

1. Giving at least three examples, discuss the various ways in which Matthew's Gospel claims the OT texts were fulfilled.

Andrew Allen – mr.aallen@gmail.com

The Greek verb **πληροῦν** means, “to make full, fulfill”; when one “fulfills a word,” one brings it to full expression – e.g., to fulfill a command is to carry it out fully; to fulfill a promise is to carry out fully what was promised; to fulfill a pattern is to express that pattern fully. (Covenant Handout, John C Collins 2/24/09 “Jesus and the Fulfillment of OT promise.”)

1. Fulfillment of a command (carrying it out fully)

Matthew 3:14-15 John would have prevented him, saying, "I need to be baptized by you, and do you come to me?" But Jesus answered him, "Let it be so now, for thus it is fitting for us to fulfill all righteousness." Then he consented.

- Jesus knows his baptism is the Father's will. By receiving baptism, he identifies with his people in their sin. The nation needs to repent. He does not separate himself from them. The nation needs to repent, and Jesus is part of the nation, so Jesus comes to repent. He does not separate himself from them. Jesus binds himself to the destiny of Israel. If John is a prophet and a leader of Israel, then Jesus will submit to his call to repentance, whether he personally needs to or repent or not (Dan Doriani, *Matthew*, Reformed Expository Commentary, 60.)
- Both John's baptism of Jesus and Jesus' submission to baptism at the hands of John (note the use of 'for us') are identified as having their part to play in the unfolding of God's purpose... it is not the baptism alone which fulfills all righteousness; rather the baptism constitutes the opening move of an unfolding sequence designed to fulfill all righteousness... Through repentance and baptism people would once again be set on the path of righteousness. Beginning with his baptism by John, Jesus was committed to carrying forward the mission begun by the preparer (Mat.3:3). (John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, 153-154)

2. Fulfillment of a promise (carrying out fully what was promised):

Matthew 1:22-23 all this took place to fulfill what the Lord had spoken by the prophet: “Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel” (which means, God with us).

- This refers back to Isa. 7. The LORD tells Ahaz to ask for a sign to confirm God's promise that He would destroy the two kings from the lands to the north that were threatening Judah. Ahaz protests, but the Lord insists and then gives the prophecy “Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel” (Isaiah 7:14)
- Motyer sees OT use as only Messianic; others see an OT provisional fulfillment – King Hezekiah or some anonymous prophet, or a collective remnant in Israel; Oswalt sees the OT use as Isaiah's own son Maher-Shalal-Haz-Baz.
- Beale & Carson go with Oswalt (calling it a double fulfillment) writing, “Matthew recognized that Isaiah's son fulfilled the dimension of the prophecy that required a child to be born in the immediate future. But the larger eschatological context... depicted a son, never clearly distinguished from Isaiah's, who would be a divine messianic king. That dimension was fulfilled in Jesus, who was unequivocally born to a young woman of marriageable age, but to a woman who also was a virgin at the time of the conception.”
- (All three bullets above are from Beale & Carson, NT use of the OT, 3-4.)

3. Fulfillment of a pattern (expressing that pattern fully):

Matthew 2:14-15 and he rose and took the child and his mother by night and departed to Egypt and remained there until the death of Herod. This was to fulfill what the Lord had spoken by the prophet, "Out of Egypt I called my son."

- This refers back to Hosea 11:1, which itself is referring back to the nation of Israel's exodus from Egypt. In Hosea's context "son" is used merely to refer to literal, biological offspring (as it is so used in the five other times it appears in Hosea).
- The original event need not have been intentionally forward looking by the OT author; for believing Jews, merely to discern striking parallels between God's actions in history, especially in decisive moments of revelation and redemption, could convince them of divinely intended "coincidence". (Two bullets above are from Beale & Carson, NT use of the OT, 8.)
- Christ was the embodiment of Israel. He was the true Israel. This passage clearly fulfills a pattern. (Jack Collins in office hours discussion)

Jay Neufeld - jakeneufeld@yahoo.com

Sources: Perry's Lecture: "What is Written in the Law? How Do You Read?" slide 5: Notes on Fulfillment; Chris Wright "knowing Jesus through the Old Testament", pp.55-76

General theme of fulfillment in Matthew:

- Fulfillment is a major theme in Matthew. Jesus came to fulfill the OT Scriptures; he came to finish and embody the climactic story of Israel.
- Programmatic phrase throughout Matthew: "to fulfill what was spoken by the prophet..."
- "The Old Testament is seen to have declared a promise which Jesus fills. What Matthew does these opening chapters about the childhood of Jesus is programmatic for the rest of his gospel, in which he repeatedly comes back to this note of fulfillment, whether in some action or teaching of Jesus, and supremely of course in his suffering and death." (Wright, p.63)

Three basic types of fulfillment: (Perry, slide 5)

- Specific Prediction > Verification (rare) = literal fulfillment. This is a narrow, literal sense of fulfillment, illustrating God's control over history and authenticating true prophets. Matt 1:22-23- (quoting Isaiah 7:14) "Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel." The virgin birth has no prior fulfillment.
- Undertaking > Completion = Finishing/completing a specific task. No uses of this sense in Matthew. Example John 19:30- Jesus says "It is finished"—he has completed the task he was meant to do.
- Covenant Promise – Eschatological Fulfillment (predominant) Covenant promise entails a relational pattern of fulfillment. A promise can have multiple occurrences of fulfillment throughout its history. All of the OT promises (i.e. Abrahamic) found their climactic fulfillment in Christ. This pattern leads to expect a figurative fulfillment that is different from the original details of the promise (Wright, p72). All of the promises of God are yes in Christ.
 - Matt. 2:15- (Hosea 11:1) to fulfill what the prophet spoke, "out of Egypt I called my son." In its original context Hosea refers to Exodus 4:22 in which Yahweh brings Israel (his first born son) out of Egypt. This isn't a prediction; it's a description of what happened in history. How is it a fulfillment? Covenant promise means that Yahweh entered into a relationship in which he promised to care for Israel as a son. Throughout history, Yahweh will treat Israel as a son. This has various historical expressions of which Christ marked the climactic (eschatological) ultimate fulfillment.

- Matt 5:17 I did not come to abolish the law or the prophets, but to fulfill them. Jesus is the ultimate fulfillment of the law. He kept it perfectly. The law was part of God's covenantal promise; it showed how Yahweh would be their God and how Israel would be his people (the law showed what the covenantal relationship should look like). In his person, Jesus embodied how God ideally relates to his people and what it looks like to keep the law (true covenantal relationship).
- Other Examples of fulfillment:
 - 2:5-6 (born in Bethlehem)
 - 2:17-18 (Rachel weeping over her children)
 - 2:23 (Nazareth)
 - 3:15 (fulfill all righteousness)
 - 8:17 (he bore our diseases)
 - 12:17-18 (my servant who will proclaim justice)
 - 21:4-5 (king mounted on a donkey)

“A promise is made to someone; a prediction is made about someone.” (Wright, p.65)

Daniel Smith - hermanodansmith@gmail.com

Pattern/Type

Matthew 2:15

and remained there until the death of Herod. This was to fulfill what the Lord had spoken by the prophet, “Out of Egypt I called my son.”

1. At the Exodus, Yahweh called Israel His son.
2. Jesus fulfills everything that Israel was called to fulfill.
3. He is the ideal and true Israelite, the son of God.
4. Jesus' experience fulfilled the pattern of the exodus (case of pattern and fulfillment rather than *sensus plenior*)

Other passages speak of Jesus as the son of God as well, furthering the truth that He is the true messiah

Promise and fulfillment

Matt 12:17-21

This was to fulfill what was spoken by the prophet Isaiah:

“Behold, my servant whom I have chosen, my beloved with whom my soul is well pleased. I will put my Spirit upon him, and he will proclaim justice to the Gentiles. He will not quarrel or cry aloud, nor will anyone hear his voice in the streets; a bruised reed he will not break, and a smoldering wick he will not quench, until he brings justice to victory; and in his name the Gentiles will hope.”

1. Matthew understood OT text as providing a promise about where the story was headed
2. He identifies a particular event as the fulfillment (or partial fulfillment) of a promise.
3. Matt. 12:17–21 understood the Servant of the Lord in Isa. 42:1–3 as the Messiah, with Jesus being the promised person.

The following is a shorter verse that is promise/fulfillment. It might be easier to memorize:

Matthew 1:22,23- *All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had spoken by the prophet:*

“Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel” (which means, God with us).

Development

Matt 5:17

Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them.

1. Jesus' gospel of the kingdom does not replace the OT but rather fulfills it as Jesus' life and ministry,
2. Coupled with his interpretation, complete and clarify God's intent and meaning in the entire OT.

from ESV Study Bible: All of the OT in that it all points to him:

3. not only in its specific predictions of a Messiah,
 4. Its sacrificial system, (which looked forward to his great sacrifice of himself),
 5. In many events in the history of Israel which foreshadowed his life as God's true Son,
 6. In the laws (which only he perfectly obeyed)
 7. In the Wisdom Literature (which sets forth a behavioral pattern that his life exemplified)
- (see note in ESV Study Bible Matt 1:22 and Matt 5:17)

Sources: from Portal: Collins NT Uses of OT-expanded; Matthew and Fulfillment (Collins);
ESV Study Bible Notes

2. Comment with reference to the biblical text (and Dr. Matthews discussion of kosmos), on the relationships between the redemption of human beings and the redemption of all creation. Why does this relationships exist? Is there a reason that evangelical Christianity has neglected this relationship?

John Casteel - johnwcasteel@gmail.com

- There is a dynamic relationship between God, His people, and His creation. From creation, man was put as the covenant representative and steward over God's creation (Gen. 1:29). Thus, as man goes, so creation goes (c.f. Gen. 3:17-18). If man is obedient to God and His commands, the creation will enjoy the blessings of God just as man does. Therefore, at creation, man, in his sinless state was enjoying the blessings of God extending those to creation. Part of this is that man, as he fulfilled his role well, was a good steward of and representative for the creation. Man was made in the image of God and part of that image-bearing is being the a steward of representative for the creation.
- At the fall, man did not stop being the covenant representative for the creation. When man sinned, his sin and corruption extended to the whole creation just as his blessing had. At the fall God says to Adam, "cursed is the ground because of you" (Gen. 3:17). Therefore, when Adam and Eve fell, all creation followed suit. All things were subjected under Adam, including under Adam's sin and fall (see slide 5 of "All Creatures of Our God and King").
- After the fall, God acts redemptively in history through Christ. His action in redemptive history begins with mankind, but it does not end with us. By our redemption, still as God's covenant representatives in the world, the creation begins to be redeemed. We are also empowered now and given a reason to act as redeemers in the cosmos. God has bound creation to mankind irrevocably and therefore, even the redemption of man has an effect on the creation. Thus, the redemption of mankind is often connected to the redemption of the entire cosmos (Romans 8). Humanity has a relationship of direct connection with the rest of the world. Biblical writer often used the term *κόσμος* to talk about humanity in their connection and relationship to the rest of the world.

- This means that, as human beings who are in Christ after the fall, we have a responsibility to be involved in God’s mission of the redeeming the whole cosmos. The church is a cosmic institution, it is the place set apart by God from which redemption emanates as we live in this universe. We, as the church should be redeeming all things. See Romans 8 for a discussion of this concept.
- I think evangelical Christianity does often neglect this relationship. There are a couple of reasons for this. The first is that we are descendents of Reformation thinking and therefore tend to reduce redemption down to the personal forgiveness of sins that we have in Jesus. While this is partly true, it is not enough. It is not the whole story. God is interested in the entire creation and proclaimed the entire creation good. He is concerned about returning, not just mankind, but also creation to the good state in which He created it. Another reason is the western individualism that we have inherited from the Enlightenment and from the Revivalist tradition. This causes us to emphasize our personal relationship with Jesus and to forget about both the corporate nature of our salvation and the relationships that we share with the rest of the cosmos, especially creation. Thus, when both of these traditions from which we have come are in play, they tend to make us flatten out Scripture and read everything with a hermeneutic of individualistic justification by faith. While it is important to recognize what is good about these traditions, it is also important to recognize the ways that they cause us to not cooperate with the text, which clearly says that we are to care for God’s world, for its redemption is closely bound up with ours.

Jonathan Marzinke - eknizram@gmail.com

(All bible quotes are from the ESV.)

Comment, with reference to the biblical text (and Dr. Matthews’ discussion of *kosmos*), on the relationship between the redemption of human beings and the redemption of all creation.

- Man and the rest of creation are bound together in relationship, dependence.
 - Creation is man’s home – Gen. 1:26-28
 - “Then God said, ‘Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them **have dominion** over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over the livestock and **over all the earth** and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.’ So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them. And God blessed them. And God said to them, ‘Be fruitful and multiply and **fill the earth and subdue it and have dominion** over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the heavens and over every living thing that moves on the earth.’”
 - “Genesis 1:26-28 indicates that there is more to bearing the divine image than personal relationship with God. **It also involves relationship with creation.** The image of God does not make man unique from the created order, but rather **unique within the created order.** Man is called to be God’s agent, the mediator of God’s covenant with creation... The human is uniquely a creature of the earth in special relationship with God **for the sake of the whole earth.**...Genesis 1 suggests that the **world without man is incomplete...man without the world is incomprehensible.**” (FATCIF, 60)
 - NT connection of *kosmos* (world, humanity) with *ktisis* (creation). From Dr. Matthews’ presentation.

