Recovering a Christian Practice*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

Tugwell, Simon. *Did You Receive the Spirit?* Revised Edition. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1979.

———. 'The Speech-Giving Spirit'. In Tugwell, et al. *New Heaven? New Earth?*, 199-59.

Tugwell, Simon, et al. *New Heaven? New Earth? An Encounter with Pentecostalism*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1976.

Turner, Max. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit.* Pamphlet. Cambridge: Grove, 2000.

———. 'Does Luke Believe Reception of the "Spirit of Prophecy" Makes All "Prophets"? Inviting Dialogue with Roger Stronstad', *JEPTA* XX (2000): 3–24.

———. *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts: Then and Now*. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1996.

———. 'Interpreting the Samaritans of Acts 8: Waterloo of Pentecostal Soteriology and Pneumatology?' *Pneuma* 23.2 (2001): 265–86.

———. 'James Dunn's *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*: Appreciation and Response'. *JPT* 19.1 (2010): 25–31.

———. 'Levison's Filled with the Spirit: A Brief Appreciation and Response'. *JPT* 20.2 (2011): 193–200.

———. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Twelftree, Graham. *People of the Spirit: Exploring Luke's View of the Church*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009.

Vander Lugt, Wesley. *Living Theodrama: Reimagining Theological Ethics*. London / New York: Routledge, 2016.

Vanhoozer, Kevin J. *The Drama of Doctrine: A Canonical-Linguistic Approach to Christian Theology*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.

———. *Faith Speaking Understanding: Performing the Drama of Doctrine*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014.

———. 'Human Being, Individual and Social'. In Gunton, *Cambridge Companion to Christian Doctrine*, 158–88.

———. *Remythologizing Theology: Divine Action, Passion, and Authorship.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

———. 'The Reader in New Testament Interpretation'. In Green, *Hearing the New Testament*, 301-28.

———. 'The Voice and the Actor: A Dramatic Proposal About the Ministry and Minstrelsy of Theology'. In Stackhouse, *Evangelical Futures*, 61–106.

———. 'Wrighting the Wrongs of the Reformation? The State of the Union with Christ in St. Paul and Protestant Soteriology'. In Perrin and Hays, *Jesus, Paul and the People of God*, 235-59.

Vanhoozer, Kevin J., Gen. ed. *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic; London: SPCK, 2005.

VanGemeren, Willem A., gen. ed. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.

Van Leeuwen, Raymond C. 'Form, Image'. In VanGemeren, *NIDOTTE*, 4:643–8.

Vasquez, David C Dawson. *The Mystical Theology of Vladimir Lossky: A Study of His Integration of the Experience of God into Theology*. PhD dissertation, Catholic University of America, 2000.

Verhey, Allen. 'Ethics in Scripture'. In Green, *Dictionary of Scripture and Ethics*, 5-11.

Vondey, Wolfgang. *Beyond Pentecostalism: The Crisis of Global Christianity and the Renewal of the Theological Agenda*. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010.

———. 'Pentecostal Identity and Christian Discipleship'. *Cyberjournal for Pentecostal-Charismatic Research* 6 (1999). http://www.pctii.org/cyberj/cyberj6/vondey.pdf; accessed 6 October 2016.

———. 'Review of Kevin J. Vanhoozer. *The Drama of Doctrine: A Canonical-Linguistic Approach to Christian Theology*'. *Pneuma* 30 (2008): 365-6.

Von Rad, Gerhard. *Genesis: A Commentary*. The Old Testament Library. Revised Edition. Trans. John H. Marks. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972.

Wacker, Grant. *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Waddell, Robby. 'The Holy Spirit of Life, Work, and Inspired Speech: Responding to John (Jack) R. Levison, Filled with the Spirit'. *JPT* 20.2 (2011): 207–212.

Wainwright, Geoffrey. *For Our Salvation: Two Approaches to the Work of Christ*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Waltke, Bruce K. *Genesis: A Commentary*. With Cathi J. Fredricks. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001.

———. *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach*. With Charles Yu. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007.

Walton, John H. *The NIV Application Commentary: Genesis*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001.

Warrington, Keith. *The Message: Elim's Core Beliefs*. Elim Training, n.d. Unpublished document.

———. *Pentecostal Theology: A Theology of Encounter*. London / New York: T & T Clark, 2008.

Watson, David C.K. *One in the Spirit*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1973.

Webb, Robert L. 'Jesus' Baptism: Its Historicity and Implications'. *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 10.2 (2000): 261-309.

Webster, John, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Karl Barth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Webster, John, Kathryn Tanner and Iain Torrance, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Systematic Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Weinandy, Thomas G. 'St. Irenaeus and the Imago Dei: The Importance of Being Human', *Logos: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture* 6.4 (2003): 15–34.

