

**A RE-EXAMINATION OF THE CULTURAL MANDATE:
AN ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF
THE DOMINION MATERIALS**

by
Ronald E. Manahan

Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Theology in
Grace Theological Seminary
May 1982

Title: A RE-EXAMINATION OF THE CULTURAL MANDATE: AN
ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF THE DOMINION MATERIALS

Author: Ronald E. Manahan

Degree: Doctor of Theology

Date: May, 1982

Advisers: James Eisenbraun, D. Wayne Knife, and David Turner

Frequently correlation is made between the cultural mandate, that activity of doing and making given to man at his creation whereby he is to glorify his Creator, and the dominion materials (Gen 1:26-28; 9:1, 7; Ps 8:6-10; Heb 2:5-9; Jas 3:7). Understanding the nature of this correlation and its subsequent implications is best aided by working with a carefully defined field of terms, by isolating what alternative views of the correlation have been expressed throughout the church's history, and by engaging in a thorough examination of the background and interpretive field of the dominion passages.

The conclusion resulting from the isolation of the several views on dominion material is that each view gives indication of having been influenced by the cultural milieu of the interpreter and by perceptions of culture in general. The interpreter continually interacts between his constantly changing, dynamic cultural milieu and the Biblical text.

The context within which this study is conducted includes the realization that man is contextualized and is an integral part of the creation in which he was placed by his Creator. Man stands in a dependent relationship with God, who has placed him within an order. From this placement man sees that he is suspended in a threefold, concurrent relationship: (1) to God, (2) to others, and (3) to the world. The terms "cultus" and "culture" indicate the full range of human activities where man acts out this threefold relationship. "Culture" refers to both the activity and the context of human shapers and formers. So defined, culture must be done.

Through analysis of the Old Testament dominion material in the light of royal ideology, apocalyptic ideas, and societal hierarchical structuring this study concludes that the dominionizing activity (formative activity) has been given and not rescinded. But this activity may be done in loyalty or disloyalty toward man's sovereign Creator. When done in loyalty, שלם exists. However, when done in disloyalty, the formative activity struggles with the cosmos. This struggle produces a feeling of frailty within man.

The New Testament dominion material by individualizing the use to which it puts Psalm 8 points to Jesus Christ as the resolution to the clashing tenets of man's frailty and incomparable position.

Major conclusions reached are that the dominion given man refers to shaping activity. Shaping activity done with respect to concrete things is not optional. Man is given a mandate. But only in Jesus Christ, who was fully loyal, is there any hope of beneficent shaping activity, an activity which will glorify the Creator.

Accepted by the Faculty of Grace Theological Seminary
in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree
Doctor of Theology

Adviser: James E. Eisenbraun
Adviser: D. Wayne Knife
Adviser: David L. Turner

Copyright © 1982 by Ronald E. Manahan

Digitally prepared and posted on the web by Ted Hildebrandt (2004)
with permission.

Please report any errors to: thildebrandt@gordon.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	vi
PREFACE	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
Reasons for This Study	2
Glossary	5
Culture	6
Cultural Mandate	7
Dominion Materials	9
Re-examination	10
Form of the Study	11
I. HISTORICAL SURVEY OF THE INTERPRETATION OF DOMINION MATERIALS	13
Ancient Interpretations	14
Rule Over Creation as a Present Possession	15
Selected sources	15
Commentary	20
God's Rule--Man's Rule	26
Selected sources	27
Commentary	28
Promise-Fulfillment Debate	30
Selected sources	30
Commentary	33
Rule as Lost or Diminished	36
Selected sources	36
Commentary	39
Rule in an Eschatological Figure	43
Selected sources	43
Commentary	45
Rule as Cultural Expression	47
Selected sources	47
Commentary	49
Summary	51
Medieval Interpretations	52
Augustine	53
Context of interpretation	53
Interpretation of dominion materials	58
Aquinas	61
Context of interpretation	63
Interpretation of dominion materials	65

Summary	68
Modern Interpretations	68
Martin Luther	69
Context of interpretation	69
Interpretation of dominion materials	71
John Calvin	75
Context of interpretation	75
Interpretation of dominion materials	78
The Anabaptists	81
Context of interpretation	81
Interpretation of dominion materials	84
Summary	85
Recent Interpretations	86
Karl Barth	86
Dietrich Bonhoeffer	88
Emil Brunner	90
Paul Tillich	92
Summary	94
Concluding Assessment	94
II. A PHILOSOPHIC PERSPECTIVE	97
Man's Life in an Order	98
Man as Contextualized	98
Man is dependent	99
Within a whole	99
Within an "ordered" whole	101
Within a law-structured whole	102
Man is in a continuum	108
A contemporary appraisal	108
A rebuttal	109
A suggestion	111
Man as Relational	116
In relation to God	117
In relation to others	122
In relation to the world	127
Cultus and Culture	132
Cultus	133
Culture	134
A Proposal	140
III. EXAMINATION OF OLD TESTAMENT DOMINION MATERIALS	
The Extent of Dominion Materials	142
Hermeneutical Realities	143
Royal Ideology	143
Egyptian royal ideology	145
Mesopotamian royal ideology	154
Israelite royal ideology	166
Historiographic literature	168
Hymnic literature	172

	v
Prophetic literature	176
Summary	179
Apocalyptic Imagery	180
Societal Hierarchical Structuring	188
Summary Evaluation	194
Explicit Dominion Materials	196
Genesis 1:26-28	197
Textual variants	198
Literary context	200
Examination of dominion material	207
The expression בצלמנו כדמנתנו	207
כבש and רדה	220
Interpretive field	229
Genesis 9:1, 7	231
Textual variants	231
Literary context	233
Examination of dominion material and interpretive field	236
Psalm 8:6-10	238
Textual variants	238
Literary context	240
Examination of dominion material	242
Interpretive field	245
Summary	247
Implicit Dominion Materials	247
IV. EXAMINATION OF NEW TESTAMENT DOMINION MATERIAL .	251
Explicit Dominion Material	251
Hebrews 2:5-9	252
Textual variants	252
Literary context	258
Examination of dominion material	266
Interpretive field	270
James 3:7	275
Summary	279
Implicit Dominion Materials	280
A Suggestion	280
An Example	283
V. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS	289
The Christian and Culture	293
The Christian and Education	298
The Christian and Theology	303
BIBLIOGRAPHY	308

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AB	The Anchor Bible
ABL	Harper, <i>Assyrian and Babylonian Letters</i>
AGNT	Aland et al., eds., <i>The Greek New Testament</i>
ANEP	Pritchard, ed., <i>The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament</i>
ANET	Pritchard, ed., <i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i>
ANF	The Ante-Nicene Fathers
AnOr	Analecta Orientalia
BAGD	Bauer, Arndt, and Gingrich, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , 2nd edition
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BHK	Kittel, eds., <i>Biblica Hebraica</i>
BHS	Elliger and Rudolph, eds., <i>Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BSac	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
BJRL	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>
BR	<i>Biblical Research</i>
BSP	Walton, eds., <i>Biblia Sacra Polyglotta</i>
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZAW	<i>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
CAD	Gelb et al., eds., <i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CKRS	Raines, <i>The Cosmic Kingdom in the Rise of the Christian Interpretation of the State: A Study of the Interaction of Religious and Political Mythology from Hebraic Prophetism through John Calvin</i>
CTM	<i>Concordia Theological Monthly</i>
EvQ	<i>The Evangelical Quarterly</i>
ExpTim	<i>The Expository Times</i>
GCES	Nelson, <i>The Groaning of Creation: An Exegetical Study of Romans 8:18-27</i>
GRHI	Eareckson, <i>The Glory to be Revealed Hereafter: The Interpretation of Romans 8:18-25 and its Place in Pauline Theology</i>
HPS	von Gall, <i>Der hebraische Pentateuch der Samaritaner</i>
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>

ICC	The International Critical Commentary
<i>INST</i>	Baillie, McNeill, and Van Dusen, <i>The Library of Christian Classics</i> , vols. 20 and 21: Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>IOTT</i>	Jobling, "And Have Dominion . . ." The Interpretation of Old Testament Texts Concerning Man's Rule Over the Creation (Genesis 1:26, 28, 9:1-2, Psalm 8:7-9) from 200 B.C. to the Time of the Council of Nicea
<i>ITQ</i>	<i>The Irish Theological Quarterly</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JCS</i>	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JNSL</i>	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>The Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>KMCO</i>	Lowe, <i>The King As Mediator of the Cosmic Order</i>
<i>LW</i>	Pelikan and Lehmann, <i>Luther's Works</i>
<i>LXX</i>	Rahlfs, ed., <i>Septuaginta</i>
<i>MQR</i>	<i>The Mennonite Quarterly Review</i>
<i>Neot</i>	<i>Neotestamentica</i>
<i>NGTT</i>	<i>Nederduitse Gereformeerde Teologiese Tydskrif</i>
<i>NICNT</i>	The New International Commentary on the New Testament
<i>NIV</i>	<i>New International Version</i>
<i>NPNF</i>	The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 2nd series
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>PA</i>	Winston, <i>Philo of Alexandria</i>
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestinian Exploration Quarterly</i>
<i>Poet</i>	<i>Poetica</i>
<i>Sal</i>	<i>Salesianum</i>
<i>SEA</i>	<i>Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok</i>
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
<i>SSU</i>	Rainey, <i>The Social Stratification of Ugarit</i>
<i>STH</i>	Aquinas, <i>Summa Theologica</i>
<i>Th</i>	<i>Theology</i>
<i>TNTC</i>	The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>UF</i>	<i>Ugarit-Forschungen</i>
<i>UOTH</i>	Reid, <i>The Use of the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews</i>
<i>USQR</i>	<i>Union Seminary Quarterly Review</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>VTSup</i>	Supplements to <i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>ZA</i>	<i>Zeitschrift fur Assyriologie, Neue Folge</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift fur die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift fur die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

PREFACE

The work of this dissertation could not have been carried forward without the help of several individuals. In particular these are the members of the dissertation committee, Professors Eisenbraun (chairman), Knife, and Turner and Mr. Ibach and Mr. Votaw, librarians at Grace Theological Seminary. All of these have contributed in significant ways to my thought and research work in preparation for the writing of this dissertation.