- There is a tri-part covenantal relationship between God, man, and creation.
 - *Kosmos*
 - As universe. (Rom. 1:20)
Used generously in the NT with an underlying concept of something as “well-ordered” and “beautiful,” and generally signifies the universe.
 - As world/earth.
Used often to denote the things in or of the earth.
 - As humanity. (Jn. 14:17; 15:19; 1 Cor. 1:21; 2:12)
Humanity was viewed as a microcosm of the universe, so *kosmos* “implied relationship with persons and societies.” NT writers’ use of *kosmos* closely connected humanity with creation (*ktisis*).
 - This connection had implications regarding the fall. In other words, man’s fall affected creation.
- The fall affects all of creation.
 - “**God subjected all things to Adam**, and that included subjecting creation to fallen Adam, to share in his fallenness.” (Matthews’ Presentation, slide 5)
 - Speaking of Adam’s first disobedience in his role as covenant representative: “The scope of Adam’s act includes not just the human population but all of planet earth. **God cursed the ground because of Adam’s disobedience** (Gen. 3:17-19). His **sin proves catastrophic for creation as a whole**, shattering creation’s harmony...Because Adam was the mediator of God’s covenant with all creation, **his moral response to God affects all creation.**” (FATCIF 68)
 - **Gen. 3:17-19** – “And to Adam he said, ‘Because you have listened to the voice of your wife and have eaten of the tree of which I commanded you, “You shall not eat of it,” **cursed is the ground because of you**; in pain you shall eat of it all the days of your life; thorns and thistles it shall bring forth for you; and you shall eat the plants of the field. By the sweat of your face you shall eat bread, till you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; for you are dust, and to dust you shall return.’”
 - Creation groans under the effects of sin even though sin is not its fault. (**Rom. 8:20-22**)
 - **Hos. 4:2-3** – “There is swearing, lying, murder, stealing, and committing adultery; they break all bounds, and bloodshed follows bloodshed. **Therefore the land mourns**, and all who dwell in it languish, and also the beasts of the field and the birds of the heavens, and even the fish of the sea are taken away.”
- Man’s redemption brings creation’s redemption.
 - “Enter the second Adam, the one who sets things straight. **Just as the fall of the first Adam was the ruin of the whole earthly creation, so the atoning death of the second Adam brings the blessings of redemption to the entirety of creation.** As man goes, so goes the world. As the second Adam goes, so goes the world.” (FATCIF 275)
 - “We cannot separate our present spiritual regeneration from cosmic regeneration because **our present restoration to life is the first stage in the eschatological restoration of all creation** to its proper vitality and relationship to God. We are the firstfruits.” (FATCIF 275-6)
 - Jas. 1:18 – “Of his own will he brought us forth by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of **firstfruits of his creatures.**”

- Col. 1:20 – “...and through him to **reconcile to himself all things**, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross.”
- Acts 3:21 – Speaking of Jesus, “whom heaven must receive until the time **for restoring all the things** about which God spoke...”

Why does this relationship exist?

- See previous answer! This is the way God set it up from the beginning! Man and creation are bound together, with man as God’s vice-regent over creation. Man’s actions affect all of creation. If man is to be redeemed, then the rest of creation must be redeemed as well.
- “Because the entire **creation has been drawn into the mutiny of the human race** (Rom. 8:19-24). **Because man’s fall affected not only himself but also the rest of creation, redemption must involve God’s entire creation.**” (FATCIF 276)
- Key passage here is **Romans 8:19-24**.

Is there a reason that evangelical Christianity has neglected this relationship?

Several possible reasons:

1. Individualism of the Gospel.
 - a. Focus on the salvation of the individual has neglected our relationship with creation.
 - b. Neglects our role as stewards of creation because of disconnect with Adam’s original covenantal role.
2. Platonic influence.
 - a. Unbiblical dualism: Spirit = good; body = evil.
 - b. Results in lack of care for state of creation.
 - c. Focus becomes escape from physical world because our true selves are spiritual beings.
3. Discontinuity of Church with Israel.
 - a. Lack of understanding in how God’s goals for Israel are the same for the Church.
 - b. Ignorance of the progressive, continuous nature of the biblical narrative.
4. Christian emphasis of “heaven” as goal.
 - a. Many (most?) Evangelical Christians believe that the consummation consists of “going to heaven.” This is just plain unbiblical. Heaven was never the goal. We began on earth and we will end up on earth when it is renewed.

3. What is the place of baptism in the history of redemption? What, if anything, happens in baptism? Describe and defend a covenantal view of baptism, demonstrating its relationship to circumcision, the OT purity rites, and the Spirit’s ministry. Note: you will find both class lectures and Dr. Collin’s paper necessary to answer this question.

Aaron White - aaron.white.covenant@gmail.com

- The history of covenantal baptism was circumcision of the flesh for all males beginning with the line of Abraham. God came to Abraham establishing a law to circumcise all males including Abraham to keep his promise of bearing a great nation through his seed. Circumcision became the sign that God would sovereignly keep his seed promise to him. It became Abraham’s covenant obligation for all men so that they would not be cut off from his people. (Gen. 17:9-14) This was their obedient response and this physical sign set them apart from all the other nations. The men were the only recipients of circumcision because they were the head of the households and this seal was a covenant to his whole family. But this act did not cleanse their hearts. They had ritual washings to prepare them for worship, feasts and festivals dedicated to God. Their response to God was the attitude of their hearts and

obedience to His laws. Circumcision was a temporary agreement until the fulfillment of Christ came.

- John the Baptist tells everyone that Jesus came to bring a more radical baptism. (Luke 3:16) The coming of Christ abolished the need to shed blood (Col. 2:11-12) and keep the law via actions and duties. It replaced circumcision with the washing of water through baptism. This act does not mean that the people under the old covenant were inferior to those under the new covenant. "This new covenant is not new...it is rather a single unfolding covenant story that moves toward greater levels of fulfillment of divine promise." Williams, *Far as the Curse is Found*, 219. The difference is redemptive-historical. Even though circumcision and baptism have different external actions to the body, they have the same internal workings of the heart. Christ came to set a new form of carrying out the same covenant. This is to fulfill the prophecies of the Word. Even though God's children were set apart, they were and still are in need of washing. The goals of the new and old covenants are the same: to turn their hearts toward the law of God, to offer intimate knowledge of God, and to graciously give forgiveness of sins. Man was never able to keep the law perfectly so intervention was required. His life was in perfect obedience to God and a sacrificial offering on our behalf.
- The Old Testament covenant separated Jews from Gentiles (Eph. 2:15) but Christ brought a new covenant which no longer separated people from his free gift of salvation. Many of the Jews thought they were automatically saved because they were in the family of Israel. Therefore, John challenged all Jews to be baptized because they could no longer have confidence in the family of Abraham. Christ brought a new covenant which allowed any nation and any race who had faith in Christ to be baptized. Matt. 28:19 "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name..." Furthermore, In Eph. 2, Paul addresses the issue of Judaizers demanding the Gentile Christians to submit to their rules and rituals concerning circumcision and the Mosaic law. He continued to argue that the old covenant was a temporary agreement that was fulfilled by Christ
- Baptism is a covenantal action performed to a person representing the washing and cleansing of their heart and renewal of the Body. It's a sign which states that we are admitted into fellowship of the Church and a corporate engagement to publicly announce ones faith in Jesus Christ. It is also a sealed instrument by which He assures us that all our sins are so deleted, covered, and effaced, that they will never come into his sight, never be mentioned, and never imputed...being baptized for the remission of sins.
- Ephesians 5:25-26 "Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word"
- Titus 3:5 "not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost"
- However, in 1 Peter 3, Peter states, "baptism also doth now save us," but he is not saying that water itself posses the power to save, purify, regenerate, renew or remove our sins. Baptism is not the cause of salvation. It is an act that changed the status of a person from unclean to clean. This cleansing is our response towards God who initiates and chooses us. It is our act of worship towards God. We announce to others our celebration of a new life in Christ. We died with Christ in his death and we are washed with Christ in his baptism. He who knew no sin displayed the act of baptism to show us our rightful act of worship towards God in the presence of others after our hearts were made new. Christ's true baptism was in his death. (Luke 12:50, Mark 10:35-45) All of this is not about us and our faith in repentance but about God and HIS GIFT TO US. It's about Christ's work and not about our testimony.
- A covenantal view of baptism is not circumcising the flesh of your infants but baptizing those, young or old, into the covenantal family. To mark them with this sign as one included into the family of God. This act does not insure or give them salvation. And it's not the

amount of water that cleanses a person or makes baptism more effective. It's the renewing of the heart. The prayer for covenantal children is that they will remain and abide in the family.

Summary of Baptism:

- Sign and seal of forgiveness of sin – cleansing (1 Cor. 6:11, Acts 22:16, Eph. 5:26, Titus 3:5, Heb. 10:22)
- Identification with Christ in his death and resurrection –share a new life with obedience and love.
- Sign and seal of renewal in Holy Spirit – being poured into our lives.
- Sign and seal of being united to the Body of Christ the Church.

Chris Ammen - christopherammen@gmail.com

What is the place of baptism in the history of redemption?

- Circumcision was the sign of initiation into the Old Covenant
 - Gracious gift to Israel by the Lord – it is God's sign (Gen 17:10)
 - Sign and declaration to God's people of his saving acts on their behalf
 - Also a seal to affirm his ongoing covenant love and commitment to his people.
 - Demands faith of those who practice it – physical signs of a spiritual reality. Moses calls for circumcision of the heart (Deut 10:16) and Paul says Abe had faith before circumcision (Rom 4:11)
- In addition to being a 'boundary marker' and a necessary practice, also personal sacrament – God's sign and seal of the righteousness and covenant fellowship he granted to Abraham.
- Baptism is the sign of initiation into the new covenant.
 - Essentially the same meaning as circumcision (Col 2:11-12)
 - Unity in the way God deals with OT people and NT people
 - In Christ, realization of God's promise with Abraham and seed is found in Abe's spiritual descendants (those in Christ)
 - Should still be given to children, since was given to children before and is still a sign and seal of covenant promises

In what ways is the doctrine of covenant baptism informed by the OT rite of circumcision and the purity rites of the levitical system?

- OT washings are purification washings
 - Gives people the administrative status of clean
 - provides access to the benefits of the covenant
 - Picture of God's cleansing work that God does for those who trust him
 - Become a way of describing the great work of God in his people's hearts (Ezekiel 36:25-26)

Describe and defend a covenantal view of baptism.

- Baptism is our receiving the benefits of Christ's death and resurrection
- It is God's gift – like circumcision and Passover, it is God's sign for us
- It points to Christ's work – baptized into name of Christ
- Physical sign that is both physical and spiritual – visible, material promise for material beings
- Sign and seal of washing away sin and promise of restored fellowship
 - Also identification with Christ in death and resurrection
 - And renewal in Holy Spirit
 - And being united with the church

- Promises should be given to believers and their children
 - God created families and works through them
 - That's how it was done in the OT
 - Household baptisms
- God works in infants – Samuel, Jeremiah, John the Baptist

4. How does Abraham most commonly feature in our theological conversation and evangelism today? Explain, with reference to the biblical text how Abraham should impact our discourse and why?

Brooks Cain - cain.brooks@gmail.com

Part 1: How does Abraham most commonly feature in our theological conversation and evangelism today?

- Abraham is most commonly featured as the Father of Israel, the one with whom the Old Covenant was made, the one who was promised in Gen 12:2-3 - "And I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you and make your name great, so that you will be a blessing. I will bless those who bless you and him who dishonors you I will curse, and in you all the families of the earth shall be blessed." Therefore, he is commonly seen as having nothing to do with Christians today because we are heirs of the New Covenant, which is something completely different from the Old. He is seen as a man who received covenant promises which are now obsolete because the Jews were disobedient. The Jews may be children of Abraham, but we are not.

Part 2: How should Abraham impact our discourse? Why?

- In the NT, this story is remembered often in the language of "Abraham's seed/offspring." Where in the OT this phrase most commonly referred to Abe's physical descendants, in the NT this meaning is widened to include believing Gentiles. We see this in Galatians 3:29 - "If you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise." Heirs of what? Heirs of all the promises of God to Abraham. How can this be?
- In John 8:31-41, Jesus explains to the Jews that being a descendant of Abraham is not about being a physical descendant. Instead, he says, "If you were Abraham's children, then you would do the things Abraham did. As it is, you are determined to kill me, a man who has told you the truth that I heard from God. Abraham did not do such things. You are doing the things your own father does" (8:39-41). Therefore, those who are children of Abraham are those who believe Jesus and obey God, not those who are physical descendants.
- In Romans 4, Paul makes the point that Abraham was not justified by his works, works which showed that he deserved the covenant blessings (circumcision, etc), and therefore, Jews cannot claim to be justified simply because they go through rituals which prove that they are part of God's chosen people. Instead, Abraham was justified by his faith. In fact, Abraham was chosen as God's man before he even had a chance to be circumcised. He was not a Jew by birth. He was a wandering Aramean. Therefore, his status as God's chosen man did not come from his heritage, or works that he did to prove that he was part of God's chosen line of people. Instead, his justification came by faith, and his circumcision was simply a sign of that faith. He goes on to say, "So then, he is the father of all who believe but have not been circumcised, in order that righteousness might be credited to them. And he is also the father of the circumcised who not only are circumcised, but who also walk in the footsteps of the faith that our father Abraham had before he was circumcised." Abraham is the Father of anyone who believes.

- Gal 3:16-18 says, “The promises were spoken to Abraham and to his seed. The scripture does not say, ‘and to seeds,’ meaning many people, but ‘and to your seed,’ meaning one person, who is Christ. What I mean is this: The law introduced 430 years later, does not set aside the covenant previously established by God and thus do away with the promise. For if the inheritance depends on law [whether you are a Jew], then it no longer depends on promise; but God in his grace gave it to Abraham through a promise.” The promise comes to anyone who is in Christ, the seed of Abram to which all of this was promised.
- The language of Abraham in the NT serves to "tie together" the story of the OT with the person and work of Jesus in the NT. The covenants (Abrahamic, Mosaic, and New in particular) do not nullify one another. Instead, they build upon one another. A good understanding of Abraham gives us a better understanding of the church.

5. A. What covenant elements appear in 2 Samuel 7?

B. Explain the Problem with Israel’s desire for a king. How was problem resolved in the Davidic Covenant?

C. Explain the role of the Davidic King among the people of God. How is 2 Sam 7 Messianic?

Nick Policow - nick.policow@gmail.com

Answers from Sklar’s notes from Feb 4: “The Davidic Covenant” (Not on portal I believe)

A.) What Covenantal elements are in 2 Sam 7?

- Great Name\
 - And I will make for you a great name, like the name of the great ones of the earth. 2 Sam. 7:9b
 - And I will make you a great nation and I will bless you, And make your name great . . . Gen. 12:2
- Land
 - I will appoint a place for my people Is. and will plant them . . . in their own place . . . 2 Sam. 1:10a.
 - Now the LORD said to Abram, Go forth . . . to the land which I will show you. Gen. 12:1
- Eternal covenant relationship, kings
 - And your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me. 2 Sam. 7:16
 - And I will establish my covenant between me and you . . . an everlasting covenant . . . Gen. 17:7
- Seed
 - I will raise up your offspring . . . from your body, and I will establish his kingdom. 2 Sam 7:12.
 - One who comes from your body shall be your heir Gen. 15:4
- Sonship language
 - I will be to him a father and he shall be to me a son. 2 Sam 7:12-15
 - Then you shall say to Pharaoh, ‘Thus says the LORD, Israel is my first born son. Ex. 4:22
- Overarching purpose: establish that YHWHY is indeed God.
 - “confirm the word that your name may be magnified . . . by saying, “The LORD of hosts is God over Israel” 2 Sam. 7:25-26a (No Gen. quote.)

B.) Explain the Problem with Israel's desire for a king. How was problem resolved in the Davidic Covenant?

- The people wanted a king "like all the nations," (2 Sam 8) rejecting the LORD's kingship. The law made provisions for a king to rule under YHWY. But the people wanted a king to essentially replace YHWY. The Lord provided a disciplinary King, Saul, and then the type they needed, David.