Weinrich, William C. '*Homo theologicus:* Aspects of a Lutheran Doctrine of Man'. In Lints, Horton, and Talbot, *Personal Identity*, 29–44.

Wells, Samuel. *Improvisation: The Drama of Christian Ethics*. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2004.

Welz, Claudia. '*Imago Dei*: References to the Invisible', *Studia Theologica* 65 (2011): 74-91.

Wenham, Gordon J. *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 1: Genesis 1–15*. Waco: Word, 1987.

Westermann, Claus. *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary*. Trans. John J. Scullion. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.

Westminster Assembly. *Westminster Shorter Catechism*. http://www.reformed.org/documents/wsc/index.html; accessed 16 June 2014.

White, R.E.O. 'Heal, Health'. In Elwell, *Baker Theological Dictionary of the Bible*, 328–30.

Wilckens, Ulrich, and Gerhard Kelber. 'χαρακτήρ'. In Kittel and Friedrich, *TDNT*, 9:418–23.

Williams, David T. '"He is the Image and Glory of God, but Woman ..." (1 Cor 11:7): "Unveiling" the Understanding of the *Imago Dei*', *Scriptura: International Journal of Bible, Religion and Theology in Southern Africa* 108.1 (2011): 314–25.

———. 'The Spirit in Creation'. *SJT* 67.1 (2014): 1–14.

Williams, Ernest S. *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols. Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 1953.

Williams, J. Rodman. *Renewal Theology: Systematic Theology from a Charismatic Perspective*. Three Volumes in One. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988–96.

Wilson, Sarah Hinlicky. 'Water Baptism and Spirit Baptism in Luke-Acts: Another Reading of the Evidence'. *Pneuma* 38.4 (2016): 476–501.

Wingren, Gustaf. *Theology in Conflict: Nygren, Barth, Bultmann*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1958.

Wirzba, Norma. *The Paradise of God: Renewing Religion in an Ecological Age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Witherington, Ben III. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998.

———. *Troubled Waters: The Real New Testament Theology of Baptism*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007.

Wood, Laurence W. *The Meaning of Pentecost in Early Methodism: Rediscovering John Fletcher as John Wesley's Vindicator and Designated Successor*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2002.

———. 'Can Pentecostals Be Wesleyans? My Reply to Don Dayton's Rejoinder'. *Pneuma* 28.1 (2006): 120–130.

———. 'An Appreciative Reply to Donald W. Dayton's "Review Essay"'. *Pneuma* 27.1 (2005): 163–72.

Wright, N.T. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991.

———. 'How Can the Bible Be Authoritative?'. *Vox Evangelica* 21 (1991): 7–32. https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/vox/vol21/bible_wright.pdf; accessed 21 March 2017.

———. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God, vol. 2. London: SPCK; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.

———. *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision*. Downers Grove: IVP, 2009.

———. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God, vol. 1. London: SPCK; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

———. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. 2 vols. Christian Origins and the Question of God, vol. 4. London: SPCK; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013.

———. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God, vol. 3. London: SPCK; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.

———. 'The Word and the Wind: A Response'. In Everts and Lamp, *Theological Vision of N.T. Wright*, 141–78.

Yong, Amos. 'Review of *Remythologizing Theology: Divine Action, Passion, and Authorship*. By Kevin J. Vanhoozer'. *Religious Studies Review* 36.4 (2010): 283.

———. *The Spirit of Creation: Modern Science and Divine Action in the Pentecostal-Charismatic Imagination*. Grand Rapids / Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2011.

———. *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.

———. *Spirit-Word-Community: Theological Hermeneutics in Trinitarian Perspective*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.

———. *Theology and Down Syndrome: Reimaging Disability in Late Modernity*. Waco, Tx: Baylor University Press, 2007.

———. *Who Is the Holy Spirit? A Walk with the Apostles*. Brewster, MA: Paraclete Press, 2011.

Yun, K.D. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: An Ecumenical Theology of Spirit Baptism.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America: 2003.

Zaccuber, Johannes. *Human Nature in Gregory of Nyssa: Philosophical Background and Theological Significance*. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2000.

Zachman, Randall C. 'Jesus Christ as the Image of God in Calvin's Theology', *Calvin Theological Journal* 25.1 (1990): 45–62.

Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985.

Web pages and online documents

Church of England. *Mission-Shaped Church: Church Planting and Fresh Expressions of Church in a Changing Context*. London: Church House Publishing, 2004. Report.

https://www.chpublishing.co.uk/uploads/documents/0715140132.pdf; accessed 18 January 2017.

Apostolic Church of Pentecost. 'Statement of Faith'. http://acop.ca/acop_faith.php; accessed 21 Feb 2017.