Especially to be thanked, however, are the members of this writer's family, my wife, Barbara, and children, Kelly and Nathan. Each of these has contributed to a home in which such work as is reflected in this dissertation is thought to be a worthwhile and noble human enterprise. For this reason they, each in their own way, gave their encouraging support. To them I am most thankful. They with me believe that such work as this is part of our stewardship owed to the Lord who has redeemed the members of this home and because of whose grace such work is made possible and thought worthwhile. Ultimately our family's thanks belongs to Him who is the true dominionizer, the King of Kings.

INTRODUCTION

Through an examination of the dominion passages of Scripture this dissertation seeks to re-think the concept of the cultural mandate. This general aim is attended by three purposes. The first is to determine what might be an appropriate correlation between the dominion passages (materials) and the cultural mandate. This purpose brings with it several problems. Definition of terms and concepts is obviously one of the initial difficulties. What is "dominion"? What is "culture"? Another problem is that of "appropriate correlation." The available options for interpretation must be known before the appropriate one is selected. To know this requires some familiarity with past interpretations and, when those interpretations differ, to account for the variations.

Purposes two and three are by-products of the first. The second purpose is to address indirectly the whole Christ-culture complex.¹ Varied reasons have caused people to

¹ In recent years there has been increased interest in this complex subject. Generally what is meant by the Christ-culture complex is that set of interpretive problems encountered when one attempts a correlation between the implications found in Christ and his teachings for the totality of the cosmos. The results of encountering this complex are a description of Christian man's legitimate activity within the cosmic kingdom of Christ. As a recent example of attempting to define this complex see Robert E. Webber, *The Secular Saint* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1979), pp. 14-19.

venture into this difficult area of inquiry.¹ A host of books have treated the problem of exactly what the Christian's place in culture is (Christian in the broadest sense of the term).² The third purpose is that through these findings something of a prolegomenon to a theology of culture can be suggested. This suggestion certainly could not hope to be exhaustive. But it ought to be informative and programmatic.

Reasons for This Study

Several reasons have led to the formulation of this

¹ What has motivated, this increased interest is not always the same. For Richard Kroner, *Culture and Faith* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951), p. viii, the catastrophe in 1933 in Germany forced him "to reconsider the relation between thought and faith, between reason and revelation, between culture and religion." For others it may have been "The Chicago Declaration"; cf. Ronald J. Sider, ed., *The Chicago Declaration* (Carol Stream, IL: Creation House, 1974). However, by the evidence not many were moved to action by "The Chicago Declaration."

² While certainly not exhaustive the following works indicate something of the more recent breadth of interest: L. Wm. Countryman, *The Rich Christian in the Church of the Early Empire: Contradictions and Accommodations* (New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1980); Thomas M. McFadden, ed., *Theology Confronts A Changing World*, The Annual Publication of the College Theology Society (West Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications, 1977); William M. Newman, *The Social Meanings of Religion* (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1974); William J. Richardson, *Social Action vs. Evangelism: An Essay on the Contemporary Crisis* (South Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1977); Ronald J. Sider, *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger* (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 1977); Donald Eugene Smith, *Religion, Politics, and Social Change in the Third World* (New York: The Free Press, 1971); and Peter DeVos et al., *Earth-Keeping: Christian Stewardship of Natural Resources*, ed. Loren Wilkinson (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980).

research. Among these is, first, the correlation that is often made between culture and the dominion materials. An example of this type of correlation is that of Lynn White, who argued that abuse of nature in our technological world finds its origin in the dominion materials.¹ Another is that suggested by Woolsey in his somewhat humorous assessment:

Such a course [i.e., use of political action to achieve social ends] would be consistent with a "cultural mandate" view held by some evangelicals. The cultural mandate people assert that the Christian today is obligated to two "commissions." The first of these is the Great Commission . . . The second commission, as they see it, is what they call the "cultural mandate," which they find in Genesis 1:28. It involves "subduing" and "having dominion." Expressed in terms of today's world, it means the Christianization of society. We fundamentalists have rejected this idea. Because of our dispensational approach to Biblical interpretation, we understand that society in the "last days" will be unreformable.²

These brief examples show that interpreters persist in

¹ Lynn White, Jr., "The Historical Roots of our Ecological Crisis," *Science* 155 (10 March 1967): 1205 says: "Finally, God had created Adam and, as an afterthought, Eve to keep man from being lonely. Man named all the animals, thus establishing his dominance over them. God planned all of this explicitly for man's benefit and rule: no item in the physical creation had any purpose save to serve man's purposes. . . . Christianity . . . insisted that it is God's will that man exploit nature for his proper ends." One should also compare the interesting article by Margaret Rowe, "Genesis and the Natural Order," *Cross and Crown* 23 (1971): 272-82 in which she argues: "God, says Genesis, gave man dominion over all living things; and Western man has found therein a justification for wholesale spoliation of earth's natural resources. It is our reading of Genesis that should be challenged here, and a more helpful interpretation could lead us to solving the present environmental crisis" (277).

² G. Arthur Woolsey, "Perspective," *Baptist Bulletin* 46 (February 1981): 15. The words within brackets are supplied by this writer from the context.

correlating the cultural mandate with the dominion materials.¹ The question clearly is: Do the dominion materials teach a cultural mandate, or any general cultural perspective? This investigation seeks an answer.

Moreover, another reason for this study is an apparent lack of a theology of culture upon which a broad spectrum of Christians can agree. This lack has been heightened by the concurrent existence of a supposedly catholic church and a multiplicity of cultural models. How does the one church mesh with this divergency of cultural models? The models are divergent because a given "culture which man builds is experienced not as a system but as an actual reality which dominates his life and in which he participates by his conduct and attitude through active contribution and creativity."² That is, there is reciprocation between the catholic church and a given culture. So Leon Morris agrees; church and culture reciprocate so that, while Christianity, it could be argued, stands above culture, this in no way means it stands outside of culture.³ But still there is the question: What program should a theology of culture follow? This

¹ For an example of a more positive correlation of the cultural mandate and the dominion material see Webber, *Saint*, pp. 35-41.

² This is the assessment of Kroner, *Culture and Faith*, p. 71.

³ Leon Morris, "The Religion That Stands Above Culture," *Christianity Today*, 6 June 1980: 55-56. Probably, one is more correct in saying that Christianity is trans-cultural, rather than that it stands above culture.

dissertation seeks a solution, resulting from the inter-facing of the cultural mandate and the dominion materials.

A further reason for encouraging this inquiry is this writer's personal interest, generated originally when an undergraduate student. This undergraduate influence shifted from an Anabaptistic approach to culture in the earlier years to a thoroughgoing Calvinistic approach in the later years. These two approaches were also entertained during graduate study; sometimes they raised more questions than they provided solutions. Therefore, there is in this present work a personal goal to be achieved, a goal to discover to what degree the dominion materials do or do not teach about the relative validity of these approaches.¹

Glossary

What the evaluation of the purposes of and reasons for this study indicates is the need to define with some exactness particularly important terms, namely those made important by the title of this study. These are "culture," "cultural mandate," "dominion materials," and "re-examination." Here the goal is merely to supply a glossary of terms to aid in fixing the direction of this study. In the later stages of this study the complexity of these terms will become clearer.

¹ The suggestion is not being made that this study proceeds in objectivity. To the contrary, no interpreter can lay claim to this supposed utopia of research.

Culture

As Laura Thompson remarks, "the concept of culture is not a simple one."¹ The term "culture" stems from the Latin term *colere*, meaning "to cultivate, till, tend," thus the feminine *cultura* meaning "tilling, culture, cultivation."² From this the term "culture" has come to refer generally to what is civilized or refined, perhaps even educated. This meaning is implied in the German *kultur*.

However, the exact content to which culture refers is another matter. Culture has been interpreted to mean anything from an aggregate of discrete items associated by historical chance to a mechanical system whose worn parts need either revitalization or replacement.³ Exactly what is culture? Thompson defines it as "a human group's self-selected and self-tailored problem-solving tool."⁴ Her definition highlights two important elements, "self-selected" and "problem-solving." The first emphasizes that the members of the given culture actively participate in what is included in that culture. The second suggests that the incorporation of items into a culture is founded on problems needing and capable of solution. Of course, some cultures are broader

¹ Laura Thompson, *The Secret of Culture*, consulting ed. Anthony F. C. Wallace (New York: Random House, 1969), p. 4.

² D. P. Simpson, *Cassell's New Latin Dictionary* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1968), pp. 116 and 160.

³ Thompson, *The Secret of Culture*, pp. 4-5.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 219.

than others. That is, some are more elaborate.

What governs the elaboration of a culture? Honigmann concludes that "the size of a culture's inventory depends on the number of windows on the world that a social system has open."¹ In other words the broader the contacts with the world and with the past, the more elaboration there will be. Briefly put, culture is a human group's elaboration, corresponding to the number of its contacts, of its problem-solving schema. This definition is overly simplified. For instance, it does not address the important matter of a group's perception of or perspective on its needs, its problems. But this general definition allows one a starting point for beginning to elaborate on the cultural mandate as analyzed through the study of the dominion materials.²

Cultural Mandate

To speak of a cultural *mandate* is to elicit several implications from the above definition of culture. The negative implications are these. The definition offered for culture does not imply that culture is *necessarily* the antithesis of Christianity. Indeed it is not. Nor does the definition, on the other hand, imply that culture is

¹ John J. Honigmann, *Understanding Culture* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), p. 309.