C.) Explain the role of the Davidic King among the people of God. How is 2 Sam 7 Messianic?

- not prophetic (prophet Nathan rebukes King David 2 Sam 12, Is. and Jer. prophesied to kings.)
- The King is not priestly (King Uzziah for his presumption (2 Chr. 26: 16-21).
- Rather: King embodies YHWH's rule, he is to be the ideal Israelite. While all Israel should rule in creation as God's image bearers, the king ought to do this uniquely. (Ps. 72:104, 12-15 God's king reigning righteously)
- King is God's Son "You are my Son (Ps. 2).
- King is God's anointed (Messiah), (1 Sam 16.)

2 Sam 7 is ultimately messianic because.

- Jesus is the true Davidic king, embodying/ fulfilling the Abe. and Davidic covenants (Mt.1:1)
- Jesus is Son: "This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased. (Mt. 3:16-17). Who does the will of God "The Son can do nothing of his own accord, but only what he sees the Father doing" (Jn. 5:19).
- Jesus is Messiah: We have found the Messiah (Jn. 1:41. You are the Son of God, you are the king of Israel"

Shane Waldron - jcandme@hotmail.com

Curse = *Far as the Curse is Found*; Lecture = *The Davidic Covenant* class lecture by Dr. Sklar

5. A. What covenant elements appear in 2 Samuel 7? (See Curse, top of p. 183)

- It is divinely initiated (v. 5)
- It contains promises
 - peace for Israel (v. 10)
 - rest and house for David (v. 11)
 - offspring & kingdom forever (vv. 12-13)
- It is mutually binding (vv. 14-16)
- It places upon the Davidic house the obligation of faithfulness to Yahweh & his law (Ps. 132:1-12)

B. Explain the problem inherent within Israel's desire for a king. How was the problem resolved in the Davidic covenant?

- Deut. 17 had made provisions for king. Therefore, the problem was not Israel's request, but the motives behind their request. Israel wanted a king *like the nations*, which was a rejection of their God-given vocation and mission to be a peculiar nation (1 Sam. 8:5; Curse pp. 176-177). Their true desire was to displace Yahweh as their Ruler and look to an earthly king for power and security (1 Sam. 8:7, 19-20; Curse pp. 176-177; Lecture 2d). Furthermore, the negative consequences of having an earthly king will out weigh the positive. Rather than the king serving Yahweh by ruling the people on his behalf, the king will use the people to serve himself (1 Sam. 8:10-18; Curse p. 177).
- The problem was resolved in the Davidic covenant by Yahweh giving Israel the type of king they needed – a king after God's own heart. The king ruled Israel on Yahweh's behalf (2 Sam. 7:8-16; Curse p. 180), embodying the rule of Yahweh on earth (Ps. 72:1-4; Lecture 4c).

C. Explain the role of the Davidic king among the people of God. How is 2 Samuel 7 ultimately Messianic?

- Role of the Davidic king- The king served as **Covenant Mediator** between Yahweh and Israel (Curse p. 181). As such the king was a:
 - Representative
 - Represented God's rule among the people (Curse p. 180 – Chris Wright quote)
 - Represented the people before God (Curse p. 181).
 - Embodiment
 - Embodied Yahweh's rule on earth (Lecture 4c)
 - Embodied the people before God (Curse p. 181)

Representing and embodying the people before God meant that the king's obedience or disobedience had enormous consequences for national life (Curse p. 181).

- 2 Sam. 7 is Messianic because its ultimate fulfillment looks beyond Solomon and can only be completed through Jesus Christ.
- The throne of the Davidic Heir will be established forever (2 Sam. 7:13, Curse p. 184)
- The Davidic Heir will be God's Son (2 Sam. 7:14; Lecture 5)
- Calling Jesus the Son of God is synonymous with saying he is the Davidic Heir
 - Ps. 2:7 & Heb. 1:5
 - Matt. 1:1, 3:16-17
 - Rom. 1:1-4
- The Davidic covenant carried the Abrahamic promise forward into the future (compare 2 Sam. 7:12-15 with Gen. 15:6-7; Lecture 3b)

6. Dr. Perry argued that the problems that drove Paul's letter to the Galatians were more complicated than the typical description of the Galatian error.

A. List and explain each of the three errors that Dr. Perry noted within the church at Galatia

B. How did Paul address each of these errors within the book? Be specific with your use of scripture.

Lucas Dourado - ldourado@gmail.com

(This is answered completely in Perry's lecture on 4/29/09 entitled, "Paul's Mission to the Gentiles & Second Temple Judaism," pages 10-13 of the handout, or slides 20-25)

1. The Ethnocentric error

- The Judaizers argued that the Gentile believers must have the Jewish "badges" of identity (i.e. circumcision, food laws, Sabbath keeping). They thought you needed to be a Jew to be a full member of the covenant people. This is what Paul addresses in the confrontation with Peter in 2:14 – "If you, though a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how can you force the Gentiles to live like Jews?"
- Paul addresses this by coming after the "works of the law." "Works of the law" does not simply mean legalism and moralistic striving. It means taking on the Jewish distinctive of circumcision (5:3 – "Every man who accepts circumcision that he is obligated to keep the whole law"), observance of fasts and feasts (4:10 – "You observe days and months and seasons and years"), and kosher food practices (2:12 – Peter no longer eating with Gentiles). Paul asserts that faith in Jesus is the "badge" now, not "works of the law." 2:16 says "a person is not justified by works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ." This argument is supported by an appeal to Abraham as the father of those who have faith. Also 3:28-29 –

baptism into Christ means there is neither Jew nor Greek anymore, just those who are in Christ.

2. The Redemptive-Historical error

- The Galatians aren't recognizing what time it is in redemptive history. They think that they need to keep the law in order to be faithful to God, but they don't recognize the temporary role of the law in redemptive history.
- Paul addresses this in Galatians 3-4. He argues that you can't be a faithful Jew and just pretend that Jesus hasn't come. He stresses two main things to show that the Law is not in force any more.
- God's promise to Abraham occurred before Abraham's circumcision and before the giving of the Law (3:6-9, 15-18). The Law was not against the promise, nor did it nullify the promise (3:17)T
- The Law functioned temporarily to expose the "transgressions" or "sin" (3:19; Rom 3:20, 7:7) of those "under" its supervision, but only "until faith was about to be revealed" (3:23) – that is "until Christ" (3:24). Here, Paul brilliantly plays on the temporary and ironic role of a pedagogue (3:24) in Greco-Roman culture.

3. The Legalistic error

- As demonstrated by the Pharisees in the gospels, there was a tendency to insist on and "intensification of Torah" to mark out who the "real" Jews were. This resulted not only in an emphasis on "ethnic identity" but an inner-Jewish emphasis on "moral identity". To be saved, you needed to not only be a Jew, but a "real" Jew who lived up to the intensified moral requirements of the "works of the Law."
- Paul deals with legalism (the attempt to secure an eschatological assurance with God by means of Torah observance) in 2:15-21 as well as the redemptive-historical error of nomism. This is seen most clearly in 2:19-20. The "I" here (v20) is the 'flesh' of 5:13-24, which is antagonistic to the Spirit's jurisdiction. So in identifying with Christ's death, both the law and the human ego have ceased to be controlling factors for the direction of the Christian life.

Michael Posey - maposey@gmail.com

Most students of God's word could summarize the book of Galatians as Paul's rebuking to the churches in Galatia because they have left the true gospel and returned to a works of the law. And although this is correct, Dr. Perry unpacks this issue with the law for us. Dr. Perry states that there are 3 errors about the law at issue in the letter to the Galatians: the **ethnocentric error**, the **redemptive-historical error** and the **legalistic error**. All three of these errors are remedied by "the revelation of Jesus Christ".

Below is a description of each of these errors along with how Paul addresses each in the book of Galatians:

1. Ethnocentric Error: This was the belief that the Gentile believers must ADD to their 'faith' and 'baptism' the 'badges' of Jewish identity as any other Gentile proselyte would in order to gain full membership in the covenant people. The 'Judaizers' of Galatia believed that these badges or 'works of the law' included circumcision (Gal 5:3), the observance of Jewish fasts and feasts (Gal 4:10) and kosher food practices (Gal 2:12).

- **Paul's response-** (Gal 2:11-14) Paul opposes Peter for upholding the beliefs of the 'Judaizers'. Peter was living hypocritically in front of the Gentile believers by 'eating' with them until the 'circumcision party' came around and then withdrawing because of what these Jews might think.

2. Redemptive-Historical Error: In chapters 3-4, Paul outlines the temporary place and role of the Mosaic Law within redemptive history. The ‘Judaizers’ were using Abraham to argue for the necessity of circumcision. And Paul refutes them by giving two fundamentals of redemptive history ordered in relation to the law.

- **Paul’s response-** 1. God’s promise to Abraham, Abraham’s faith and his justification, all occurred prior to his circumcision and the addition of the Mosaic Law (Gal 3:6-9). If these things would have come after the law then maybe the ‘Judaizers’ argument would have some weight, but Paul reminds the Galatians that this is not the case. 2. The Law functioned temporarily to expose the transgressions or sin (Gal 3:19) of those under its supervision, but only “until faith was about to be revealed” (Gal 3:23)- that is “until Christ” (Gal 3:24).

3. Legalistic Error: As seen throughout the book of Galatians, the Jews (particularly the Judaizers) focused on the law for achieving righteousness. This “intensification of Torah” resulted not only in an emphasis on “ethnic identity” but in inner-Jewish emphasis on “moral identity”. Israel’s place for “boasting” and assurance of final salvation was to be found in “blamelessness” or doing “the works of the law”.

- **Paul’s response-** Paul deals with this legalism and confidence in self in Gal 2:15-21. The Crucifixion with Christ implies not only death to the jurisdiction of the Mosaic Law (Gal 2:19), but also death to the jurisdiction of one’s own ego. So in identifying with Christ’s death, both the law and the human ego have ceased to be controlling factors for the direction of Christian life.

(All answers and quotes have come from Dr. Perry’s lecture (power point presentation) titled “Paul’s Mission to the Gentiles & Second Temple Judaism: Beyond New Perspectives to the Mission of the Church” April 2009.)

7. A. What is Paul’s gospel?

B. How does he describe it in relation to God, Israel and her scriptures and Messiah, as well as in relation to the nations and the world?

C. In what sense is the gospel both personal and public good news?

D. What characteristics of your context (currently and its background) relate, positively and negatively, to understanding and communicating this matter faithfully?

Nick Gray - ndgray02@yahoo.com

This answer was taken from Collins’ lectures on 4/8/09 and 4/17/09 and Perry’s lecture on 4/22/09. Note that part D of this questions requires contextualization to your specific circumstance. I have given some context to the larger PCA and Reformed communities, but I have also contextualized to my specific local church, and you may need to modify your answer to do the same.

A. The way that Paul defines “gospel” is probably quite different than many current evangelicals would define “gospel.” Paul’s definition of “gospel” is NOT simply an answer to the question “How can I be justified before God?” In fact, in Rom. 1:1-6, Paul uses εὐαγγέλιον not to mean “personal justification by faith in Jesus,” but to express the good news of the story of God’s redemptive acts for all creation throughout history. We must remember that Paul’s gospel is *personal* (as opposed to abstract, not as a synonym for “individual”). He is writing to specific situations and specific problems. He is not writing about abstract ideas detached from a personal situation. Paul is concerned about pastoring the people of God, not writing some sort of theological textbook. Instead, Paul writes to shepherd the people of God away from the false ideas of the day, and toward faithful living in the covenant community. Thus, Paul’s use of

“gospel” is much more sweeping in scope than just “justification by faith” In fact, Paul never addresses justification to the Corinthians. If the doctrine of “personal justification” was truly so central to Paul’s gospel, one would expect it to be included in his lengthy discourse to the troubled Corinthian church. Instead, Paul’s gospel is the victory of God in Christ Jesus to restore all things.

B. In order to cooperate with Paul, we must understand that he writes his letters as narratives to fit in with the larger biblical storyline. In viewing Paul’s letters this way, we can see how his use of “gospel” calls upon images from the entire story of the Bible. In Rom. 1:11-15, Paul’s zeal to come to Rome to preach the gospel is informed by his understanding of his place in the story. Thus, Paul is concerned with *all* of the ways that God has acted for the good of his people, not only us getting out of hell. Paul is concerned about how God has personally acted for his people in order to teach them of their place in the story, not merely describing the legal status of believers.

In fact, Paul explicitly calls upon imagery from Israel’s story in the Old Testament in order to correctly place his readers their redemptive-historical context. For example, Paul begins Romans by, in chapter 1, recounting the history of creation up through the Flood. Furthermore, Rom. 2 and 4 address why the outward sign of covenant membership in the OT was not enough; Paul is correctly placing ultimate importance on circumcision of the heart. In Ephesians, Paul applies OT terminology to the first century believer receiving his letter. In Eph. 1:1, he refers to them as “saints,” which was an OT term for the people of God, consecrated to him, and set apart to behave in a holy manner. Thus Paul writes to connect the Ephesians as heirs to God’s redemptive story. Thus Israel’s story in the OT is *our story*. As a Gentile Christian, Abraham truly is my father (as Paul writes in Rom. 4), and God did bring my people out of Israel. This is also seen in Eph. 3 where Paul clarifies that the “mystery” of the OT is the fact that Gentiles would be fully grafted into membership of the people of God—not in a nationalistic victory where the Davidic king rules over all the world, with Gentiles simply as residents in that world, but with Gentiles receiving full citizenship, being able to truly call themselves heirs to Israel’s story. The Messiah would not be a nationalistic victor, triumphing over Israel’s political enemies. Instead, as Paul writes, the Messiah would be the one who defeats the spiritual foe. Thus, as Paul writes in Eph. 6:10-17, when Christians put on the armor of God (the equipment of the Messiah, as described in the OT), we are actually putting on Christ.

It is clear the scope of the gospel as described as Paul is not simply for nationalistic Israel. It has exploded outward. In fact, in Rom. 1:5, Paul states that he preaches the gospel for the sake of Jesus’ name among the nations. Thus, here Paul is picking up on the missional theme that God set out for his people in Gen. 12:1-3.

C. Since Paul talks about the sake of the nations, we see that his “gospel” is not personal, but quite public. Of course, personal salvation is important, and Paul does affirm this, but it is not the only thing. *εὐαγγέλιον* does not *only* mean individual salvation. Instead, Paul writes about both individual salvation AND God’s grand redemptive history of the community of God. For example, most of Paul’s use of “you” is in the second person *plural*. Thus, clearly he is concerned with the community of believers. Paul also does frequently use the first person *singular* as he recounts how God’s gospel has impacted his life (i.e. Gal. 2:20—I have been crucified with Christ...). Paul writes of his personal gospel conversion, but he’s doing so in the context of God’s over-arching redemptive story. Paul affirms the OT story that members of the people of God are not simply saved to go about their individual lives. Instead, God does things for his people so that their piety can flourish and they can flourish in community. In Rom. 14, Paul urges the readers to get along in one community. They were not to have separate churches

for separate affinities, but since the Messiah has made it possible for wolves and lambs to lie down together, the people of God are to lovingly operate as one body. Paul confirms this in I Corin. 10:17 where he writes that “we who are many are one body.”