Assemblies of God. 'Assemblies of God Statement of Fundamental Truths'. http://ag.org/top/Beliefs/Statement_of_Fundamental_Truths/sft_full.cfm; accessed 28 January 2013.

———. 'Assemblies of God Fundamental Truths, Condensed'. http://ag.org/top/Beliefs/Statement_of_Fundamental_Truths/sft_short.cfm; accessed 21 Feb 2017.

———. 'Baptism in the Holy Spirit'. Position paper. http://www.ag.org/top/Beliefs/Position_Papers/pp_downloads/PP_Baptism_In_the_Holy_Spirit.pdf; accessed 28 January 2013.

———. 'Sanctity of Human Life: Abortion and Reproductive Issues'. Position paper. http://ag.org/top/Beliefs/Position_Papers/pp_downloads/PP_Sanctity_of_Human_Life_Abortion_Reproductive_Issues.pdf; accessed 12 April 2014.

Assemblies of God Great Britain. 'What We Believe'. http://www.aog.org.uk/about-us/what-we-believe; accessed 21 Feb 2017.

Australian Christian Churches. 'Doctrinal Basis'. http://www.acc.org.au/AboutUs/WhatWeBelieve/DoctrinalBasis.aspx; accessed 28 January 2013.

Church of God. 'Declaration of Faith'. http://www.churchofgod.org/beliefs/declaration-of-faith; accessed 2 November 2016.

Council of Trent. *The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Oecumenical Council of Trent*. Ed. And trans. J. Waterworth. London: Dolman, 1848; http://history.hanover.edu/texts/trent.html; accessed 21 March 2017.

Elim Pentecostal Churches. 'Fundamental Truths'. http://www.elim.org.uk/Articles/417857/Our_Beliefs.aspx; accessed 28 January 2013.

International Pentecostal Holiness Church. 'Articles of Faith'. http://iphc.org/beliefs/; accessed 21 Feb 2017.

International Theological Commission 2002. 'Communion and Stewardship: Human Persons Created in the Image of God'. http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/cti_documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20040723_communion-stewardship_en.html; accessed 21 Apr 2014.

Lutheran World Federation and the Roman Catholic Church. *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*. http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/documents/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_31101999_cath-luth-joint-declaration_en.html; accessed 6 March 2017.

Pentecostal-Roman Catholic Dialogue. 'Perspectives on Koinonia: Report from the Third Quinquennium of the Dialogue between the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity and Some Classical Pentecostal Churches and Leaders 1985 – 1989'. http://www.prounione.urbe.it/dia-int/pe-rc/doc/i_pe-rc_pent03c.html; accessed 27 Sept. 2012.

The Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada. 'Article 5: Statement of Fundamental and Essential Truths,' in 'General Constitution and By-Laws (2010)'. http://www.paoc.org/upload/files2/docs/Stmt%20of%20Fundamental%20and%20Essential%20Truths.pdf; accessed 28 January 2013.

———. 'What We Believe'. https://paoc.org/family/what-we-believe; accessed 21 Feb 2017.

Vatican Council. *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (Lumen Gentium)*. http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html; accessed 21 March 2017.

World Assemblies of God Fellowship. 'Constitution and By-Laws'. http://worldagfellowship.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/11/WAGF-Const-Bylaws.pdf; accessed 28 January 2013.

Biblical Quotations

All direct biblical quotations are taken from the English Standard Version (ESV); Wheaton: Crossway, 2001.

Other Ancient Sacred Literature

1 Enoch. http://wesley.nnu.edu/index.php?id=2126; accessed 21 March 2017.

The Apocalypse of Moses. http://wesley.nnu.edu/sermons-essays-books/noncanonical-literature/noncanonical-literature-ot-pseudepigrapha/the-apocalypse-of-moses/; accessed 25 May 2015.

The Book of Jubilees. http://wesley.nnu.edu/sermons-essays-books/noncanonical-literature/noncanonical-literature-ot-pseudepigrapha/the-book-of-jubilees/; accessed 21 March 2017.

The Enuma Elish. Trans. L. W. King. http://www.sacred-texts.com/ane/enuma.htm; accessed 21 March 2017.

The Rule of Community. http://www.yahwehsword.org/community/c-man-discipline.htm; accessed 14 September 2016.

The Pesachim. http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Talmud/pesachim8.html; accessed 14 September 2016.

Qumran Documents. 1QS; http://www.essene.com/History&Essenes/md.htm; accessed 7 July 2016; 4Q266; http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/scrolls_deadsea/uncovered/uncovered06.htm#40.%20The%20Foundations%20Of%20Righteousness; accessed 7 July 2016.

Wisdom of Solomon. http://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/greek-texts/septuagint/chapter.asp?book=29; accessed 21 March 2017.