² For a further elaboration on defining culture, cf. Fred W. Voget, "History of Cultural Anthropology," in *Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology*, ed. John J. Honigmann (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1973), pp. 2-3.

therefore neutral. This could not be because man as moral agent is the one doing the selecting and eliminating. His selecting and eliminating is conditioned by his moral being. Therefore cultural *activity* is a moral, not an amoral, matter. And because it is, it cannot necessarily be the antithesis of Christianity. A second negative implication of the definition offered for culture is that culture is not the *achievement* of this or that culture. Culture has a dynamic because it is founded on doing, making, acting. And this activity goes on in both more primitive and more civilized groups of people.

Now from these negative remarks several positive ones are implied. Cultural activity may be done morally or immorally. Upon initial analysis what is moral or immoral would appear to be conditioned by a given group's definition of morality. But a closer analysis is needful. The definition of morality given by a group is never without context. This context is at least twofold. Members of the group live in a law-structured order, a divine order. Further, they bear some relationship to this order and to this order's Creator. One may speak of this relationship as religious because it is conditioned by man's relationship to his Creator. In summary, the group which defines morality is in fact comprised of individuals who sustain a religious relationship to their Creator. Out of this religious depth the definition of morality comes. Each member of the group makes his contribution, but the contribution is not amoral. It springs from

his religious relationship. Therefore, the cultural activity is done either in positive or negative relationship toward God; it is either for or against Him.

The second positive implication about this definition of culture is that culture is activity. One does culture in the context of the relationships he sustains. This context will be more fully developed in chapter two of this work. In general this relationship is threefold, relationship to the Creator, others, and the cosmos.

At this point the meaning of a cultural mandate is more obvious. Such a mandate would be from man's Creator. He would mandate cultural activity from the beginning. Therefore, the cultural mandate as used in this work is defined as that cultural activity given to man at his creation whereby he is to glorify his Creator.¹ The second chapter of this work will cover these matters in considerably more detail.

Dominion Materials

Though chapters three and four of this work will define in detail what are the dominion materials, a brief definition here at the beginning will prove helpful. A distinction should be made between dominion materials and dominion

¹ For further discussion of the definition of the cultural mandate, cf. Webber, *Saint*, pp. 35-71; Henry R. Van Til, *The Calvinistic Concept of Culture* (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1971), pp. 15-36; and the somewhat popularized treatment of W. Harold Mare, "The Cultural Mandate and the New Testament Gospel Imperative," *JETS* 16 (Summer 1973): 139-47.

allusions or images. This study understands the word "materials" to refer to those passages where a dominion or rulership is actually stated. Passages of this sort are very few. There are what might be called explicit dominion passages. These passages are Genesis 1:26-28; 9:1, 7 (included because of the Septuagint tradition); Psalm 8:6-10; Hebrews 2:5-9; and James 3:7. In these passages there is direct reference to man's rule over the creation or at least reference to the imagery of Genesis 1:26-28. Most of the effort of this study will be spent on these few materials. To be sure, there may be distant allusions to general rulership ideology in other passages, but the relationship of these passages to the fountainhead of Genesis 1:26-28 is so uncertain as to render them inappropriate for inclusion in this work.¹

Re-examination

By this term is meant that the relationship between the dominion materials and the cultural mandate will be

¹ Some individuals find an abundance of dominion materials, though not for good reason; cf. the general thought of J. Jervell, *Imago Dei* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), pp. 218ff. Among verses that some think allude (though there is great uncertainty) to dominion as it is found in Gen 1:26-28 are: Lev 26:6; Ps 91:13; Isa 11:6-9 (a more important one of this group); Dan 7:13; Matt 7:29; 9:6-8; 10:1; 21:23-27; 28:18; Luke 10:10; John 17:2; Rom 1:23; 5:17; 8:37-39; 1 Cor 3:21-23; 6:2; 15:24-28 (another important one in this group); 2 Cor 10:5; Eph 1:22-23; Phil 2:6-11; 3:21; Col 1:20; 2 Tim 2:12; 1 Pet 3:22; and Rev 2:26-27. However, the judgment of this writer, after considering these, is that the evidence is uncertain enough to warrant not including them in this work.

examined. In order to re-examine this relationship several other factors will require scrutiny. The whole relationship between interpretation and the given cultural context within which the interpreter stands must be watched. One must be sensitive to the reciprocation between culture and interpretation. Such re-examination will require analysis of not only the explicit dominion materials. Those other passages, upon which the examination of the explicit dominion materials may cast light, must be surveyed (such as Rom 8:18-25).

Form of the Study

In order to carry forward this project the work develops along the following lines. Chapter one gives a brief survey of the history of the interpretation of dominion materials. Throughout this survey special attention is given to that complex of influences which were a part of the interpreter's world (especially in the ancient historical period) and to the interpreter's general view of culture (especially in the medieval, modern, and recent historical periods).

Chapter two establishes the general perspective for this study. There concentration falls on man's life as being lived in an order. Living in this order is seen to have major implications for the very way one distinguishes and correlates cultus and culture. It is argued that culture is not optional for man; it is required in the very nature of his creatureliness. With chapters one and two as background, chapters three and four provide a detailed study of the

Biblical dominion materials, chapter three Old Testament and chapter four New Testament.

Finally, in chapter five important findings of this, study are synthesized. Using these findings as a foundation, this writer makes a series of proposals for the contemporary Christian understanding of culture (something of a prolegomenon to a theology of culture), the Christian educational enterprise, and the discipline of Biblical-theological studies in general.

Unless otherwise indicated, citations from the English Bible are taken from the New International Version (NIV).

CHAPTER I
HISTORICAL SURVEY OF THE INTERPRETATION OF
DOMINION MATERIALS

Discussion here assumes the legitimacy of the pre-record.¹ These materials have a long history of interpretation in the church. Review of this varied hermeneutical record serves several purposes. It indicates that very early there was breadth of opinion on the explicit and implicit meaning of the material. Certainly it indicates multiple exegetical options for the modern interpreter. Just as surely this hermeneutical record will make clear that most modern exegetical opinions on these dominion materials have ancient antecedents. And these antecedents must be taken into account in modern interpretation.² Legitimate contemporary exegetical work does not operate in isolation from the

¹ See pp. 9-10.

² Cf. David Jobling, *"And Have Dominion . . ." The Interpretation of Old Testament Texts Concerning Man's Rule Over the Creation (Genesis 1:26, 28, 9:1-2, Psalm 8:7-9) from 200 B.C. to the Time of the Council of Nicea* (Th.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York, 1972; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 72:22,;911, 1972), pp. 3-6 and 325-31 (hereafter cited as *IOTT*). Jobling's analysis of ancient interpretation is excellent.

canon's history of interpretation.

This survey will best serve present purposes if it is divided into the convenient categories of ancient, medieval, modern, and recent interpretations.

Ancient Interpretations

The discussion here follows Jobling's analysis that one finds in this period five general opinions on the dominion materials.¹ The first of Jobling's categories might best be subdivided into two, thus furnishing the following six general categories of interpretation: (1) Rule over creation as a present position, (2) God's rule--man's rule, (3) Promise-fulfillment debate, (4) Rule as lost or diminished, (5) Rule in an eschatological figure, and (6) Rule as cultural expression.²

¹ *IOTT*, pp. 54ff. For further discussion of a historical analysis of the interpretation of Biblical material which is tangent to the dominion idea (at least in the Genesis material) see David A. Yegerlehner *"Be Fruitful and Multiply, and Fill the Earth . . .": A History of the Interpretation of Genesis 1:28a and Related Texts in Selected Periods* (Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University Graduate School, 1974; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 75-12, 270, 1981). This work also has value as a historical hermeneutical survey for modern interpretive work. For a survey of the history of interpretation on another passage attendant to the dominion materials see James M. Childs, Jr., *The Imago Dei and Eschatology: The Ethical Implications of a Reconsideration of the Image of God in Man Within the Framework of an Eschatological Theology* (S.T.D. dissertation, Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, 1974; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 75-18, 208, 1981), especially pp. 9-167.

² As a point of comparison note the several categories of opinion about the Christ-culture correlation given by H. Richard Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (New York: Harper and Row, 1956) and Webber, *Saint*, p. 204, who analyzes his

Because these ancient interpretations are foundational for purposes of this work, considerable attention will be given to this period. In keeping with this design, extensive quotations will be made from the primary source materials that help elucidate ancient interpretation of the dominion materials.

Rule Over Creation as a Present Possession

Though the ancient period furnishes no extensive testimony for understanding the dominion materials as implying a present possession, there are a number of brief references to such an idea. Though the following citations are not exhaustive, they are representative of those who understood the dominion materials as indicating a present possession.

Selected sources

The testimony of those who understood dominion to refer to a present possession is fairly broad in terms of chronology and literary type. The following list is arranged

categories with those of Niebuhr as follows: "Niebuhr lists five categories of Christ and culture--Christ against culture; Christ of culture; Christ above culture; Christ and culture in paradox; Christ the transformer of culture. While these are helpful categories, they are somewhat confusing because they do not allow for the vast differences that exist under each category. I have therefore delineated three general categories, each of which has a large variety of expression." For Webber these three categories are the separational model, the identificational model, and the transformatory model (pp. 75-165). Though Webber (and Niebuhr) speaks more of modern categories of opinion (and not *directly* about dominion passages), the categories he suggests have great similarity with those of the ancient church period. This fact suggests that modern opinion has antecedents.

generally in chronological order, beginning with the earliest.¹ The dates suggested are those that may be tentatively accepted for purposes of this study.

The Epistle to Diognetius, x (ca. A.D. 130):

If you also desire [to possess] this faith, you likewise shall receive first of all the knowledge of the Father. For God has loved mankind, on whose account He made the world, to whom He rendered subject all the things that are in it, to whom He gave reason and understanding, to whom alone He imparted the privilege of looking upwards to Himself, whom He formed after His own image, to whom He sent His only-begotten Son, to whom He has promised a kingdom in heaven, and will give it to those who have loved Him.²

Theophilus of Antioch (A.D. 115-181), *Theophilus to Autolycus*, II, 10:

And first, they taught us with one consent that God made all things out of nothing; for nothing was coeval with

¹ As with any historical study built upon manuscript transmission, there are, of course, some uncertainties about chronology. For discussion of these uncertainties the reader is referred in a rudimentary way to the introductory biographical remarks about individual authors and titles scattered throughout Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vols. I-VIII, American Reprint of the Edinburgh Edition (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979), hereafter cited as ANF, and Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, eds., *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Vols. I-XIV, Second Series Reprint (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979), hereafter cited as NPNF.