D. As we negotiate how to best communicate this idea to those in our current context, we must do so with great care and sensitivity. Any context in the Reformed setting will find it to be a new (and possibly troubling concept) whenever we try to take some of the ornaments off of justification and describe it as something other (more!) than only a person believing in Jesus as their personal savior. Certainly in the PCA, where we view ourselves as very doctrinally educated, it can be a hard pill to swallow to confront the idea that we may have misunderstood something as central as the “gospel” as described by the most beloved writer of the Reformed tradition. Much of the current way whereby people understand Paul’s gospel to mean individual saving faith is rooted in both the tradition of Luther (who was reacting against Catholic misunderstandings, and thus he too narrowly defined Paul’s use of gospel) and out of American revivalism (which championed the idea that all a person needs to do is be saved from hell with no other implications for their life). On the flip side, since my context is in the PCA, where intellectual stimulation is valued, people might be more willing to discuss a more nuanced version of Paul’s writings and intentions. They might be eager to approach that sort of study and come to see this doctrine that is so rooted in biblical truth.

Furthermore, I think that my current church does function as a community quite well (certainly not perfectly, but of all the churches I have gone to in my life, this one best embodies a place where I feel truly invested in the lives of the other members, and I feel that they are invested in mine). Since this is the case, discussing Paul’s emphasis on the corporate aspect of the gospel and God’s over-arching redemptive history for a community of people may be well received, as it would help to give sound biblical reason why our church acts as we do.

Hans Stout - hansmpa@hotmail.com

a. What is Paul’s gospel?

Paul’s gospel:

Is the redemptive story that God is telling concerning Christ Jesus, who, as the promised Davidic King rose from the dead, rules over Jew and Gentile, and draws both into a united praise of God.

Critical passages:

Romans 1:1-6 1 Paul, a servant of Christ Jesus, called to be an apostle, set apart for the gospel of God,² which he promised beforehand through his prophets in the holy Scriptures,³ concerning his Son, who was descended from David according to the flesh⁴ and was declared to be the Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord,⁵ through whom we have received grace and apostleship to bring about the obedience of faith for the sake of his name among all the nations,⁶ including you who are called to belong to Jesus Christ,

Romans 15:8-12 8 For I tell you that Christ became a servant to the circumcised to show God’s truthfulness, in order to confirm the promises given to the patriarchs,⁹ and in order that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy. As it is written, “Therefore I will praise you among the Gentiles, and sing to your name.”¹⁰ And again it is said, “Rejoice, O Gentiles, with his people.”¹¹ And again, “Praise the Lord, all you Gentiles, and let all the peoples extol him.”

¹² And again Isaiah says, “The root of Jesse will come, even he who arises to rule the Gentiles; in him will the Gentiles hope.”

Romans 15:15-21 15 But on some points I have written to you very boldly by way of reminder, because of the grace given me by God¹⁶ to be a minister of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles in the

priestly service of the gospel of God, so that the offering of the Gentiles may be acceptable, sanctified by the Holy Spirit.¹⁷ In Christ Jesus, then, I have reason to be proud of my work for God.¹⁸ For I will not venture to speak of anything except what Christ has accomplished through me to bring the Gentiles to obedience--by word and deed,¹⁹ by the power of signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God--so that from Jerusalem and all the way around to Illyricum I have fulfilled the ministry of the gospel of Christ;²⁰ and thus I make it my ambition to preach the gospel, not where Christ has already been named, lest I build on someone else's foundation,²¹ but as it is written, "Those who have never been told of him will see, and those who have never heard will understand."

b. How does he describe it in relation to God, Israel and her scriptures and Messiah, as well as in relation to the nations and the world?

- i. **In relation to God:** The gospel is a story told by God about *his* redemptive activity and covenant faithfulness to his promises (This story is, "...the gospel of God..." Romans 1:1).
- ii. **In relation to Israel and her scriptures and Messiah:** Israel's scriptures foretold the coming of a greater David whose rule over the nations would be characterized by righteousness (See Isaiah 11).
 - i. Notice that as Paul is articulating his gospel, his description of Christ Jesus in 1:3 implicitly alludes to the Davidic promises of the Old Testament (See also Paul's citation of Isaiah 11:10 in Romans 15:12: "And again Isaiah says, 'The root of Jesse will come, even he who arises to rule the Gentiles; in him will the Gentiles hope.'").
 - ii. Notice also that Paul's appears to see Christ's resurrection as a fulfillment of Isaiah 11:10 "...even he who *arises* to rule the Gentiles..." N.T. Wright argues for this saying, "The Gentiles will come to hope in the Davidic Messiah, the 'root of Jesse'; he is the one who 'rises to rule the nations.' The echo of 1:4 should leave us in no doubt that Paul intends a reference to Jesus' resurrection. This is what constituted him as Messiah and Lord of the whole world."¹
- iii. **In relation to the nations and the world:** The gospel spoken by Paul and anticipated in the Old Testament, foretold a time when Gentiles would come under the rule of the new David and join God's people in a united praise of God. See Romans 15:9-12, 15-21. These verses function as an inclusio with Romans 1:1-6 in which the major themes introduced at the beginning of Romans function as a heightened summary of the gospel.
 - i. "In Romans 15:8-12, he [Paul] is showing that his own ministry to the Gentiles is part of the way in which God fulfills the Old Testament passages about the Gentiles coming to glorify God. He quotes Psalm 18:49; Deuteronomy 32:43; Psalm 117:1; *and Isaiah 11:10*. That is, he saw the faith of the Gentiles as their coming under the Messiah's rule. And he did what he could to get Jewish and Gentile Christians to 'live in such harmony with one another...that together [they might] with one voice glorify the God and Father of [the] Lord Jesus Christ."²
 - ii. Notice that Isaiah 15:8-12 form an inclusio with chapter 1 in which the major problems raised have been reversed by the work of the Son of David:
 - o Reversal of mankind's failure to glorify God.
 - o Reversal of mankind's failure to join in a unified praise of God.

¹ N.T. Wright, *The New Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. 10 (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2002), 748.

² C. John Collins, *Science and Faith: Friends or Foes?* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2003), 156

- Reversal of the failure of the Davidic kings.
 - iii. In Romans 15:15-21, Paul articulates how the universal scope of the gospel compels him to go to the nations where Christ has not been named.
- c. **In what sense is the gospel *both personal and public good news*?**
 - i. The gospel is personally good news because we have personally been reconciled to God and have the sure hope that God will dwell with us in a renewed creation.
 - ii. The gospel is public good news, because through the gospel God is making for himself a unified and worshipping people from all nations.
- d. **What characteristics of your context (currently and its background) relate, positively and negatively, to understanding and communicating this matter faithfully?**
 - i. Negatively: Much of my growing years were spent in churches that were heavily influenced by an individualistic revivalism. This has made it difficult to understand God's redemptive aims for all of creation.
 - ii. Positively: Seeing the individualism that attended the individualistic revivalism caused me to look for different answers (many of which have been answered in the covenantal / reformed tradition). Another benefit that I had was that all through my growing years, I was taught the Word. As a result, I am more familiar with the general categories being discussed than I would have been otherwise.

8. The so-called New Perspective(s) on Paul is put forth as an argument against an Old Perspective. Much of the debate centers on interpretations of Judaism in the Second Temple Period.

A. Briefly explain what is meant by the Old Perspective, its understanding of Second Temple Judaism, and its reading of Paul.

B. How does the New Perspective understand Second Temple Judaism and Paul's engagement of it?

C. What major insights or dangers should we take note of as we engage in New Perspectives on Paul?

Wei Hui - weisan_free@yahoo.com

From class notes on "*Contributions and Criticisms of the New Perspectives on Second Temple Judaism and Paul*" Gregory R. Perry.

A. "The Old Perspective on STJ"

- Based on Lutheran hermeneutical dichotomy of Law and Grace
- understands Judaism as a religious system offering salvation from God on the basis of amassing merit through keeping the Mosaic Law (works righteousness)
- Paul's gospel, according to Luther is centered on Justification by faith alone: Salvation is based on Christ's substitutionary, atoning work, which sinners received by faith in Christ alone. Justification is, for those who believe this Gospel, the "imputation" (not infusion) of Christ's righteousness to their account (Gal., 26:223).
- For Luther, "works of the law" refers to the sum that humankind is required to do for God. On the other hand, "faith" is not what we do, but trusting what God has done, is doing, and will continue to do in keeping his promises.
- Referring to Romans 4:4; 9:30 and 11:6 in his *Bondage of the Will*, Luther wrote, "Grace would not be grace if it were earned by works."

B. (i) New Perspectives (NP) offered by E.P. Sanders (p.1-2 Perry's class notes)

- Jews, who lived in first century Palestine, understood themselves to be in covenant relationship with God as a result of his merciful, electing grace, shown first to Abraham,

then in the Exodus. Having been brought into a covenant relationship with God by grace, Israel was to respond in obedient faith, by keeping the Mosaic Covenant (Torah).

- According to Sanders, this “covenant nomism” was never about “getting in” the covenant community; rather it was about “maintaining” covenant relationship with a gracious God [Sanders, 419-428].
 - On this point, Sanders argues, that Paul was in agreement with STJ: “salvation is by grace, but judgment is according to works.” Paul’s problem with STJ and “a righteousness from law” (Phil 3:9) was “not the distinction between merit and grace but between dispensations.” Paul’s critique of Judaism, according to Sanders, is salvation-historical . . . In short, Judaism is wrong because “it is not Christianity” [Sanders, 552]”
- (ii) NP – Dunn (p.3 Perry’s classnotes)
- “Covenantal Nomism” is not about maintaining Israel’s covenant relationship with God, but in reinforcing a sense of “privilege” that God’s saving righteousness was restricted to Israel.
 - The “works of law” (circumcision, food laws) function like “badges” of national identity to distinguish Israel as set apart from other nations.
 - Gentiles are thus required to take on “the persona and practices of the Jewish people” in order to be justified. (Dunn, *Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 359-366)
 - Paul’s gospel, thus, is rejecting this type of covenantal nomism: participation in the covenant is through bearing the marks or wearing the badges of Jewish national/ethnic identity instead of only “through faith in Christ.”
- (iii) NP – NT Wright (p.5-6 Perry’s classnotes)
- STJ is to be understood as an unfinished story about Israel still-in-exile due to covenantal unfaithfulness
 - God called Israel to live as the true humanity in the land under God’s presence, but Israel failed to keep the covenant, and incurred the covenant curse (Deut 27-28) - exile
 - The end of the exile is indicated by the return of the Lord’s presence
 - Paul’s gospel announces the end of Israel’s exile with the arrival of Jesus, Israel’s Messiah. (what time is it in the story)
 - All who believe Paul’s gospel are declared vindicated or “righteous”, assured of their membership in the covenant people of God.

C. The New Perspective reading of Paul seeks to clarify three errors of STJ:

1) The Ethnocentric Error (p11, slides printed copy)

- That Gentile believers, must ADD to their faith and baptism the badges of Jewish identity (circumcision, food laws) in order to gain full membership in the covenant people.

2) Redemptive-Historical Error (p11, slides printed copy)

- The Mosaic Law has a temporary function within the redemptive history
- It serves to expose sin (Gal 3:19; Rom 3:20; 7:7), but only until Christ comes (Gal 3:24).

3) The Legalistic Error (p12, slides)

- Assurance of final salvation was to be found in doing the “works of the law”
- Compared to the ethnocentric error, this resulted in an emphasis on “moral identity” not just an “ethnic identity”.

Other insights offered by Wright (p.13 slides)

- Luther’s notion of “imputed righteousness” is a misunderstanding of Paul’s use of the law-court metaphor.
- This “righteousness” is not a *moral quality* the vindicated bring into court with them but a *legal status* they carry out of court with them.

- This status is based on “the cross and resurrection of Jesus – Israel’s Messiah”

Perry’s Critique (p.14 slides)

- Luther’s understanding of “dikaiosunh qeou” (righteousness of God) fails to discern Paul’s intent to use the phrase as a shorthand summary of God’s covenantal faithfulness throughout the biblical storyline, now culminated in Jesus, Israel’s Messiah.
- Wright’s understanding of “God’s righteousness” in the context of Hebrew law-court does not adequately account for another court scene – the *manumission of Roman slaves*
- **Manumission of Roman slaves** – Paul envisions the imputation of the master’s righteousness to a slave, not the judge’s righteousness to a criminal. The slave’s legal standing AND personal/relational identity were changed. His debts were paid, now reckoned as citizen. He also takes on the master’s name to assume his dignity and reputation.
- Justification for Paul is about Christ’s representation of us (Christ died for us) AND our participation with him (I have been crucified with Christ). NP discussion has revealed the implicitly Trinitarian structure of Paul’s teaching on justification.
- Wright’s criticism of the traditional Lutheran/Reformed understanding of “imputed righteousness” focuses primarily on Paul’s use of dikaiosunh qeou. Wright describes righteousness of God as an activity, God’s own covenant faithfulness in relation to Israel; and not as an attribute or quality, which he imputes or imparts to others. (class notes p.15)
- Luther’s emphasis on the imputation of Christ’s righteousness is valid on at least two counts: 1) Christ’s representative role as Messiah/Lord over his people 2) the believer’s participation, co-crucifixion with Christ through the spirit (p.18 class notes)
- We need to consider this: **Could it be that Luther and Wright both read something that is really there in Paul, but that their readings need each other to comprehend Paul’s implicitly Trinitarian doctrine of justification?** (p.17)

Kraker, Justin - Justin.Kraker@covenantseminary.edu

A. Old Perspective

- a. Understanding of Second Temple Judaism (STJ)
 - i. STJ seen as a works-righteousness religion
 1. Understood STJ as “a religious system offering salvation from God on the basis of amassing merit through keeping the Mosaic Law (works righteousness)” (Greg Perry, “Contributions and Criticisms of the New Perspectives on Second Temple Judaism and Paul” [henceforth “CCNP”], 1)
- b. Reading of Paul (flows from the understanding of STJ)
 - i. “Works of the law” = “the sum that humankind is required to do for God” (Perry, CCNP, 1)
 - ii. In response to the supposed works-righteousness of STJ, Paul announces a Gospel that is centered on justification through faith alone, providing a “stark contrast” to works-righteousness
 1. “...salvation [is] based on Christ’s substitutionary, atoning work, not [on the work] of sinners, and is received by faith in Christ alone, resulting in the justification of all who believe this Gospel...” (Perry, CCNP, 1)
- c. Summary

- i. The Old Perspective believes that STJ was a religion of legalistic works righteousness, and therefore Paul is interpreted as responding to this works-righteousness with the doctrine of justification through faith alone.
 - ii. Key verses: Romans 4:4; 9:30; 11:6
- B. New Perspective
 - a. A reaction against the Old Perspective’s universalizing and de-contextualizing of “works of the law”
 - b. Key definition: covenantal nomism
 - i. “The view that one’s place in God’s plan is established on the basis of the covenant and the covenant [then] requires as the proper response of man his obedience to its commandments” (E.P. Sanders quoted in Greg Perry, “Paul’s Mission to the Gentiles & Second Temple Judaism(s)” [henceforth PMG], slide #7) – emphasizes the need to maintain the covenant through proper response
 - c. Basic of New Perspective: covenantal nomism
 - i. Understanding of STJ
 - 1. Covenant is established by grace, but maintained through the Law
 - a. “Having been brought into a covenant relationship with God by grace, Israel was to respond in obedient faith, by keeping the Mosaic Covenant (Torah)” (Perry, CCNP, 1-2)
 - b. I.e., a sort of covenantal nomism
 - ii. Reading of Paul
 - 1. Paul announces that the covenant is by faith in Christ, who brings about the end of the law
 - a. Paul’s Gospel is proclaiming that “Christ has put an end to the law and provides a different righteousness from the provided by Torah obedience” (Perry, CCNP, 2)
 - iii. Summary
 - 1. The New Perspective believes that STJ was a religion of covenantal nomism (established by grace, but maintained through works of the law/proper response), and therefore Paul is interpreted as responding to this covenantal nomism by asserting that that the end of the law has come through Christ.
 - 2. Key verse: Romans 10:2-4
- C. Major insights and dangers as we engage the New Perspective on Paul
 - a. Insights
 - i. Catches what Luther (Old Perspective) missed: Paul’s intent to use “righteousness of God” as “a shorthand summary of God’s covenant faithfulness throughout the biblical storyline, now culminated in Jesus, Israel’s Messiah” (Perry, PMG, slide #28)
 - ii. In general, shows commendable concern for the original context of Paul’s writings; seeks to cooperate with the Text by seeking to hear the original intent of the author
 - b. Dangers/errors to avoid
 - i. Ethnocentric error
 - 1. The belief that “Gentile believers in Messiah Jesus, must add to their ‘faith’ and ‘baptism’ the ‘badges’ of Jewish identity as any

- other proselyte would in order to gain full membership in the covenant people” (Perry, PMG, slide #21)
- ii. Redemptive-historical error
 1. “In Galatians 3-4, Paul outlines the temporary place and role of the Mosaic Law within redemptive history”...the redemptive-historical error means trying to extend living by the Mosaic Law beyond the death, resurrection, and ascension of the Messiah (Perry, PMG, slide #22)
 - iii. Legalistic error
 1. In Galatians 2:15-21, “Paul deals with ‘legalism’ (the attempt to secure and eschatological assurance with God by means of Torah observance)...” (Richard Longenecker in Perry, PMG, slide #25)

Bryan Loney - loney.bryan@gmail.com

NOTE: The answer to this question is found in Dr. Perry’s essay entitled, “Contributions and Criticisms of the New Perspectives on Second Temple Judaism and Paul.” This information is summarized in his power point lecture entitled, “Paul’s Mission to the Gentiles and Second Temple Judaism.”

A. Briefly explain what is meant by the Old Perspective, its understanding of Second Temple Judaism, and its reading of Paul.

“...yet we know that a person is not justified by works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, so we also have believed in Christ Jesus, in order to be justified by faith in Christ and not by works of the law, because by works of the law no one will be justified.” --- Gal 2:16

The Old Perspective on Second Temple Judaism (STJ) is rooted in “the Lutheran hermeneutical dichotomy of Law and Grace” (i.e., law and grace set in opposition). According to the Old Perspective, first century Judaism was a “religion of legalistic works righteousness” (i.e., attempted to earn salvation through keeping the Mosaic Law). The “works of the law” referenced in Gal 2:16 were viewed as “the sum that humankind is required to do for God.” Paul’s gospel offered a stark contrast by stating that one is pronounced righteous and saved solely by faith in Christ. For Luther, who was bound by the Law for so many years until he came to see the grace of Christ, the Law was opposed to grace and had no part in it. This is a common view adopted by many evangelicals today.

B. How does the New Perspective understand Second Temple Judaism and Paul’s engagement of it?

In 1977, Sanders published a critique of the Old Perspective (i.e. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*), arguing that STJ was not a “religion of legalistic works righteousness.” Sanders stressed that STJ emphasized the grace of God in establishing a covenant relationship with the Jewish people. The role of the “works of the law” (viewed by Sanders as the Mosaic Law in its entirety) was to maintain the covenant. This is referred to as covenant nomism (i.e., obedience as means of maintaining covenant status/privileges). According to Sanders, Paul’s critique of STJ was the failure to recognize that Christ “put an end to the law” as a means of maintaining the covenant. Covenant status is no longer maintained by the law but through faith in Christ. Others within the New Perspective movement have similarly emphasized covenant nomism. However, they differ in their views on covenant nomism (i.e., what aspects of the Law are being emphasized) and Paul’s particular critique of STJ. For example, Dunn suggests that the covenant nomism of STJ was particularly focused on “badges of national identity” (e.g., circumcision, food laws, and Sabbath observance). Dunn argues that Paul’s critique of STJ is the use of the “works of the law”

rather than faith in Christ as the appropriate marker for the covenant. Wright similarly speaks to the problems of STJ using “works of the law” as “badges of superiority.” However, he brings emphasis to the greater biblical story of nation Israel. He sees STJ as a nation still in exile and seeking vindication through adherence to “works of the law.” Ultimately, the covenant nomism in view is a distortion of the law in which “badges of nationality” are being used to restrict grace to one race. Wright calls this a meta-sin, and he argues that Paul critiques this mindset by arguing that Jesus is the true Israelite who ultimately brings the Israelites out of exile by reconstituting the nation, displaying perfect covenant faithfulness, and ultimately leading the nation in its intended vocation of blessing all the nations. Wright’s emphasis is on the continuity of the story and the final vindication that is afforded through faith in Christ.

C. What major insights and/or dangers should we take note of as we engage the New Perspective(s) on Paul?

NOTE: There is substantial overlap here with questions 6 and 11.

Major Insights/Positives:

1. Appropriately challenges a law-grace dichotomy: As we have discussed over the past two semesters of Covenant Theology, the Law is not opposed to grace. The New Perspective properly roots the Law in the grace of God. The Law teaches us how to live according to our identity as the people of God in order to enable us to be covenantally faithful and fulfill God’s mission in the world.
2. Appropriately emphasizes a redemptive-historical reading of Paul: The New Perspective encourages us to take note of where STJ fits in the overall biblical story. This is essential in properly understanding the radical nature of the mystery (Eph 1:9) taking place in the first century.
3. Makes more coherent sense of the space that Paul devotes to Jew-Gentile relations: Paul pays far more attention to this issue than to justification, per se. This makes more sense if we understand STJ as being strongly concerned with marking out ethnic identity rather than simply earning their way to heaven.
4. More general hermeneutic implications: The New Perspective has pushed a more careful analysis of the “world behind the text” (i.e., original audience and socio-cultural issues) which is essential in properly interpreting and applying texts to today.

Potential Dangers:

1. Overly simplistic view of STJ: The New Perspective could inadvertently imply greater homogeneity to STJ than was actually present. There were a variety of Jewish sects, even during the Maccabean period, such as the Essenes, the Zealots (who performed forcible circumcisions), the Pharisees and the Sadducees, just to name a few. STJ likely included diverse sects engaging the Law in different ways, some rightly, to be sure, and some wrongly. For example, it is sure that Paul addresses in various places those who are “intensifying the Torah” as N.T. Wright calls it. They are proclaiming that in addition to faith in Christ, one must also observe certain Torah commands as well. Paul addresses these Judaizers it seems often, but he does so in different ways with different emphases, and Galatians is a perfect example of this, where Paul addresses three errors of different types of Judaizers: the Ethnocentric error (2:1-16a), the Legalistic Error (2:16b-3:14), and the Redemptive-Historical Error (3:15-29).
2. Potential over-correction that downplaying of the personal implications of the gospel: The individual, which has been overemphasized by Luther has been reacted against by Dunn and Wright, along with others. Yet, as discussed in question 11 of our study guide, anthropocentric and redemptive-historical readings of Paul are not an either/or situation but a both/and. The Gospel is both personal and communal. For example, in Romans 6:19-22, Paul makes the argument that you (plural, the people of God) were enslaved to righteousness but now have been set free from it; therefore you are live not as slaves but as free in regard to sin. And he follows

that up in 8:2, that the “law of the Spirit of Life has set you (singular, individually) free from the law of sin and death.”

3. The issue of justification and imputed righteousness: Building on the danger #2 and strongly linked to the work of N.T. Wright is the question of what Paul means by “righteousness.” Wright emphasizes judicial vindication or eschatological status before God and takes issue with the notion of imputed righteousness. In his words, “Justification in the first century was NOT about how someone might establish a relationship with God. It was about God’s eschatological definition, both future and present, of who was, in fact, a member of his people...” This emphasis on eschatological legal status is true, but it fails to also convey the new identity and relationship of familial love that begins with justification. Again, Wright and Luther are often set in opposition (i.e., either-or) rather than appreciating the contributions that both make to a fuller understanding of the gospel (i.e., both-and).

9. A. What is the primary role of the OT prophets?

B. What do the prophets foretell about the Messianic future? How does knowing this help us to read specific NT texts?

Jason Dausman - jdausman@yahoo.com

“A spokesman for God, particularly to the covenant people.”³ (Exodus 7:1; Num 12:6; Deut 8:15-22)

Note the differences from:

- *Priests*: taught law, led worship, sought specific answers from the Lord (Urim and Thummim, Num 27:21)
- *Kings*: embodied the rule of the Lord on earth (Ps 72:1-4, 12-15)
- The prophet was not a “minister of the word” (priestly duty Deut 33:10)
- The “call” of the prophet is important as it was always for a particular purpose related to the covenant. So, be careful making Isa 6 a paradigm for all Christian ministry

Function: (taken from Jay’s lecture; bold is Collins’ ‘main message’ of the prophet)

As a spokesperson for God for several purposes;

- Giving of the Law (Ex 19-24); Leviticus; Deuteronomy
- Giving of specific instructions: Tabernacle building (Ex 25-31), Deciding the king and anointing him (1 Sam 10:1; 16:12-13)
- Proclaiming what would happen in time to come (Isa 1:19-20; Jer 3:16-18)
 - *conditional element*: fulfillment of all promises were conditional on the faith and obedience of the Israelites. So: neither election (Ex 3:2) nor the Exodus (9:7), nor the land (2:10-16; 5:2) guaranteed immunity from God’s judgment.
 - *unconditional element*: God will always be faithful to effect his threats or his promises.
- ****Calling the covenant people of the Lord to covenant faithfulness, i.e. to live as the people of God (Isa :16-17; Jer 3:11-14; Mic 6:8)**
 - The mosaic covenant constitutes the majority of the prophetic activity. Prophets speak to a *covenant* people who are to follow *covenant* laws.

³ Jack Collins, “The Prophetic Indictment of Israel,” “Notes for Covenant Theology, p. 18

- *The reason for ‘calling’ so many prophets is that the covenant people of God failed to exhibit the *internal* reality, embracing the covenant from the heart, of which their *external* membership (rd: circumcision) should never be without.

Dumbrell, 138 (Collins quotes him in his notes...not sure what book it is from...only an excerpt from his article...no bibliography, it is not from *The Faith of Israel*, at least not on p. 138)
 “Prophecy was a covenant office in the sense that its rational lay in the need for the construction of such an office because of Israel’s potential infidelity.....A major source of OT difficulty during the prophetic period was the natural tendency for kingship to solve external difficulties by the construction of a web of foreign relationships. This invariably led to religious compromises.”

ESV Intro. to Prophetic Books:

- The prophets assert that God has spoken through them.
- The prophets affirm that God chose Israel for covenant relationship.
- The prophets most often report that the majority of Israel has sinned against their God and his standards for their relationship.
- The prophets warn that judgment will eradicate sin
- The prophets promise that renewal lies beyond the day of punishment that has occurred already in history and beyond the coming day that will bring history as we know it to a close.
- Prophets were concerned with present and future issues, but the present issues were overwhelmingly of greater concern.

B. What do the prophets foretell about the Messianic future?

The OT portrays itself as a story that is going somewhere.

- *Overarching story*: calling and preparation of a people of God to serve his mission. Israel to be a blessing to all nations (Gen 12:1-3; Ex 19:4-6)
- *Gen 22:17-18; 24:60; 49:10: The story is definitely going somewhere.
- *Prophetic “*eschatology*” nurtures the expectation that the story is going somewhere. Isa 2:1-5 “in the latter days”...that there will be a time in the future when the Heir of David will lead his people and the Gentiles into his light.

Isaiah wrote the richest promises of a future Savior and his kingdom. Micah promised that a leader born in Bethlehem would defeat God’s enemies.

Jeremiah promised a future new covenant with the house of Israel (Jer. 31:31-34; see Heb. 8:8-12)

Malachi predicted the coming of a new Elijah and the Messiah (Mal. 4:5-6)

How does knowing this help us to read specific NT texts?

NT texts that reflect on Jesus and his fulfillment of OT prophecy: Luke 24:25-27; 44-47 --

Romans 1:1-6; cf. 15:4 -- 1 Peter 1:10-12 -- 1 Cor 10:1-13

The NT presents the resurrection and ascension of Christ as ushering in the expected time of the “last days”. (Acts 2:17; Jas 5:3; 1 Pet 1:20; 2 Pet 3:3; Jude 18; Heb 1:2; 2 Tim 3:1)

And the Gentiles being grafted in and shown into this light is reflected throughout the book of Acts as the Gentiles accept the new movement on a large scale under God’s guidance: ‘redemptive history’ in action. *Examples*: Acts 1:8; compare with 13:47 (Isa 49:6), also consider different Jews from around the world, Samaria and Gentile proselyte, conversion of Saul, also of Cornelius. Mission to Antioch. Paul to Gentiles lands. Mission to Europe.

Help: I am looking for the handout on “The Messianic Idea in the OT”. Collins didn’t send it to me. I am guessing it is a handout. Couldn’t find it on the portal either. If someone has got it, I could integrate it into this answer in the next revision. Thanks!