² This translation is taken from ANF, 1:29. Subsequent translations within this section on ancient interpretations are taken from this same series on the fathers. The translations are adequate and readable and offer to the English reader easy access to lengthy translations for comparative purposes. There are, of course, other translations and editions such as J.-P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, series latina*, 221 vols. (Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1844-55). Note also Johannes Quasten, Walter J. Burghardt, and Thomas C. Lawler, eds., *Ancient Christian Writers*, 40 vols. (New York: Newman Press, 1946-75) and Ludwig Schopp, ed. dir., *The Fathers of the Church*, 68 vols. (Washington, DC: The Catholic University Press of America, 1947-79).

God: but He being His own place, and wanting nothing, and existing before the ages, willed to make man by whom He might be known; for him, therefore He prepared the world.¹

II, 17:

For when man transgressed, they [i.e. the animals] also transgressed with him. For as, if the master of the house himself acts rightly, the domestics also of necessity conduct themselves well; but if the master sins, the servants also sin with him; so in like manner it came to pass, that in the case of man's sin, he being master, all that was subject to him sinned with him. When, therefore, man again shall have made his way back to his natural condition, and no longer does evil, those also shall be restored to their original gentleness.²

II, 18:

And when He had made and blessed him, that he might increase and replenish the earth, He put all things under his dominion, and at his service; and He appointed from the first that he should find nutriment from the fruits of the earth, and from seeds, and herbs, and acorns, having at the same time appointed that the animals be of habits similar to man's, that they also might eat of all the seeds of the earth.³

Athenagoras, *The Resurrection of the Dead* (ca. A.D. 180), XII:

The argument from the cause will appear, if we consider whether man was made at random and in vain, or for some purpose; and if for some purpose, whether simply that he might live and continue in the natural condition in which he was created, or for the use of another; and if with a view to use, whether for that of the Creator Himself, or of some one of the beings who belong to him, and are by Him deemed worthy of greater care . . . and irrational beings are by nature in a state of subjection, and perform those services for men for which each of them was intended, but are not intended in their own turn to make use of men: for it neither was nor is right to lower that which rules and takes the lead to the use of the

¹ Ibid., 2:97-98.

² Ibid., 2:101. The material within brackets is supplied from the context of the quotation by this writer.

³ Ibid., 2:101-2.

inferior, or to subject the rational to the irrational, which is not suited to rule.¹

Tertullian (A.D. 145-220), *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*, V:

For the creatures which were made were inferior to him for whom they were made; and they were made for man, to whom they were afterwards made subject to God. Rightly, therefore, had the creatures which were thus intended for subjection, come forth into being at the bidding and command and sole power of the *divine* voice; whilst man, on the contrary, destined to be their Lord, was formed by God himself, to the intent that he might be able to exercise his mastery, being created by the *Master the Lord Himself*.²

Origen (A.D. 185-254), *Origen Against Celsus*, IV, 23:

And in his [i.e., Celsus'] fictitious representation, he compares us [i.e., Christians] to "worms which assert that there is a God, and that immediately after him, we who are made by him are altogether like unto God, and that all things have been made subject to us,--earth, and water, and air, and stars,--and that all things exist for our sake, and are ordained to be subject to us."³

The Clementine Homilies (ca. A.D. 230-250), X, 3:

"God having fo wed the heaven and the earth, and having made all things in them, as the true Prophet has said to us, man, being made after the image and likeness of God, was appointed to be ruler and lord of things, I say, air and earth and water, as may be known from the very fact that by his intelligence he brings down the creatures that are in the air, and brings up those that are in the deep, hunts those that are on the earth, and that although they are much greater in strength than he . . ."⁴

¹ Ibid., 2:154-55.

² Ibid., 3:549. The underlining indicates italicized words within the quotation.

³ Ibid., 4:506. The words within brackets are supplied by this writer from the context of this quotation.

⁴ Ibid., 8:280.

XI, 23:

"For on thy account, O man, God commanded the water to retire upon the face of the earth, that the earth might be able to bring forth fruits for thee . . . For is it not for thee that the winds blow, and rains fall, and the seasons change for the production of fruits? Moreover, it is for thee that the sun and moon, with the other heavenly bodies, accomplish their risings and settings; land rivers and pools, with all fountains, serve thee."¹

Lactantius (A.D. 260-330), *The Divine Institutes*, VII, 4:

It is evident, therefore, that the world was constructed for the sake of living beings, since living beings enjoy those things of which it consists . . . Again, that the other living beings were made for the sake of man, is plain from this, that they are subservient to man, and were given for his protection and service . . .²

VII, 5:

. . . therefore, God did not make the world for His own sake, because He does not stand in need of its advantages, but for the sake of man . . .³

VII, 7:

The Stoics say that the world, and all things which are in it, were made for the sake of men: the sacred writings teach us the same things. Therefore Democritus was in error, who thought that they were poured forth from the earth like worms, without any author or plan.⁴

Lactantius, *A Treatise on the Anger of God*, XIII:

If any one considers the whole government of the world, he will certainly understand how true is the opinion of the Stoics, who say that the world was made on our account. For all the things of which the world is composed,

¹ Ibid., 8:289.

² Ibid., 7:198.

³ Ibid., 7:199.

⁴ Ibid., 7:204.

and which it produces from itself, are adapted to the use of man.¹

Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, (ca. A.D. 325-360), VII, 2, xxxiv:

And at the conclusion of the creation Thou gavest direction to Thy Wisdom . . . saying, "Let us make man after our image, and after our likeness"; and hast exhibited him as the ornament of the world . . .²

Gregory of Nyssa (A.D. 335-395), *On the Making of Man*, II, 2:

For this reason man was brought into the world last after the creation, not being rejected to the last as worthless, but as one whom it behoved to be king over his subjects at his very birth.³

Commentary

From these several citations may be drawn a composite assessment of the dominion materials. Of course, the general picture is that these sources express the understanding that dominion is a present possession. However, in assessing the selected sources more carefully the following details are evident.

Man's superiority

Jobling has already noted that in this ancient period ontological superiority of man is linked with the understanding of the dominion as a present possession.⁴ That is,

¹ Ibid., 7:269. In the discussion following this quotation man is said to use fire, springs, rivers, earth, and sea for his purposes. For yet further discussion by Lactantius on the nature of man's dominion see *On the Workmanship of God*, II in Ibid., 7:282-83.

² Ibid., 7:473.

³ NPNF, 5:390.

⁴ *IOTT*, p. 54.

through asserting man's ontological status the fathers were able to maintain dominion as a present possession. The reasons for this superiority are variously assigned in these selected sources. Perhaps most prominent is the idea that man's rational capacity makes him superior. By his intelligence man is able to control those things made subject to him by the Creator. Another reason for man's superiority is his upward look, enabling him to give his loyalties to his Maker. In addition the distinctive creative activity surrounding man's creation helps distinguish him as superior to other creatures. Thus man's superiority ontologically characterizes him as an ornament in his environment.

Creation for man's sake

Again Jobling's analysis is correct.¹ These ancient church sources exhibit the notion of anthropocentric teleology. The idea that creation was for man's sake is especially prominent as a means of explaining dominion as a present possession. A recurring assertion is that all was made for man's sake and that God ordained that all things should be subject to man. Therefore, through divine appointment man is stationed as king, as ruler and lord. In this way the things of the world are at man's service. Even when man fell his

¹ Ibid. Thus Jobling says that study of these ancient church testimonies indicates that the idea of man's rule is often--linked "with two other ideas. These are man's ontological superiority, the idea that man is superior to the rest of creation, and anthropocentric teleology, the idea that the creation was made and exists for man's sake."

subjects fell with him. Thus, the general view is that the rest of creation was in every sense prepared for man's appearance to fulfill his regal position.

Tradition influences

The assessments above are easily seen. What is not so evident, however, is that complex of influences extant in the ancient world which may have suggested to the church fathers this particular view of the dominion materials. Lactantius declares his familiarity with at least a part of that complex of influences, namely Stoicism.¹

Stoicism is most often associated with Zeno, though without the work of Chrysippus Stoicism would not have been fully developed.² For Stoicism the goal of life is cast in Panaetius' formula, "to live according to the starting-points given us by nature."³ Nature is here for the purpose of man's

¹ Cf. *The Divine Institutes*, VII, 7 in ANF, 7:204 and *A Treatise on the Anger of God*, XIII in *ibid.*, 7:269.

² Cf. the succinct discussion on this point by F. I. Finley, gen. ed., *Ancient Culture and Society*, 11 vols. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1975), vol. 11: *The Stoics*, by F. H. Sandbach, pp. 11-19. For further discussion on Stoicism see Emile Brehier, *The History of Philosophy*, vol. 2: *The Hellenistic and Roman Age*, trans. Wade Baskin (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 23-65; W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, 5 vols. (London: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 2:80-100; Werner Jaeger, *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers* (London: The Clarendon Press, 1947; Oxford Paperbacks, 1967); Frederick Copleston, *A History of Philosophy*, vol. I: *Greece and Rome*, The Bellarmine Series, no. 9 (London: Burns and Oates Limited, 1966), pp. 385-400, 421-437.