Bibliography:

- Lecture by Jay Sklar: *Prophets* See lecture handout (3 pages)
- ESV Study Bible Notes: *Introduction to Prophetic Books* (before Isaiah)
- Jack Collins, “The Prophetic Indictment of Israel,” Notes for Covenant Theology, p. 18 (I am not in Collins’ section. Jay cited this in his lecture handout. I have it in an email if you need it)
- Jack Collins, “Jesus and the Fulfillment of Old Testament Promise”. Collins handout. Same goes for above, except he emailed this to me. If you don’t have it, I’ll email it to you)

Matthew Terrell - matthewbterrell@gmail.com

A. What is the primary role of the OT prophets?

A prophet's primary role was to be a spokesman for God, particularly to the covenant people. He was not a leader of worship, a teacher of the law, or a seeker of answers; those were roles specifically for the priests. Neither was he to embody the rule of the Lord on earth; that was the role of the king.

This role as God's spokesman to his people plays out in several different functions, four in particular. The first function was the giving of the law, which is seen through Moses in Exodus 19-24, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy. The second function was the giving of specific instructions, such as how to build the tabernacle (Exodus 25-31), or how to find something that was lost (1 Samuel 9), or which king should be anointed (1 Samuel 10:1, 16:12-13). The third function of the prophet as God's spokesman was his (or her) proclaiming of what would happen in the time to come. This can take on conditional traits (if Israel continues in 'Activity X', then 'Result Y' will occur: Isaiah 1:19-20) or unconditional traits (God saying, "I will do this for you...": 2 Samuel 7:11-16). In both of these ways, it should be noted for sure that the focus is not really on the prophets "predicting" the future as it is on them stating God's faithfulness to the promises and threats he makes through his prophets (*Far as the Curse*, 199). The fourth and *primary* function of the prophets was calling the covenant people of God to covenant faithfulness (Isaiah 1:16-17, Jeremiah 3:11-14, Micah 6:8). This fourth function, the calling of Israel into covenant faithfulness, takes place primarily in the context of the Mosaic covenant. In other words, the majority of prophetic activity takes place in the context of the prophets speaking to a *covenant* people who are obligated to follow *covenant* laws. Israel's obedience to these laws was imperative, because it was the primary means by which they reflected the image of God throughout the earth.

The majority of the answer to 9A was taken from Dr. Sklar's lecture entitled "Prophets".

B. What do the prophets foretell about the Messianic future? How does knowing this help us to read specific NT texts?

The prophets foretell of a new hope for Israel, a hope in a new covenant, which has several threads intertwining. There are six threads in all: (1) repentance and forgiveness [Isaiah 43:25, Isaiah 53:4-6, Ezekiel 36:25-26]; (2) return to the land of promise [Ezekiel 37:24-28, Isaiah 11:10-12]; (3) reinstallation of the Davidic king [Ezekiel 37:24, Jeremiah 30:8-9, 18]; (4)

rebuilding the Temple [Ezekiel 37:24-28]; (5) returning of the Lord's Spirit/glory [Ezekiel 36:25-26, Isaiah 44:3-4]; (6) renewal of covenant and creation [Isaiah 54:10, Ezekiel 37:24-28, Ezekiel 34:25-31, Jeremiah 31:31, Isaiah 65:17-19]. To the recipients of this prophecy it was unclear how these threads would be woven together. It becomes clearer in the NT that all of these threads pull together in Jesus the Messiah.

In short, knowing all of these threads is crucial to reading *many* NT texts. In Hebrews 9 and 10, for instance, we get a fuller sense of who Jesus is as the mediator of a new covenant by understanding that it is his blood/death that are the final fulfillment of the blood/death in the OT sacrificial system. His death is the definitive forgiveness spoken of in Jeremiah 31:33! Or, knowing the Messianic hope of Israel when reading in Luke 22, Matthew 26, and 1 Corinthians 11 gives us the full import of Jesus' words when he says that, "this cup is the new covenant in my blood." He is not dying a sacrificial death that has no history or anticipation or hope behind it, he is dying a death that has been anticipated and foretold and hoped for by generations of Israelites before him. Without the words of Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Isaiah, Amos and others it would be impossible to know the fullness of the good news that is being proclaimed in the crucified and risen Messiah! Knowing Jesus' heritage through the prophets' words gives us the full picture of who Jesus really is in the NT: he is the tie that binds all the threads of Israel's hope together.

The majority of the answer to 9B was taken from Dr. Perry's lecture entitled "Horror and Hope: The Rupture and Reconfiguration of Covenant Relationship".

10 A. What is at issue in the New Covenant of Jeremiah 31:31-36? What is new about the new covenant? What is not new?

B. How does the reference to the new covenant in Hebrews 8 relate to Jeremiah's prophecy? C. How does Christ's reference to the Passover cup as the "blood of the covenant" in Matt.26:28 relate to the new covenant?

D. When is the new covenant?

Rob Rayburn - robertgrayburn@googlemail.com

- The issue at stake in Jeremiah 31:31-36 is how one reads Jeremiah's prophecy, and in so doing, what one then believes about the continuity/discontinuity between Old Testament faith and spirituality and New (if one believes that the Old and New distinction is appropriate at all). Or, the distinction may be better viewed in terms of objective (specifics of administration) and subjective (heart response to covenant) as Collins argues (2). If Jer. is speaking of the objective than one may say that the "new covenant" refers to a redemptive historical development. We need to remember that Yhwh administers each covenant- there are all His- it is the same God, the same people, the same covenant (even though it may look differently (Collins 2). The subjective faith response remains the same (Collins 3).
- We may agree that Jeremiah is offering the people of Israel hope. The people are in exile (Dr. Perry refers to this as "the undoing of Israel's Exodus"- power-point 7 (pp)). Jeremiah 8 and Lamentations 3 help us wonder if there is anything good that will happen now...is it all over? The political framework of the Sinai covenant is ended. Here (already in the OT- the Mosaic law is done). Isa. 52, Ezek. 36-37, and Dan. 9 all predict a future reconciliation between Israel and Yhwh. Jeremiah's concern does not seem to lie in any redemptive-historical changes but rather with the state of Israel's heart- their response to Yhwh's covenant. However, there does seem to be a fulfillment of some kind, in the line of Deut. 30. The return from exile is also part of the fulfillment of this prophecy.

- Aspects of this hope include Repentance and Forgiveness, Return to the Land, Reinstallation of the Davidic King, Rebuilding of the Temple, Return of the Lord's Spirit, and a renewed covenant and creation (pp16). Jer. 31 is a promise of restoration and renewal, because of Yhwh's relationship with His people. This will be something that Yhwh does Himself, not that the people do. These promises do not seem to be yet fulfilled, at least in the way Jeremiah speaks about them.
- New Life, New Spirit, power and purity, resurrection, new creation- this are all things promised in the new covenant (Ez. 37, Jer. 31, Ez. 11, 36, Acts. 10, 11, 15, etc.) (pp 19). All of these seem to indicate an addressing of the heart, not redemptive history.
- What is new? The covenant deals definitively with peoples sins- they are taken away...Yhwh will visit and shepherd His people...established on the heart of flesh, not heart of stone (pp. 20). It is enduring and irrevocable. When Yhwh refers to the Mosaic covenant it is always- the covenant that they broke (Collins 11). The newness in Jer. And Ez. Seems more likely to refer to hearts and spirits, not administration (Collins 11). The time of real fulfillment is consummation- the end of it all.
- Dr. Perry argues, when Christ refers to the "blood of the covenant" in Mat. 26:28, that Christ is *inaugurating* the new covenant (as opposed to the old- the Mosaic covenant). However it seems easier to say that the blood is to the "new covenant" as the bread is to his body, instead of inserting something that may or may not be there.
- Regarding the role of the new covenant in Hebrews- Perry argues that the preacher is contrasting Jewish faith with that of Christian faith, admonishing his hearers not to revert to Judaism. Although it seems, as the preacher points out in chp. 8 that he finds all the fault with the people, not the Mosaic covenant. He seems to identify the old covenant with the people not Moses. This is the distinction- is the old covenant the faithless hearts of the people or the law of Moses.
- So, Perry argues that the new covenant began with Jesus and carries on to the end of the world. The other side would argue that the new covenant has been since the exile, when people respond to God in faith (hearts of flesh) instead of faithlessness (hearts of stone). Both agree that there is a now and not yet, but Perry has more now. The other side finds much of the language, esp, in Jer. 31 to be referring to a time that has not yet come (when we will no longer need to admonish one another to follow the Lord because we already will.

Phillip Bozarth - phil.boz@gmail.com

What is at issue in the New Covenant of Jeremiah 31:31-36?

At issue is whether the covenant of which Jeremiah speaks is "new" objectively or subjectively. Does the newness of the covenant show how Calvary contrasts to Sinai or does the newness see Calvary as inexorably putting into effect what Sinai always should have been? Objective newness means that the covenant is identifiably separate from a covenant that preceded it. It is its own particular event in redemptive history different from the event in which God cut the first covenant. Subjective newness is not constituted by a separate event in redemptive history. It means that the original covenant is, at long last, kept the way it was meant to be kept from the very beginning.

Dr. Perry believes that the covenant is new in the objective sense, while Dr. Collins believes it is new in the subjective sense. They disagree respectfully, so you can probably take either position and be fine. I provide both of their answers to these questions (as best as I can understand them), so that you can temper your answer as you see fit:

Dr. Perry

- Dr. Perry (Page references are from handout called Horror and Hope: The Rupture and Reconfiguration of Covenant Relationship)
- Background: The period of exile was devastating to the Jews because it was the reversal of the exodus. (p. 6) Jeremiah's pastoral intent is to impart hope to the Jews in exile. (Jer. 31:17) To do this, God inspires him to write the book of comfort/ consolation (Jer. 30-33, p. 9, 15) The future God promises to them includes a return to the land, rebuilding of the temple, restoration of Davidic leadership, and a renewed irrevocable covenantal framework marked by God's own presence and initiative to provide definitive forgiveness and enabling power for covenant faithfulness. (p. 15) The hope is a new event / development in redemptive history which will make Israel obedient to the covenant from the heart. Dr. Perry's argument can be defended from Heb. 9:18 since the "even" suggests that the New Covenant was started at Christ's suffering upon the cross just as the Sinai Covenant was started by the animal sacrifices God ordained.

What is new about the new covenant? (p. 10 also see p. 15 for what comes along with the New Covenant)

- The new covenant deals definitively with the sins of God's people, accomplishing complete forgiveness
- YHWH constitutes the New Covenant not by law-giving, but by giving his Spirit to the members of the New Covenant community
- YHWH himself will visit/shepherd his people
- The New Covenant is effective, enduring, and irrevocable.
- The new covenant represents new life, resurrection, and newness of heart, spirit, power, and purity, inaugurating a new creation and a more extensive "knowledge of YHWH." (Jer. 31:28, Ez. 37:5, Ez. 11:19-20, 36:25-29, Jer. 31:33-34, Acts 10, 11, 15, 2 Cor. 3:3)

What is not new? (p. 9)

- The relationship between God and his people is not new. He is still their God, and they are still his people. (Lev. 26:12, Jer. 31:1) He is still their father and they are still his firstborn son. (Ex. 4:22, Jer. 31:9, 20) For the spousal relationship see Jer. 31:32, but I do not know of a pre-Jeremiah passage which casts God as Israel's husband, though that is how his relationship with them functioned. Perhaps there is a pre-Jeremiah reference to idolatry as harlotry, and that might suggest the constitution of a spousal relationship between God and Israel prior to Jer. 31:32.

How does the reference to the new covenant in Hebrews 8 relate to Jeremiah's prophecy? (p. 13)

- The letter to the Hebrews argues from the lesser to the greater, the lighter to the heavier or, more specifically, from the partial to the perfected.
- The book focuses on how God's Word is perfected in Jesus. The perfection of God's word ushered in by the work of Christ is the center argument of the book.
- Although the fault of the first covenant was with the people (Heb. 8:8), the first covenant was partial in that the sacrifices had to be offered regularly rather than one sacrifice being sufficient for all time. (Heb. 9:6-10, 10:1)
- The author quotes Jer. 31 to show that, through Jesus, there is now definitive forgiveness. Jer. 31 is quoted again in Heb. 10:16-17, and v. 18 makes it clear that the emphasis is upon the perfection of Jesus' sacrifice. (also Heb. 9:15- Dr. Perry regards this text as the key to his argument)

How does Christ's reference to the Passover cup as the "blood of the covenant" in Matt. 26:28 relate to the promise of the new covenant? (p. 11)

- They are directly related in that Christ's passion (the cup representing the blood of the covenant) inaugurates the New Covenant. The covenant is instituted by Christ at the Passover feast in anticipation of his sacrificial death just hours later. (Besides the Eucharistic passages in Luke 22:20, Matt. 26:28, and I Cor. 11:25 Dr. Perry also cites Heb. 9:15-22, 10: 19-20)

The key word here is “inaugurate”—Christ inaugurated the New Covenant at the Passover feast before his death.

When is the new covenant?

- The New Covenant was inaugurated by Christ at the Passover feast prior to his death, and it extends to the consummation of the ages. (Heb. 10:14- note that it comes right before Jer. 31 is quoted again in vv. 16-17) The diagram on p. 14 of the handout is somewhat helpful for this question.

Dr. Collins

(page references come from the New Covenant and Redemptive History doc posted on portal except where noted)

What is new about the new covenant?

- The “newness” of the covenant derives from employing the word covenant in the subjective sense of the word instead of in the objective sense of the word (p. 11)
 - The biblical pattern is that covenants build upon one another rather than replace one another. Therefore, the burden of proof that Jer. 31 speaks of the covenant in the objective sense lies upon those who believe that the new covenant represents a new era in redemptive history. (p. 3 of the handout The Prophetic Indictment of Israel)
 - Terms for “covenant” in the Bible are sometimes employed in the subjective sense
 - A similar passage from Ez. Speaks of a heart and spirit which are “new” subjective sense (Ez. 11:19, 36:26)
 - Because this covenant is “not like” the covenant made with their fathers, it makes sense that the difference between them is a subjective difference rather than an objective difference. “Covenant” in v. 31 is a metonymy for a new situation in which the people embrace the covenant from the heart
 - Isaiah also sometimes speaks of the covenant in the subjective sense of the word
 - Is. 55:3
 - ii. Is. 54:10, 59:21, and 61:8 all connect with the new covenant class of prophecies in Jeremiah and Ezekiel speaking of return from exile and renewal of covenant authenticity (pp. 14-15)
 - Isaiah refers to the Messiah/ Servant as one who will be “a covenant for the people.” Of the two “Servant Songs” (Is. 42:1-9, 49:1-13), Isaiah describes the long process of the Servant of the Lord bringing the knowledge of God to the gentiles as if it were a single event and he gives no timeline for it. Therefore, Isaiah does not equate the new covenant with the messianic period. This suggests that Isaiah is also thinking of the new covenant as new in the subjective sense rather than in the objective sense, as we see in Jeremiah 31 and Ez. 11:20, 36:27, 37:23. (p. 14)

What is not new?

- There is no objective development in covenant administration. (p. 15) The new covenant does not mean we have numerically increased the count of covenants in redemptive history. It is a renewal of the covenant that is spoken of in Deut. 31:20. Deut. 30:6, 10, & 15-17 show that there was always a subjective sense to the Mosaic covenant in which the whole covenant was a matter of the heart. Therefore, when Jeremiah begins speaking of God putting his laws into the hearts of his people, this is not unprecedented. It is a renewal of the existing covenant. Therefore, the covenant itself is not new.

How does the reference to the new covenant in Hebrews 8 relate to Jeremiah’s prophecy?

- Recognize that Hebrews is not a treatise on salvation generally. It is a sermon crafted for a particular group of Jewish Christians facing a particular set of challenges. Those challenges were coming from other Jews who were persecuting them for their confidence that Jesus was the promised Messiah.
- Collins specifically says that the change of sacraments, dissolution of the church-state nexus instituted under the law of Moses, and its new openness to all ethnicities do not come up in the letter to the Hebrews. (p.18)
- The author's objective is to shepherd the Jewish Christians away from the notion that they may continue relating to God through the sacrifices and rites of the Law of Moses. Doing so would use those sacraments in a way God never intended for them to be used.
- When the author introduces Jer. 31, he specifies that the covenant was not at fault. The people were. (Heb. 8:8) They illustrate what is not true faith.
- The author uses Jer. 31 to define true faith for the persecuted Jewish Christians. Idolatry was Israel's perennial sin, and idolatry is a decision to worship God the way you want. If the Jewish Christians succumbed to the pressure of their persecutors in rejecting Jesus as the Christ and extending the use of the sacrifices and rites of the law of Moses beyond what God intended, they would be sinning in the same way their fathers had sinned through their unbelief and idolatry. True faith- the covenant written upon the heart- makes God's revelation the primary thing.
- Conclusion: The author of Hebrews does not present the covenant as a redemptive-historical development of itself (it is not intrinsically new). The subjective condition of the covenant- true faith- is the means by which the Jewish Christians are able to embrace the particular redemptive historical development of their time. The focus then, is on the subjective side of the word "covenant" in Hebrews 8, just as it is in Jer. 31.

How does Christ's reference to the Passover cup as the "blood of the covenant" in Matt. 26:28 relate to the promise of the new covenant?

- Note what the Eucharistic passages do not say. They do not say that the cup commemorates or inaugurates the new covenant. He declares that the cup is the new covenant.
- Note that this is exactly how Christ speaks of the bread being his body. How is the bread his body? Sacramentally. Ok. How is the cup the new covenant? Sacramentally also. The parallel constructions prove that we do not have to regard Christ's passion as the inauguration of the New Covenant any more than Christ's incarnation was the inauguration of bread.

When is the new covenant?

- When the Israelites broke the covenant, God exiled them to Babylon. The new covenant refers to a time after the exile in which Israel will be revived in faithfulness to the covenant which they broke. (Ez. 37:26, Jer. 32:40, p. 11 &12) It extends to the consummation.

11.A. Explain the difference between *anthropological (oro salutis)* and *redemptive-historical (historia salutis)* approaches to Pauline Epistles. How do they differ in the way they lead us to read Romans (or Ephesians, or Galatians)?

B. Does the redemptive-historical approach require us to abandon a traditional Reformational reading of Paul? Why or why not? If no, does it invite us to revise our reading in any way?

C. What characteristics of your context (currently and its background) relate, positively and negatively, to understanding and communicating this matter faithfully? (Based on Collins' lecture)

Ted Wong - tmwo78@aol.com

11. A. Explain the difference between *anthropological (oro salutis)* and *redemptive-historical (historia salutis)* approaches to Pauline Epistles.

- *Redemptive-historical (historia salutis)*: When redemptive historical theologians speak of terms such as “salvation” and “redemption,” they are generally thinking more of God’s Great Works of calling, preserving, shaping, and purifying a people for himself. (*historia salutis* - “history of salvation”)
- *Anthropological (oro salutis)*: Anthropological is the subjective appropriation of what contemporary evangelicals call “salvation” in the soul. (*oro salutis* - “order of [appropriated] salvation”).
- As we read Paul, if we define exegesis as *the effort to follow the thought expressed by an author*, then we note that redemptive-historical approaches do not replace conventional exegesis; they rather give an over-arching theological context by which we can responsibly make the move from the original intent of the Biblical text to application today.
- Collins pointed out that we should cooperate with Paul or Biblical authors. Collins wrote, “If I were to put into the simplest terms what it means to read the Bible well, I would say that we should read it in order to cooperate with the way it shapes our worldview with its overarching story, incorporates us into the people of God whose story it tells, and dignifies us with a role to play in that ongoing story.”

How do they differ in the way they lead us to read Romans (or Ephesians, or Galatians)?

- We should read Romans with the view cooperating with Paul in the redemptive historically.
- Paul saw himself as a specially appointed ambassador of King Jesus, calling the Gentiles to know him. (Question: Is he a model for you in this? 15:15-16.)
- We should consider what would happen if we read Romans as aiming to place its first century readers – a church containing Jewish and Gentile believers – in their redemptive historical context (which explains why the mission to Spain and the collection for Jerusalem believers matter so much). Survey the chapters in this light.
- This allows us to make sense of chs. 9-11 (they reflect on the Old Testament story and its expectation); it also allows us to see how its moral applications figure in (chs. 12-15). The one specific issue he takes up, the “weak” and the “strong,” revolves around the tensions created by the time the audience (a mixed body of Jewish and Gentile believers in Christ) occupies in the story. See 15:5-6 (and 15:26-27). [Some of you may be able to help how its relate to Ephesians 2:8, 9 and Galatians- Perry’s lecture.]

B. Does the redemptive-historical approach require us to abandon a traditional Reformational reading of Paul? Why or why not? If no, does it invite us to revise our reading in any way?

- No, the redemptive-historical approach does not require us to abandon a traditional reformational reading of Paul. Romans 1:1-6 Paul referred to redemptive-historical view. The traditional, anthropological is the application of the redemptive-historical reading of Pauline writings. Both of them tie together. Therefore, Dr. Collins pointed that we should read Paul as “a grace orientation coupled with approach of redemptive-historical perspective.

- Redemptive-historical perspective could be further defined as follow: “*Worldview oriented redemptive history* – an awareness of the people of God, what it means to be a member in that people and to partake of redemption, and how the stories of the Old Testament form the story of which we are heirs; thus we do not have to “do” anything to the Old Testament to make it Christian Scripture: it already is, because we are the community for whom these are our stories. (Collins, Williams; probably Chris Wright and N. T. Wright belong here. I cannot say for sure that Ridderbos or Gaffin belong in this category, though their influence has contributed to this approach; I might even claim that Ridderbos’ influence comes to its best expression here.)” (Collins’ Lecture 4/6/09)

C. What characteristics of your context (currently and its background) relate, positively and negatively, to understanding and communicating this matter faithfully? (Based on Collins’ lecture)

- The view of read every text pointing to Christ or read it twice redemptive are ways to read the Scripture which can be used to understand some aspects of the Old and New Testaments and the story line.
- Worldview oriented redemptive history described maintain the priority of authorial intent. In fact, its advocates would deny that opposition between grammatical-historical and redemptive-historical interpretation serves either the exegete or the Biblical theologian well. Rather, we are not finished with our grammatical historical exegesis until we ask where our particular text fits into the story, how it shapes the worldview of God’s people in relation to their mission, and what it says about membership in that people.
- Paying proper attention to authorial intent allows us to see that the matter of my personal standing with God is an important question in the whole Bible, but not the only question (nor is it always the *dominant* question).
- *Worldview oriented redemptive history* requires a higher coherence with authorial intent for *sensus plenior* (and I for my part suspect that often what we call *sensus plenior* (*Fuller sense*) is something that was actually there to begin with, and we just did not see it – at least that has been my experience).
- “Further, it allows us to see that the Old Testament picture of the Messiah as the king who represents and embodies his people, and who leads them in subduing the nations into his ever expanding empire, plays a far bigger role in the *New Testament* portrayal of Jesus than we have seen before, as does the category of membership in the people of God. In other words, if we apply approach the *Worldview oriented redemptive history* properly, we will fully embrace “Christocentricity,” because we will allow the Bible’s authors to expand our notion of who Christ is and what he does, not simply *for* us, and *in* us, but also *among* us and *through* us.” (Collins)

James Nichols - bbj712@mac.com

A. Explain the difference between anthropological (*ordo salutis*) and redemptive-historical (*historia salutis*) approaches to the Pauline epistles. How do they differ in the way they lead us to read Romans (or Ephesians, Galatians)?

Anthropological/*ordo salutis* approach is primarily concerned with the salvation of the individual soul. (What must I do to be saved?) Gospel is reduced to justification by faith.

The redemptive-historical/*historia salutis* approach is concerned with discerning how God has acted throughout history to redeem his people and all of creation. Salvation is more about God’s Great Works of calling, preserving, shaping, and purifying a people for himself. Recognizes that we are part of this story and reads the Bible (both OT and NT) with an awareness of the time in the story at which any given text was written

Romans – anthropological reading is common to us. Sees Paul as writing a treatise on justification by faith so that we can know that we are saved. Often relegates 9-11 to a sidebar discussion of Israel.

Redemptive-historical reading recognizes that it is a letter, which forces us to consider the audience for whom Paul is writing – mixed congregation of Jews and Gentiles who need to learn how to live with one another and join with Paul in further mission. They need to know where they are in the story.

- 1:1-6: defines the gospel as a story of redemptive events. Jesus is King.
- 1:11-15: Paul has zeal to come to Rome to share the story with them so that they will propel him to continue in its spreading
- 1:18-3:30 Recap of the story through the time of the Law
- 4:1-25: Place of Abraham in the story – father of all who believe
- 4:25: the resurrection of Jesus is his installation as our covenant representative (circle R)
- ch9-11: actually make sense why he talks about the salvation of the Jews
- 14:1-15:7: The one issue that he addresses is Jew/Gentile relationships
- 15:8-12: quotes from OT about Gentiles, Paul's purpose for writing in its redemptive-historical perspective

B. Does the redemptive-historical approach require us to abandon a traditional Reformational reading of Paul? Why or why not? If no, does it invite us to revise our reading in any way?

It can be both-and. “How can I be saved” is an essential question. The problem comes when it becomes the only question or the over-riding question. See Acts 15 as an example. The controversy is over both anthropological (What must I do to be saved?) and redemptive historical (how are God's people identified in the present era?).

- v7-9 is RH – Peter is telling them what God has done historically. The Gentiles are in because of faith.
- v10-11 is ANT – we will all be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus
- Amos text is quoted RH to show where we are in the story- the Gentiles are coming in.

We must revise our reading so that we don't immediately jump to the ordo salutis question. Try to follow the thought of the author and recognize that the RH approach gives us a means to responsibly move from original intent to application today.

C. What characteristics of your context (currently and its background) relate, positively and negatively to understanding and communicating this matter fully?

This answer is very personal. Answers may vary depending on area of the country raised in, etc. However, each person should be able to relate their own experiences and determine if they have a primarily ordo salutis attitude (what must I do), or a primarily historia salutis attitude (whole picture view). Personally, I believe that the society that we are in and the attitudes that have pervaded everything from work to education, has contributed to a sense of personal accomplishment and deserving. After this year, I am much more willing to step back and try to read the word in its original context so that I can see exactly what the original content and context meant.

12. A person in your church comes to you with this criticism of your teaching ministry: Why do you teach from the Old Testament? It seems to me that the NT replace the Old. There is nothing that I need for my faith in the Old Testament. After all it's a book of the Jews, no the church; a book of law, not grace. The Old Testament is an example of primitive religion; it's all about this wordly things. The NT is a spiritual revelation which speaks to my soul. How ought we to respond to this rejection of the OT? A substantive answer will need to address both the problematic assumptions which inform the question, and lay out a constructive, illustrative telling of how the NT writers use the OT as part of one larger story of God's work in His son and his people for the sake of the world.

Don Everts - deverts@bonpres.org

Note: If you are stuck for time, reading Michael Williams' handout on "The Problem of the Old Testament" (and whatever notes you took on that lecture) will allow you to answer the first part of this question decently. Reading the intro to *Knowing Jesus through the OT* (Chris Wright) and having ever handled *Far As the Curse is Found* will allow you to answer the second half of the question.

A. Dealing with Problematic Assumptions

"NT Replaces the Old"

- Jesus addressed this head on: see Matthew 5.17-19.
- "The NT doesn't seem to have a problem with the OT. The NT goes out of its way to affirm the OT." (Williams, The Problem) For example: Matthew 5.17, Romans 15.4, Romans 1.1-6, 2 Timothy 3.16.

"Nothing I need for my faith in the OT"

"Jews not church, law not grace"

- "A full 1/10 is actually the OT, either by way of quotation, citation or allusion. There are 295 explicit references, quotations of the OT in the NT. Only 8 OT books are not explicitly referred to in the NT. There are some 300 quotations of the OT in the NT, 1400 references and over 4000 allusions." (Williams, The Problem)
- "Jesus and his ministry are non-sensical and absurd without an understanding of the OT" (Williams in his lecture on The Problem....)