³ Finley, *Stoics*, p. 58. The point of the formula is simply that man is to live consistently with nature's manifest laws.

living. Jobling has pointed out that in two dialogues of Socrates, as reported by Xenophon, the point is expressed that man is superior to animals and that everything is here "for man's sake."¹ This Stoic influence left its impress on the church fathers.² They seem to have followed Stoic interest in understanding creation as being here for man's sake.³ Other influences from Stoicism and other Greek philosophic thought may be traced. But undoubtedly the ancient church view that dominion materials were to be understood as a present possession was influenced by Stoicism.⁴

There were, of course, other influences besides philosophy which conjoined to forge a complex that shaped to

¹ Cf. Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, I, 4:14; IV, 3:11ff. as given in R. D. C. Robbins, *Xenophon's Memorabilia of Socrates* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1856), pp. 28-29 and 145-47. For Jobling's discussion on this point see *IOTT*, pp. 64-67.

² Cf. *ibid.*

³ This influence on the fathers should not be surprising since the Middle and Later Stoa were active in the first centuries of the church; cf. Finley, *Stoics*, p. 16: "In the Greek world of the first two centuries of our era Stoicism clearly remained a lively influence." Note also Copleston, *History*, pp. 421-37, where the widespread influence is also indicated.

⁴ For additional discussion on the influences of Greek thought see Thorlief Boman, *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek*, trans. J. L. Moreau, The Library of History and Doctrine (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), pp. 90-97; G. J. deVries, "Christianity and Classical Culture," *Free University Quarterly* 2 (October 1953): 251-60; M. Foster, "Greek and Christian Ideas of Nature," *Free University Quarterly* 6 (May 1959): 122-27; Morton Smith, "The Image of God: Notes on the Hellenization of Judaism," *BJRL* 40 (1958): 473-512; M. Akita, "A Study on Greek and Hebrew Thinkings About Man," *Christianity and Culture* 1 (1964): 7-26.

one degree or another the interpretive thought of the church fathers. There is the intriguing remark by Ovid (43 B.C.-A.D. 18) in *Metamorphoses*, I, 7.6ff.:

A living creature of finer stuff than these, more capable of lofty thought was lacking yet. Then man was born: whether the god who made all else, designing a more perfect world, made man of his own divine substance, or whether the new earth, but lately drawn away from heavenly ether, retained still some elements of its kindred sky --that earth which the son of Iapetus mixed with fresh running water and moulded into the form of the all-controlling gods. And, though all other animals are prone, and fix their gaze upon the earth, he gave to man an uplifted face and bade him stand erect and turn his eyes to heaven. So, then, the earth, which had but lately been a rough and formless thing, was changed and clothed itself with forms of men before unknown.¹

While one certainly would not want to argue that Ovid's thought was directly passed on to the ancient church, the above citation does indicate that viewing man's dominion as a present possession was a rather common belief.

Further, in 2 Baruch 14:18 a similar view is expressed: "And thou didst say that Thou wouldst make for Thy world man as the administrator of Thy works, that it might be known that he was by no means made on account of the world, but the world on account of him."² And a corresponding view

¹ The translation is that of Frank J. Miller, *Ovid: Metamorphoses*, 2 vols., The Loeb Classical Library (London: William Heinemann, 1928), 1:7-8.

² Cf. R. H. Charles, ed., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, 2 vols. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913), 2:491.

³ *Ibid.*, 2:596. For further discussion on the way in

Last, there is the sketchy testimony of Jewish sources. Only brief citation is necessary to indicate that Jewish commentary provided a part of the influence on the church. The Targums of Onkelos, Jonathan Ben Uzziel, and Jerusalem generally correlate with the tradition of wording found in BHK.¹ Talmudic sources understand man as ontologically superior by the very fact that "man, in God's image, has the capacity to reflect and to criticize. All an animal can do is act and respond."² Genesis Rabba, 8 gives the midrashic

which Jewish nationalism assimilated the idea that God created the world for man's sake see C. W. Emmet, "The Fourth Book of Esdras and St. Paul," *ExpTim* 27 (1916): 551-56, especially 552.

¹ Cf. J. W. Etheridge, *The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch with Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum from the Chaldee* (New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1968), pp. 37, 160-61. As one would expect the Targum of Onkelos "restricts itself more to the simple rendering of the Hebrew Text" (*ibid.*, p. 8). The Palestinian Targum, however, being more inclined to *Derush* rabbinic interpretation ("illustration, traditio-historical, anecdotal, or allegorical"), is freer in its renderings (*ibid.*, p. 9). For an illustration of this note the interesting interpretation by the Palestinian Targum of the account of man's creation: "In the image of the Lord He created him, with two hundred and forty and eight members, with three hundred and sixty and five nerves, and over laid them with skin, and filled it with flesh and blood" (*ibid.*, p. 160).

² Jacob Neusner, *Invitation to the Talmud* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), p. 231. This difference between man and animal can be accounted for at least partially because God has placed an ethical drive within man, the *Yetzer tob*, the good inclination, and the *Yetzer ha-ra*, the inclination to evil (cf. Mishna Berachoth IX, 5: **בשני יצריך ביצר טוב וביצר רע**). For discussion of this point see Moses Mielziner, *Introduction to the Talmud*, 4th ed. (New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1968), pp. 269-70. On this same point see also the brief discussion of Ben Zion Bokser, *The Wisdom of the Talmud* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1951), pp. 92-93.

opinion that the creation of man indicates that, in addition to man being a product of earth, he is also gifted with reason, intellect, and understanding.¹ A last brief citation from the mishnaic source, *Sanhedrin*, 59, 2, indicates a similar attempt to underscore man's dominion as a present possession:

In the course of a discussion whether Adam was allowed to slay animals for food or not, the question is raised: Does not his dominion over the fish imply, that he was allowed to eat them? No; it means only that he should employ them in his service.²

In general even the Jewish influences, of whatever degree, might have been in the direction of understanding Old Testament dominion materials as indicating a present possession by man.³

God's Rule--Man's Rule

When the church fathers were faced with the interpretation that man's rule is a present possession, they sometimes hastened to emphasize that distinctions were to be made between the rule of God and the rule of man. Man's rule was

¹ Samuel Rapaport, *A Treasury of the Midrash* (New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1968), p. 62.

² Paul I. Hershon, *Genesis: With a Talmudic Commentary*, trans. M. Wolkenberg (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1883), p. 67. There was even some discussion in Mishnaic sources over the singularity or plurality of "subdue" (כַּבְּשָׁה). This debate is seen in the exchange between Rav Ilai and Rav Ytzchak (ibid.).

³ There is, however, a word of caution. Jacob Neusner, "Scriptural, Essenic, and Mishnaic Approaches to Civil Law and Government: Some Comparative Remarks," *HTR* 73 (July-October 1980) : 419-34, especially 429, cautions (in another context of discussion) that Jewish influences were more marginally felt by the Christian community.

a subordinate rule, a delegated position.¹ The focus of this understanding was on the dominion as a *delegated* rulership. Such an interpretation is still positive, but casts man's present rulership in the light of God's superior rulership. The previous interpretation of the dominion materials emphasized man's superiority over the rest of creation. The present interpretation calls attention to God's rulership over man, while still allowing man *delegated* rulership.

Selected sources

The selections included here are few in number, but may be taken as adequately implying the essence of this interpretation of the dominion materials.²

Origen (A.D. 185-254), *Origen Against Celsus*, IV, 27:

"The Sun and Night are to mortals slaves." . . . Day and night, then, are subject to mortals, being created for the sake of rational beings. And if ants and flies, which labour by day and rest by night, have, besides, the benefit of those things which were created for the sake of men, we must not say that day and night were brought into being for the sake of ants and flies, nor must we suppose that they were created for the sake of nothing, but, agreeably to the design of Providence, were formed for the sake of man.³

¹ Cf. Jobling's discussion in *IOTT*, pp. 97ff.

² Generally speaking the sources to draw upon tend to be sketchy. Only the more clear have been included. The less clear are those such as *Tertullian Against Marcion*, IV, 24 where mention is made that man's power over the animals is a delegated power: ". . . the Creator has promised . . . to give this power even to little children, of putting their hand in the cockatrice den and on the hole of the young asps without at all receiving hurt" (cf. ANF, 3:388).

³ *Ibid.*, 4:532. The opening line of this citation is taken from Euripides (480-406 B.C.), *The Phoenician Maidens*, 546: εἶθ' ἥλιος μὲν νύξ τε δουλεύει βροτῶϊς, cf. Arthur S. Way, *Euripides*, 4 vols., The Loeb Classical Library (London: William Heinemann, 1919), 3:386.

The Clementine Homilies (ca. A.D. 230-250), III, 26-27:

And, moreover, who is lord over the creatures, so far as it is possible? Is it not man . . . Wherefore, before all things, consider that no one shares His rule, no one has a name in common with Him--that is, is called God. For He alone is both called and is God.¹

Lactantius (A.D. 260-330), *The Divine Institutes*, II, 9:

In short, when God revealed the truth to man, He wished us only to know those things which it concerned man to know for the attainment of life; but as to the things which related to a profane and eager curiosity He was silent, that they might be secret.²

Lactantius, *A Treatise on the Anger of God*, XIV:

It follows that I show for what purpose God made man himself. As He contrived the world for the sake of man, so He formed man himself on His own account, as it were a priest of a divine temple, a spectator of His works and of heavenly objects. For he is the only being who, since he is intelligent and capable of reason, is able to understand God, to admire His works, and perceive His energy and power; for on this account he is furnished with judgment, intelligence, and prudence. On this account he alone, beyond the other living creatures, has been made with an upright body and attitude, so that he seems to have been raised up for the contemplation of his Parent. On this account he alone has received language, and a tongue the interpreter of his thought, that he may be able to declare the majesty of his Lord. Lastly, for this cause all things were placed under his control, that he himself might be under the control of God, their Maker and Creator.³

Commentary

The central focus of these citations is that man's

¹ ANF, 8:245.

² *Ibid.*, 7:56. This quotation follows Lactantius' citation from Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, I, 76ff.: "A living creature of finer stuff than these, more capable of lofty thought, one who could have dominion over all the rest, was lacking yet. Then man was born . . ." (cf. Miller, *Ovid*, 2:7).