"Primitive religion not spiritual revelation"

- This perceived dichotomy (between the merely physical and the superior spiritual) is foreign to scripture. This thinking actually stems from the Gnostics – who had an a priori assumption about the world (this dichotomy) that colored their read on everything – including the Bible. Marcion (2nd Century) a Deacon from Alexandria was, in essence, a polytheist: there's the OT God and the NT God, they are different. (Williams, The Problem of the OT) This perceived dichotomy was only strengthened by the Alexandrian school of Clement and Origen. Philo, for example, taught that God could not come into contact with the physical world. His Platonism was all about the "Ascent of Man", whereas the OT is the story of the "Descent of God" – which Philo was then forced to "allegorize." (Williams, The Problem) And all this became the "dominant way of reading the OT for the church" (Williams, The Problem)
- In scripture we don't see this dichotomy. In the Decalogue (Exodus 20) we see 4 commandments that deal with how we relate with God right alongside 6 commandments that govern how we relate with humans. Jesus affirmed the summary of the Law and Prophets as "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your strength and with all your mind, and your neighbor as yourself." (Luke 10.27)

- “Theology and ethics are inseparable in the Bible.” You cannot explain how and why the Israelites or Christians lived as they did until you see how and why they believed what they did.” (Chris Wright, OT Ethics for the People of God, 17)

B. Constructive Telling of the Story

- Dismissing the OT and reading only the NT is tantamount to ripping the most important chapter out of the back of a compelling and important novel. You may be left with some great pages in your hand – with the high point of the story, but having lost the rest of the book the pages you hold in your hand won’t quite make complete sense. Without the whole story you will be left to trying to connect the dots, a dangerous exercise which usually ends in reading that one chapter not quite correctly.
- “For it saddens me that so many Christians in these days love Jesus, but know so little about what he thought he was and what he had come to do. Jesus becomes a kind of photo-montage composed of a random mixture of Gospel stories, topped up with whatever fashionable image of him is current...” (Chris Wright, Knowing Jesus through the OT pg ix)
- Consider the opening of Matthew, this long genealogy. Why does Mt start with this? “Because, says Matthew, you won’t understand that story – the one I am about to tell you – unless you see it in the light of a much longer story which goes back for many centuries but leads up to the Jesus you want to know about. And that longer story is the history of the Hebrew Bible, or what Christians came to call the OT.” (Knowing Jesus, 1)
- “...we will only understand Jesus properly if we see him in the light of the story which he completes and brings to its climax.” (Knowing Jesus, 2)
- Example: if we don’t pay attention to the OT, then words and phrases in the NT will lose their true, rich meaning. Without the OT (and a careful reading of it) NT phrases used to describe Jesus to us (Messiah, Son of God, Son of Man, one who “must suffer”, etc) get “flattened out” into one generic and thin understanding of Jesus as “Messiah”. (see notes from our Guest Lecturer on April 29th, the gentleman from The Netherlands)
- “Yet we confess that the Bible is the Word of God. This implies that we expect it to comprise a coherent message within a unified whole.” (Michael Williams, Far as the Curse is Found, x)
- “The creation-fall-redemption-consummation storyline is the central theme of Scripture, and it forms the Bible’s overarching literary structure. This storyline, in its given sequence, is fundamental to the drama Scripture relates. Each successive event in the story assumes the entire preceding sequence.” (Far As, xi)
- Another potential angle: Continuity of the Covenants (See Sklar’s handouts on Davidic Covenant, Perry’s Handouts on “Horror and Hope: The Rupture and Reconfiguration of Covenant Relationships, pgs 20-22 in particular; and Collins Handout “The Prophetic Indictment of Israel” page 2, and the “Covenant Layer Cake” we’ve seen drawn so many times.)

matt morginsky - mattmorginsky@gmail.com

I. Problematic assumptions. As a Christian who is under the authority of the Word.....

A. What Biblical reason do we have to suppose the NT replaces the OT?

B. When you say that there is nothing that you need for your faith....

1. Is God’s making of the world part of your faith?
2. Do you believe that Jesus is the Christ and Lamb of God? The “Christ”, “lamb of God”, “Son of God” are incomprehensible without the Old Testament. Ergo the work of Christ is also incomprehensible without it.

3. God says and does so many things in the Old Testament to show his people who he is, do you not need to know God?
 4. 2 Tim 3:16- “ALL SCRIPTURE is breathed out by God.....”
- C. Why do you think there is an antithesis between grace and law?
1. Look at psalm 19 the law is gracious
 2. Look at the covenant with Abraham in Gen 12:1-3 it is also gracious
- D. If what is written to Jews doesn't have relevance for us, then the NT is irrelevant because the majority of the first readers and hearers were Jewish.
- E. Your underlying assumption that this world is bad and the “spiritual” world is good is not a scriptural understanding.

II. Let's look at what the New Testament says about the Old Testament.

- A. Rom 15:4 – Paul sees the scriptures as a vital part of the life of God's people.
- B. Matt 5:17- Jesus views what he is doing in terms of the OT
- C. In the NT there are 300 OT quotes, 1400 references, 4000 allusions, the NT relies on the OT

III. Everything of importance in the NT is a continuation of the OT

- A. Jesus
 1. Sacrifice for sin – Lev 5, Heb 10:12
 2. Son of Man- Dan 8
- B. New Covenant - Jer 31:30, Luke 22:20
- C. Last things -Gen 2:9,10 Rev 22:1,2
- D. Church - Ex 19:6 1 Pet 2:9

13. Williams typified a biblical approach to eschatology as “restorational.”

A. Define the term as it was used in the final chapter of Far as the Curse is Found. How does a restorational understanding of the future differ from escapist and annihilationist visions of the future?

B. Early church fathers used the principle of the analogy of Scripture as the hermeneutic for their understanding of God's future restoration of creation. Cite and explain three of the arguments that Williams employed for restorational eschatology, and show how they relate to the larger biblical story.

Matt Bennett - m.d.bennett23@gmail.com

- A. Define the term as it was used in the final chapter of Far as the Curse is Found. How does a restorational understanding of the future differ from escapist and annihilationist visions of the future?
 - Escapist – redemption is man's ultimate separation from the earthly creation. Life in the body is temporary, and we get out when we die. We go to heaven, a place without physicality, a place without earthliness
 - Annihilationist – God destroys this world and makes a new one. We will live in a different universe, a different place completely where there will be a new creation in which we will live. This world and this creation will be gone for good
 - Restorational – God will renew, purify, and cleanse this world of sin. There is real continuity of people just like 1 Cor 15
- B. Early church fathers used the principle of the analogy of Scripture as the hermeneutic for their understanding of God's future restoration of creation. Cite and explain three of the arguments that Williams employed for restorational eschatology, and show how they relate to the larger biblical story.

- The story is historical and earthly
 - The Bible is based on historical events that form the backbone of the narrative of Scripture.
 - The exodus, the exile, the crucifixion are things that really happened.
 - All of these things happen within man's historical existence, they don't take place in separate universes or in a non physical reality
 - just as the rest of history happened on this earth, so will the last elements in it, namely the resurrection
- The covers of the book
 - The Genesis tree of life and river of life are restored in Revelation 20-22. Specifically, river of life is rev 20:1-2 and genesis 1:9,2:10 and tree of life rev 22:12,19 and genesis 1:11-12
 - If Jesus came to end sin and the problem of sin forever, then the effects of sin will be reversed, and the original state of creation restored. That's the way a book works – the original problem is fixed! The biblical story is a continuing story of god's redemption and faithfulness on this earth and it'll end with another historical event on this earth.
- The unnaturalness of death
 - death is not the goal that saves us. Death is unnatural. Death is not the way its supposed to be
 - a human being is body and soul, not just soul
 - the resurrection of Christ gives a picture of what the next life is going to be like. Our physical bodies will be raised, on this earth. That's the Gospel in 1 Cor 15:1-2
 - Jesus has conquered death and that is our hope! Death will be overcome and body and soul will be reunited.

Ryan Arkema - arkema@sbcglobal.net

Definition: “The people of God will not escape physicality, nor will God create an utterly different world or alternative world for them. Rather, God will renew, purify, and cleanse this world of sin.” (Far As The Curse Is Found, p273)

- Escapist View: “We may call the belief that upon the Lord’s return the world will be destroyed and the redeemed will spend eternity in heaven an escapist view of human destiny. It casts redemption as man’s ultimate separation from the earthly creation. Life in the body is temporary.” (ibid)
- Annihilationist View: “...upon the judgment of Christ the present universe will be destroyed, annihilated. A new universe, one completely other than this present one, will be created...”(ibid)

Arguments for Biblical Restoration:

- Covers of the Book: The Bible begins with a creation story, the Bible ends with a creation story. Notice the similarities between Revelation 20-22 and Genesis 1-2. In Revelation there are references to a river of life, a tree of life. “The heavenly city descends and the Lord again walking in the cool of the day with his covenant partner.” (274)

Larger Biblical Story: “The structure of the biblical drama has matching book covers, we might say. It moves from a creation story through a drama of sin and redemption to a consummation in a new and restored creation. This balanced structure argues for a restorational vision of the future. For the covers to match and the story to be complete, it must be a garden restored in this world and history.”(274-275)

- The Incarnation of Christ:
 - 1. John 1:14 “the Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory.” According to Williams every word of this “statement marries God to his creation.” The notion that Jesus became flesh is the scandal of Christianity. It flies in the face of the universalism and changelessness sought by Greek philosophy. There is import put onto the historical person of Jesus.
 - 2. God becoming man certifies the importance of the creation. The creation is important and good. There is a wedding between heaven and creation. “In the incarnation God declared his intentions not only for humanity but also for all creation. The creation is as much an object of the sovereign love and redemption of God as is the soul of man.”(282)
 - 3. If creation was not important and the only important part of the human was its soul than it would have taken a soul to save them, not a human in flesh and a part of creation. This is in direct response to Gnosticism and Macionism. These views held that Jesus only appeared to be human.
 - Larger Biblical Story: It is also important to note that Jesus was resurrected, his entire body was resurrected not merely his soul. “Neither the incarnation of Christ or the resurrection runs counter to the purpose of creation. Rather, God’s thoroughly this-worldly action in the historical and earthly events of the life of Jesus declares not only that he is sovereign over the material creation but also that the creation is the object of his covenantal love and redemptive intent.”(284)
- The Healing Ministry of Jesus
 - Matt. 4:23 “Jesus went throughout Galilee teaching in their synagogue, preaching the good news of the kingdom, and healing every disease and sickness among the people.” Jesus healing was often done without preaching. It was meant to be an example of what the kingdom is to look like. The way it is supposed to be. Not only did Jesus come in flesh but also he wanted to exhibit the restoration of the creation through his healing.
 - Larger Biblical Story Matt. 11:5 “The blind receive sight, the lame walk, those with leprosy are cured the deaf hear; the deaf are raised, and the good news is preached to the poor.” A quote from Williams follows: “each clause proclaims the nature of the kingdom. The kingdom of God is about salvation, the return of health, removing the corruption of sin, and restoring man in the entirety of his existence, including his bodily existence.” (284)

Darrell Jung - darrelljung@mchsi.com

Restorational View of Eschatology:

The people of God will not escape physicality, nor will God create an utterly different world or alternative world for them. Rather, God will renew, purify, and cleanse this world of sin. As there is real continuity between a believer before Christ and a believer after Christ, so there is a similar continuity between the present world and the world to come.

Escapist View:

We may call the belief that upon the Lord's return the world will be destroyed and the redeemed will spend eternity in heaven an escapist view of human destiny. It casts redemption as man's ultimate separation from the earthly creation. Life in the body is temporary. God's redemption will free us from bodiliness, earthliness, and physicality.

Annihilationist View:

Another popular conception is that upon the judgment of Christ the present universe will be destroyed--annihilated. A new universe, one completely other than this present one, will be created. In support, this view cites Scripture that speaks of a new earth.

Early church Fathers (e.g., Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hippolytus) used the principle of the Analogy of Scripture (i.e., interpret according to the story) as the hermeneutic for their understanding of God's future restoration of creation. Cite and explain three of the arguments that Williams employed for restorational eschatology, and show how they relate to the larger biblical story.

Williams presents numerous arguments based on his premise that a restorational eschatology derives its basis from the larger biblical story. The following are but three. Others may be found on pp.276-285.

The overarching story is historical and earthly:

The fact that the biblical drama of redemption treats man's historical existence within creation with utmost seriousness testifies to a restorational view of human destiny. The Bible is essentially narrative in form. The Bible keys on historical events. The gospel story is tied to historical, particular events. The Bible begins with a creation story. Interestingly, the Bible also ends with a creation story. John uses the imagery of the Garden story of Genesis to describe the eschatological consummation. One cannot read Revelation 20-22 without noticing its similarities to Genesis 1-2. Its river of life (Gen. 1:9, 2:10) reappears (Rev. 22:1-2), and the Tree of Life (Gen 1:11-12) is restored (Rev. 22:14,19). The heavenly city descends, and the Lord again walks in the cool of the day with his covenant partner.

One could say that the structure of the biblical drama has matching book covers. It moves from a creation story through a drama of sin and redemption to a consummation in a new and restored creation. This balanced structure argues for a restorational vision of the future. For the covers to match and the story to be complete, it must be a garden restored in this world and history.

Humankind as God's Representative within creation:

God placed man in the Garden and commanded him to rule over and cultivate it. In doing this, God decreed that the earth is man's proper habitation and inheritance. Creation was subjected to corruption by the fall of Adam. The curse comes because of the man. The problem of sin is not a problem of temporality or physicality--no culpability can be put on the doorstep of the nonhuman creation--but one of the fallen human heart.

Enter the second Adam, the one who sets things straight. Just as the fall of the first Adam was the ruin of the whole earthly creation, so the atoning death of the second Adam brings the blessings of redemption to the entirety of creation. As man goes, so goes the world. Man is not saved in abstraction from creation, but in the midst of a creation that looks forward to redemption. Indeed, our renewal is tied to the eschatological renewal of the creation. We cannot separate our present spiritual regeneration from cosmic regeneration because our present restoration to life is the first stage of the eschatological restoration of all creation to its proper vitality and relationship to God. We are the firstfruits. James 1:18 proclaims: "He chose to give us birth through the word of truth, that we might be a kind of firstfruits of all he created." Thus the resurrection of Christ from the dead is the firstfruits of a future harvest in which all reality will benefit from his saving work. The goal of redemption is nothing less than the restoration of the entire cosmos. The scope of redemption is truly cosmic. Through Christ, God determined "to reconcile to himself all things" (Col. 1:20). Matthew 19:28 speaks of the renewal/regeneration of all things. Acts 3:21 also indicates a cosmic regeneration when it says the Jesus must remain in heaven "until the time comes for God to restore everything." Scripture tells us the creation groans, awaiting in eager expectation the renewal of the sons of God. Creation will "be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the glorious freedom of the children of God" (Rom 8:21). All of this confirms a restorational understanding of the eschaton.

Grace restores nature:

The goal of God's redemptive action in Jesus Christ is the destruction of the kingdom of Satan, sin and death, and the removal of the effects of sin upon man and creation. The reason the Son of God appeared was to destroy the devil's work (John 3:8). God's gracious redemption in Christ is a cure for the disease of sin, a cure that brings the patient to restoration and new health. The purpose of grace is the removal of the cancer of sin, first from the heart of man, its root, but also, and finally, from the entirety of the created order. Rather than being anti-creational, grace is pro-creational.

This thesis that grace restores nature derives support from the biblical vocabulary for redemption. Wolters states, "Virtually all of the basic words describing salvation in the Bible imply a return to an originally good state or situation." To redeem is to buy back, in effect to liberate or return to a lost freedom. To renew is to make new again. Reconciliation is a restoration of a broken relationship and a return to a mended one. Regeneration is a return to life after being dead. Even the word "salvation" carries the idea of a return to health after a time of sickness. Wolters concludes that redemption is a re-creation in the sense that God salvages and restores his original creation and reinstates human beings as his image bearers on the earth.