³ ANF, 7:271.

dominion is assigned to him. Whatever is his, he is assured that it came to him according to the design of Providence. Thus he is given control and in that place of authority is to be under the dominion of his creator. Man's rulership is vast, extending to the inclusion of planets as part of his kingdom. But this man never shares God's rule; he is under it. In two ways the rulership of God over man is seen.

God's dominion over man

Man clearly is in subjection to God because God has told man only those things he wishes man to know. There remains a series of things hidden from man, hidden in the mysteries of God's own knowledge. With equal clarity one understands that man is made to worship, to serve his Creator. He owes allegiance to the one whose authority and rulership is superior. Thus God's superiority of rule becomes seen through man's limited knowledge and his obligation to give his allegiances to his Creator.

Tradition influences

Jobling has clearly pointed out that this particular view of the dominion material may have been influenced by traditions outside the church.¹ Philo, *De opificio mundi*, 88 maintained that man's place within creation was that of a pilot or a ὑπαρχος, a subordinate commander, a lieutenant.²

¹ Cf. *IOTT*, pp. 97ff.

² Cf. Henry G. Liddell and Robert Scott, compilers, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 2 vols., revised and augmented through-

Another earlier tradition is that of Sirach 17:2, ". . . , and gave them authority over all things on the earth."¹ Clearly this brief citation asserts at once man's dominion and its having been delegated to him.

Thus, outside the church fathers there is a tradition consistent with the view of the dominion materials which focuses attention on the delegated nature of man's dominion.²

Promise-Fulfillment Debate

The previous two interpretations of the dominion material emphasized that man's rule is a present possession, though these interpretations focus on man's superiority and man's subordination respectively. Consideration is now given to that interpretation which estimates that, though the dominion materials indicate a promised rule, the fulfillment of that rule is only partial. That is, the fulfillment is not the possession of every man. This perspective is evidenced in the following citations.

Selected sources

Because the partial fulfillment of the dominion prom-

out by Henry S. Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie et al., with a supplement (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1968), 2:1853. For discussion of this material in Philo see *IOTT*, p. 101.

¹ Charles, *Apocrypha*, 1:375.

² Of interest is the fact that at Qumran there is a relative lack of interest in these dominion materials. Cf. *IOTT*, pp. 114-15. Also of interest in passing is the possible contribution of Stoic and neo-Platonist thought to the view of man's rule being subordinate to God's rule, *ibid.*, p. 117.

ise is variously assigned, the following sources will not seem homogeneous upon first glance.

Aristides, *The Apology of Aristides the Philosopher*, (ca. A.D. 125), I:

I say, however, concerning this mover of the world, that he is God of all, who made all things for the sake of mankind. And it seems to me that this is reasonable, that one should fear God and should not oppress man.¹

Justin Martyr (A.D. 110-165), *The Second Apology*, IV:

We have been taught that God did not make the world aimlessly, but for the sake of the human race; and we have before stated that He takes pleasure in those who imitate His properties, and is displeased with those that embrace what is worthless either in word or deed.²

The Pastor of Hermas (A.D. 160), IV:

". . . do you not perceive how great is the glory of God, and how strong and marvelous, in that He created the world for the sake of man, and subjected all creation to him, and gave him power to rule over everything under heaven? If, then, man is lord of the creatures of God, and rules over all, is he not able to be lord also of these commandments? For," says he, "the man who has the Lord in his heart can also be lord: of all, and of every one of these commandments. But to those who have the Lord only on their lips . . . the commandments are hard and difficult."³

¹ This translation is from the Syriac, cf. ANF, 10:263. The Greek version omits this citation, reading only: "The self-same being, then, who first established and now controls the universe--him do I affirm to be God . . ." (ibid.).

² Ibid., 1:189. In light of the context of this quotation Justin claims that pleasing God (giving of instruction in the divine doctrines as a faithful witness) is how we achieve God's purpose in making creation for the sake of the human race. This *dominionizing* of creation would therefore be achieved only by the righteous as they pursue the practice of instructing in divine doctrines.

³ Ibid., 2:29. This expresses the view that man's rule over created things is conditioned by the nature of his response toward God. Those who are righteous may expect to rule as God promised they would.

Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 153-217), *The Instructor*, II, 1:
 Some men, in truth, live that they may eat, as the irrational creatures, "whose life is their belly, and nothing else." But the Instructor enjoins us to eat that we may live. For neither is food our business, nor is pleasure our aim; but both are on account of our life here, which the Word is training up to immortality. . . . For God, when He created man, said, "All things shall be to you for meat."¹

Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, IV, 3:
 And what, I ask, is it in which man differs from beasts, and the angels of God, on the other hand, are wiser than he? "Thou madest him a little lower than the angels." For some do not interpret this Scripture of the Lord, although He also bore flesh, but of the perfect man and the gnostic, inferior in comparison with the angels in time, and by reason of the vesture [of the body]. . . . For if there is one function belonging to the peculiar nature of each creature, . . . what shall we say is the peculiar function of man? . . . the body tills the ground, and hastes to it; but the soul is raised to God: trained in the true philosophy, it speeds to its kindred above, turning away from the lusts of the body, and besides these, from toil and fear . . . The severance, therefore, of the soul from the body, made a life-long study, produces in the philosopher gnostic alacrity, so that he is easily able to bear natural death which is the dissolution of the chains which bind the soul to the body.²

The Clementine Homilies (ca. A.D. 230-250), X, 25:
 “. . . it is not right to call the elements gods, by which good things are supplied; but only Him who ordereth them, to accomplish all things for our use, and who commandeth them to be serviceable to man,--Him alone we call God in

¹ Ibid., 2:237-41. While the ellipsis represents a considerable omission, the conjoining of material in this citation appears to give a correct sense to Clement's thought. In this section of *The Instructor* he uses a dominion passage, Gen 9:lff., to develop ethical conclusions against gluttony.

² Ibid., 2:410-11. Clement's thinking understands the work of the righteous to be the divesting of the body (IV, 4 goes on to praise martyrdom). This divestiture he explains in light of the dominion passage in Ps 8, which passage some, he says, interpret as referring to the perfect man.

propriety of speech, whose beneficence you do not perceive, but permit those elements to rule over you which have been assigned to you as your servants.¹

Lactantius (A.D. 260-330), *On the Workmanship of God*, VIII:

When, therefore, God had determined of all the animals to make man alone heavenly, and all the rest earthly, He raised him erect to the contemplation of the heaven, . . . but He depressed the others to the earth, that . . . they might be subservient to their appetite and food. And thus the right reason and elevated position of man alone, and his countenance, shared with and closely resembling God his Father, bespeak his origin and Maker. His mind, nearly divine, because it has obtained the rule not only over the animals which are on the earth, but over his own body, . . . looks out upon and observes all things.²

Commentary

What is especially striking about these sources is their uniform judgment that the promise of the dominion materials finds fulfillment in the righteous, not in all persons. Undoubtedly these authors could not "read these texts without a sense of their being unfulfilled; we may call it a sense of loss."³ But they saw at least partial fulfillment in the life of the righteous. However, the obvious question still is: How does dominion express itself in the life of the righteous?

¹ Ibid., 8:284. Here is explained the belief that the dominion granted man is brought to ruination by one's fall into idolatry. The result of idolatry is to turn the ruler into the ruled.

² This passage, found in *ibid.*, 7:288-89, indicates that dominion is exercised by the righteous through self-control. For comparison of a similar expression see Basil, *The Hexaemeron*, IX, 6 in NPNF, 8:105-7.

³ *IOTT*, p. 130. Jobling notes that "in Sir 17:1-4 the reference to man's rule seems to be there to counteract a sense of loss which has turned to cynicism, in 16:17" (*ibid.*).

The solutions to this question are varied.

Solutions to the debate

One resolution to the promise-fulfillment debate was to apply the dominion promise to ethical matters. Clement of Alexandria, *The Instructor*, II, 1, understood the righteous person to have dominion when he kept himself from gluttony. In so doing he had ruled over foods, put them to the proper use of sustaining life, not become ruled by them. Aristides, *The Apology of Aristides the Philosopher*, I, understood that the dominion promise was at least partially fulfilled in freedom from the oppression of rulers. Justin Martyr, *The Second Apology*, IV, believed dominion was exercised by the righteous as they had freedom to give instruction in divine doctrines.¹

A second solution, which flows naturally out of the first, is to understand the promised dominion as being fulfilled in the righteous person's mastery of self. Such dominion extends not only over the animals but over one's very own body (Lactantius, *On the Workmanship of God*, VIII). Basil in *The Hexaemeron*, IX, 6, argued the same point.

A third solution to the debate was to explain the dominion in negative terms, indicating why the promise was not fulfilled. Primarily the lack of fulfillment may be blamed on man's fall into sin. *The Clementine Homilies*, X, 25, explain this fall as a turning to idolatry. The practice of idolatry results not only in loss of rule but in being ruled

¹ Cf. p. 31, n. 2.

by those very elements over which the Creator assigned man as ruler.

Tradition influences

Here, as earlier, there are a number of tradition influences at work which might be understood as antecedents of this solution to the debate. The Stoics, in keeping with rather common Greek thought, understood the sage, "the man of reason who is also the good man," as a ruler.¹ This is reminiscent of Plato's philosopher-kings. Plato's notion reminds one of the rabbinic tradition which had grown up around Solomon. *Genesis Rabba* 34:12 "thinks of the dominion lost by Adam as returning in the person of Solomon."² This tradition is understandable in light of the vastness of Solomon's domain referred to by the following:

I have eaten no food and drunk no water, in order to fly about in the whole world and see whether there is a domain anywhere which is not subject to my lord the king.³

These influences show that the assigning of rulership to one or several persons, possessed of goodly moral qualities, was

¹ See *IOTT*, p. 140 and his discussion which follows.

² *Ibid.*, p. 145.

³ Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, 7 vols. (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1968), 4:143; cf. also 1:177-78. These Jewish legends about the dominion of Solomon bothered the ancient church: "The Church Fathers are at pains to contradict this assertion of the Jewish legend, not out of dislike for Solomon, but for polemical reasons, maintaining that the scriptural passages speaking of man's dominion over the entire creation can only refer to Jesus. See Justin Martyr, *Dialogue*, 34; Tertullian, *Adversus Judaeos*, 7" (*ibid.*, 6:289).

a part of the tradition influence existing prior to the interpretive work of the church fathers.

There is also some evidence that there existed a tradition connecting the loss of dominion with the fall. This correlation is reflected in a negative way by the following Jewish legend about the creation of man:

. . . God said to Gabriel: "Go and fetch Me dust from the four corners of the earth, and I will create man therewith." Gabriel went forth to do the bidding of the Lord, but the earth drove him away, and refused to let him gather up dust from it. Gabriel remonstrated: "Why, O Earth, dost thou not hearken unto the voice of the Lord . . . ?" The earth replied, and said: "I am destined to become a curse, and to be cursed through man . . ." ¹

Rule as Lost or Diminished

The sources mentioned just above already opened the possibility that dominion materials might have been interpreted as a rule lost or diminished. Thus the sources here will indicate an extension of thought already introduced. If the rule promised has a fulfillment which is open to debate, interpretation of the dominion material would sooner or later suggest that the rule might have been lost or diminished. The following select sources suggest this.

Selected sources

These sources have in common the idea that the rule assigned was in some sense altered.² The exact nature of this

¹ Ginzberg, *Legends*, 1:54.

² For extended discussion of this idea see *IOTT*, p. 164ff.

alteration is variously understood, but its fact is underscored.¹

Irenaeus (A.D. 120-202), *Irenaeus Against Heresies*, XXIII, 2-3:

But inasmuch as man is saved, it is fitting that he who was created the original man should be saved. . . . immediately after Adam had transgressed, as the Scripture relates, He pronounced no curse against Adam personally, but against the ground, in reference to his works, as a certain person among the ancients has observed: "God did indeed transfer the curse to the earth, that it might not remain in man." But man received, as the punishment of his transgression, the toilsome task of tilling the earth, and to eat bread in the sweat of his face, and to return to the dust from whence he was taken.²

Tertullian (A.D. 145-220), *Tertullian Against Marcion*, II, VIII:

As, therefore, God designed for man a condition of life, so man brought on himself a state of death . . . No doubt it was an angel who was the seducer; but then the victim of that seduction was free, and master of himself and as being the image and likeness of God, was stronger than any angel . . . He would not have made all things subject to man, if he had been too weak for the dominion, and inferior to the angels, to whom He assigned no such subjects. . . . And thus it comes to pass, that even now also, the same human being, the same substance of his soul, the same condition as Adam's, is made conqueror over the same

¹ This understanding of alteration stands in contrast to the view that even at his creation man served as a slave. The rule as lost or diminished emphasizes that man was initially a ruler. Cf. the statement of the gnostic *The Apocalypse of Adam* (V, 5): "Then we recognized the God who had created us. For we were not strangers to his powers. And we served him in fear and slavery. And after these (events) we became darkened in our heart(s)." The reference of these words is evidently to Adam's and Eve's loss of glory and knowledge and their coming under the enslaving power of the lowly creator. See James M. Robinson, director, *The Nag Hammadi Library*, trans. members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1977), p. 257.

² Cf. ANF, 1:456.

devil by the self-same liberty and power of his will,
when it moves in obedience to the laws of God.¹

Tertullian, *On Repentance*, II:

For God--after so many and so great sins of human temerity, begun by the first of the race, Adam, after the condemnation of man, together with the dowry of the world, after his ejection from paradise and subjection to death --when He had hasted back to His own mercy, did from that time onward inaugurate repentance in His own self, by rescinding the sentence of His first wrath, engaging to great pardon to His own work and image.²

Tertullian, *On Prayer*, V:

. . . if the manifestation of the Lord's kingdom pertains unto the will of God and unto our anxious expectation, how do some pray for some protraction of the age, when the kingdom of God, which we pray may arrive, tends unto the consummation of the age? Our wish is, that our reign be hastened, not our servitude protracted.³

Recognitions of Clement (ca. A.D. 230-250), V, II:

At first, therefore, while he was still righteous, he was superior to all disorders and all frailty; but when he sinned, as we taught you yesterday, and became the servants of sin, he became at the same time liable to frailty. This therefore is written, that men may know that, as by impiety they have been made liable to suffer, so by piety they may be made free from suffering; and not only free from suffering, but by even a little faith in God be able to cure the sufferings of others.⁴

The Clementine Homilies (ca. A.D. 230-250), I, IV:

While, therefore, he was righteous, he was also superior to all sufferings, as being unable by his immortal body to have any experience of pain; but when he sinned, as I showed you yesterday and the day before, becoming as it

¹ Ibid., 3:303-4.

² Ibid., 3:657. The expression "the dowry of the world" must include the dominion granted to man by God.

³ Ibid., 3:683. This citation is in the context of an explanation of the expression, "Thy kingdom come."

⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, 8:143. This citation is preceded by a reference to the dominion material in Gen 1:26-28.

were the servant of sin, he became subject to all sufferings, being by a righteous judgment deprived of all excellent things.¹

Constitutions of the Holy Apostles (ca. A.D. 325-360), VIII, 12:

But when he neglected that command, and tasted of the forbidden fruit, by the seduction of the serpent and the counsel of his wife, Thou didst justly cast him out of paradise. Yet of Thy goodness Thou didst not overlook him, nor suffer him to perish utterly, for he was Thy creature; but Thou didst subject the whole creation to him, and didst grant him liberty to procure himself food by his own sweat and labours, whilst Thou didst cause all the fruits of the earth to spring up, to grow, and to ripen.²

Commentary

Clearly these sources indicate that whatever was included in the original dominion (Gen 1:26-28) has been at least altered, perhaps lost. This view is, therefore considerably more pessimistic than previous views. Though this pessimism is present, it does not contract the concurrent assertion that the dominion may be at least partially realized.

Realization of dominion

The dominion that was lost has cast man in the role of servant. How long will this servitude last? The question may be answered along two lines. The first concerns what initi-

¹ The context of this citation, cf. *ibid.*, 8:280, is a discussion of man's dominion as given by the creator, *The Clementine Homilies*, X, 3.

² ANF, 7:487-88. The context prior to this citation concerns a discussion of the dominion God gave man. Therefore, the word "he" in the opening line has the first man as its antecedent.

ated the loss of dominion. Predominantly, the view expressed by the sources is that the fall, especially as described by the words of Genesis 3:17-19, is the event which initiates this loss of dominion.¹ But what this loss means is not clear.

The second line of analysis concerns the time when the dominion is restored, at least partially. One answer is, of course, that the dominion's restoration awaits the coming of the Lord's kingdom (Tertullian, *On Prayer*, V). Another answer is that dominion partially returns when piety is practiced. Such obedience brings about dominion over present sufferings (*Recognitions of Clement*, V, 2). Moreover, dominion is also explained as being partially man's because man is able to procure food from the earth for himself (*Constitutions of the Holy Apostles*, VIII, 12). Or, the partial return of dominion may be explained as the power over the devil as one moves in obedience to God's laws (*Tertullian Against Marcion*, II, 8).² These sources indicate that though dominion was lost, there is a partial realization of it.

¹ Cf. the discussion of *IOTT*, p. 184, and the article he cites on history of the exegesis of the fall, H.-G. Leder, "Sundenfallerzahlung und Versuchsgeschichte," *ZNW* 54 (1963): 188-216.

² Power regained over the devil introduces the somewhat common theme of a struggle between two worlds, a notion so much a part of gnostic literature. The fighting of the worlds of good and evil here finds implementation in the dominion materials. Cf. the Jewish legend in which God spoke to the serpent: "I created thee to be king over all animals, cattle: and the beasts of the field alike; but thou wast not satisfied. Therefore thou shalt be cursed above all cattle and above every beast of the field" (Ginzberg, *Legends*, 1:78).

Tradition influences

There are several potential sources of influence that may have helped shape this view of the dominion materials. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha contain several helpful sources. The Apocalypse Mosis, XXIV, 4 associates the loss of dominion with the fall: "The beasts over whom thou didst rule, shall rise up in rebellion against thee, for thou hast not kept my commandment."¹ In this same piece of literature (XI, 1 and 2) the fall is understood to produce changes in the nature of the beasts which were in subjection prior to the fall:

It is not our concern, Eve, thy greed and thy wailing, but thine own; for (it is) from thee that the rule of the beasts hath arisen. How was thy mouth opened to eat of the tree concerning which God enjoined thee not to eat of it? On this account, our nature also hath been transformed.²

The audacity of the animals is the more startling since the first man, Adam, had such remarkable glory that he was able to name them all (Jub. 3:1-2).² Enoch 58:1-3 recounts this same past glory.³ But the glory, that noble rule, was lost. The Wisdom of Solomon offers a more complete understanding by

¹ Charles, *Apocrypha*, 2:147.

² *Ibid.*, 2:143. This quotation recounts the words spoken by a wild beast in response to a reprimand by Eve. This reprimand occurred as Eve and Seth went toward paradise, and the wild beast assails Seth. In Eve's reprimand are these words: "Thou wicked beast, fearest thou not to fight with the image of God? . . . How didst thou not call to mind thy subjection? For long ago wast thou made subject to the image of God" (X, 3).

³ *Ibid.*, 2:464.

recounting not only that original dominion of man (9:2) but connecting that to moral uprightness (9:3).¹ Being so related, the loss of moral uprightness through Adam's transgression altered his dominion, but wisdom "gave him strength to get dominion over all things" again (10:1-2).²

Philo in several of his writings expresses similar notions (*Legum allegoriae*, II, 9ff. and *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim*, I, 22).³ But Philo in a remarkable passage acknowledges that the past glory of Adam has diminished (*De opificio mundi*, 148):

. . . seeing that God had fashioned him with the utmost care and deemed him worthy of the second place, making him His own viceroy and Lord of all others. For men born many generations later, when, owing to the lapse of ages, the race had lost its vigour, are none the less still masters of the creatures that are without reason, keeping safe a torch (as it were) of sovereignty and dominion passed down from the first man.⁴

¹ Ibid., 1:549.

² Ibid., 1:550-1.

³ Cf. the brief discussion in *IOTT*, pp. 182-83.

⁴ As quoted by *ibid.*, p. 178. In another portion of this same work Philo (*De opificio mundi*, 140-41) describes a similar evaluation of a loss of past glory. David Winston, ed. and trans., *Philo of Alexandria*, The Classics of Western Spirituality (New York: Paulist Press, 1981), pp. 103-4 (hereafter cited as PA) gives this translation: "Such, I think, was the first man created in body and soul, excelling all the men that now are, and all who have preceded us. For our origin is from men, whereas God created him, and the more excellent the maker, that much better the work. For as that which is in its prime is always better than that whose prime is past, whether animal or plant or fruit or anything else in nature, so the man first fashioned was likely the flower of our entire race, while those who came after no longer attained a like prime, inasmuch as subsequent generations have taken on forms and faculties ever fainter. . . . Generation by generation the powers and qualities both of body and of soul that men receive are feebler."

Last for consideration are two Jewish traditions.

One concerns a restoration or dominion to Noah as had been enjoyed by Adam, based upon *'Aseret ha-Dibrot* 63, MHG (מדרש הגדל . . . ספר בראשית) I, 26 and Raziel 27d.¹ Another concerns the refusal of animals to propagate unless rewarded for their work, indicating a radical alteration in man-animal existence.² Together these two legends underscore the loss of an original dominion and in one case its restoration (the Noah legend).

Rule in an Eschatological Figure

This view of the dominion material is supported by fewer sources, perhaps because the fathers had before them an abundance of other passages of Scripture which functioned as eschatological texts.³ These few sources, however, do indicate a clear interest in eschatological interpretation of the dominion materials.

Selected sources

These few sources have various methods of attributing the idea of dominion to Christ or through Christ to his community. There are several indirect applications of assumed dominion material to Christ, as in Irenaeus (*Irenaeus Against*

¹ Ginzberg, *Legends*, 5:18, n. 53.

² *Ibid.*, 5:54, n. 174.

³ Cf. *IOTT*, p. 200.

Heresies, IV, 34, ii).¹ However, the following represent sources of a more explicit nature.

The Epistle of Barnabas (A.D. 100), VI:

Since, therefore, having renewed us by the remission of our sins, He hath made us after another pattern, [it is His purpose] that we should possess the soul of children, inasmuch as He has created us anew by His Spirit. For the Scripture says concerning us, while He speaks to the Son, "Let us make man after our image, and after Our likeness; and let them have dominion over the beasts of the earth, and the fowls of heaven, and the fishes of the sea." . . . These things [were spoken] to the Son. . . . But He said above, "Let them increase, and rule over the fishes." Who then is able to govern the beasts, or the fishes, or the fowls of heaven? For we ought to perceive that to govern implies authority, so that one should command and rule. If, therefore, this does not exist at present, yet still He has promised it to us. When? When we ourselves also have been made perfect [so as] to become heirs of the covenant of the Lord.²

Tertullian (A.D. 145-220), *An Answer to the Jews*, XIV:

We affirm *two* characters of the Christ demonstrated by the prophets, and as many *advents* of His forenoted: . . . "made a little lower" by Him "than angels" . . . Which evidences of ignobility suit the First Advent, just as those of sublimity do the Second . . . the Father withal afterwards, after making Him somewhat lower than angels, "crowned Him with glory and honour and subjected all things beneath His feet."³

Tertullian Against Marcion, II, 27:

. . . making Him [i.e., Christ] a little lower than the angels, as it is written in David.⁴

¹ Cf. ANF, 1:511.

² *Ibid.*, 1:140-41. The words within brackets are supplied by the translator of this passage.

³ *Ibid.*, 3:172. Words underlined in this citation indicate italicized words within the quotation.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 3:318. Words within brackets are supplied by this writer from the context.

Against Praxeas, IX:

For the Father is the entire substance, but the Son is a derivation and portion of the whole, as He himself acknowledges: "My Father is greater than I." In the Psalm His inferiority is described as being "a little lower than the angels."¹

Against Praxeas, XXIII:

This heaven the Father willed to be His own throne; while He made the Son to be "a little lower than the angels," by sending Him down to the earth, but meaning at the same time to "crown Him with glory and honour," even by taking Him back to heaven.²

Commentary

The ideas which these sources evidence are rather clear. The dominion materials, especially the Psalm 8-Hebrews complex, are consistently applied to Christ. Christ's rulership means his followers shall become perfect as He is perfect (cf. *The Epistle of Barnabas*). In this way the Genesis 1:26-28 account can be understood as speaking "concerning us, while" speaking "to the Son" (cf. *The Epistle of Barnabas*).

But there is equally clear evidence in these sources that even when applied to Christ, the dominion materials raised the promise-fulfillment debate. This problem was resolved by appeal to the two advents (cf. Tertullian, *An Answer to the Jews*). In this way the two advents became a map for charting the historical movement of the promise-fulfillment complex of the dominion materials.

¹ Ibid., 3:603-4.

² Ibid., 3:619.

Restoration of rule

By following this map the restoration of rulership is clearly implied, first in the person of Christ and then, in the community of his followers. For this restoration to happen to his followers they must have supplied to them their deficiency of what their Lord possessed in full measure, perfection. Such restoration of Christ's community was therefore eschatological, since this perfection was not expected by the community until the end.¹

Tradition influences

By the very nature of this view one would most expect to find its development in the context of the Judeo-Christian tradition, not elsewhere.² One source that ought to be cited

¹ This interest in seeing the dominion materials as applying both to Christ and, through Him, to His community may have been occasioned by the exegetical questions raised by the Heb 2 citation of Ps 8. For discussion in an introductory way see *IOTT*, pp. 207-9; Simon Kistemaker, *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Amsterdam: Wed. G. van Soest N.V., 1961), especially pp. 102ff. [cf. the brief synopsis of this dissertation in "News About the University: Dissertations," *Free University Quarterly* 8 (April 1962): 133-341; and numerous articles such as Kenneth J. Thomas, "The Old Testament Citations in Hebrews," *NTS* 11 (1964): 303-25.

² Though mention has not been made of the point, there is some evidence in the fathers of an Adam-Christ typology, the notion that the dominion lost in Adam is regained in Christ; cf. Irenaeus, *Irenaeus Against Heresies* IV, 34. For more full discussion of this point see *IOTT*, pp. 209-11. Added to these remarks should be those of Robert L. Wilkin, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971), pp. 108ff., where is discussed Cyril of Alexandria's explanation of John 1:14; in commenting on this Adam-Christ typology Cyril says: "We became diseased through the disobedience of the first Adam and his curse, but we have become rich through the obedience of the second and his bless-

is 4 Ezra 6:59.¹ The context of this remark argues "that for our sakes thou hast created this world" (6:55). The antecedent of "our" is the elect nation. Therefore, the question is raised, "if the world has indeed been created for our sakes, why do we not enter into possession of our world (59)?" This lack of entering into possession is in stark contrast to the lordship first granted Adam (54). Other apocalyptic influences will be discussed later in chapter three.

Rule as Cultural Expression

This interpretation of the dominion materials understands them as referring to cultural activity, defining such activity as one's relationship to the multiple aspects of creation. The more important question is: Over what aspects does man rule? Various answers are given. Each answer, though, locates the original man in a state of cosmic harmony, as some call chronological primitivism.² The question is whether, and if so, to what degree, man has moved from that original state of harmony.

Selected sources

The question raised above is answered in various ways as the following few sources indicate. In some cases man is

ing" (p. 109); cf. also *ibid.*, p. 113. And these same points are made by Cyril when he says that in Christ there is an ἀνακεφαλαίωσις (recapitulation) of the things in heaven and earth (p. 115).

¹ Charles, *Apocrypha*, 2:579.

² PA, pp. 339-40, n. 103.

depicted as ruling over the *domesticated* animals, in others over a more world-wide domain.¹

Tertullian (A.D. 145-200), *A Treatise on the Soul*, XXXIII:

Now all creatures are the servants of man; all are his subjects, all his dependents.²

The Clementine Homilies (ca. A.D. 230-250), III, 36:

And, moreover, who is lord over the creatures, so far as is possible? Is it not man, who has received wisdom to till the earth, to sail the sea; to make fishes, birds, and beasts his prey; to investigate the course of the stars, to mine the earth, to sail the sea; to build cities, to define kingdoms, to ordain laws, to execute justice, to know the invisible God, to be cognizant of the names of angels, to drive away demons, to endeavour to cure diseases by medicines, to find charms against poison-darting serpents, to understand antipathies?³

Lactantius (A.D. 260-330), *A Treatise on the Anger of God*, XIII:

For all the things of which the world is composed, and which it produces from itself, are adapted to the use of man. Man, accordingly, uses fire for the purpose of warmth and light, and of softening his food, and for the working of iron; he uses springs for drinking, and for baths; he uses rivers for irrigating the fields, and assigning boundaries to countries; he uses the earth for receiving a variety of fruits, the hills for planting vineyards, the mountains for the use of trees and fire-wood, the plains for crops of grain; he uses the sea not only for commerce, and for receiving supplies from distant countries, but also for abundance of every kind of fish. But if he makes use of these elements to which he is nearest, there is no doubt that he uses the heaven also, since the offices even of heavenly things are regulated for the fertility of the earth from which we live. The

¹ For further discussion on these points see the analysis of IOTT, pp. 227ff. The discussion is a very fine treatment of a host of complex problems.

² ANF, 3:214.

³ *Ibid.*, 8:245.

sun. . . . The moon. . . . The other heavenly bodies also.¹

Commentary

These few sources associate the dominion material with cultural activity but not always in the same way. Further, the sources underscore these cultural activities as man's relationship to the immediacies of his environment, those very relationships which man utilizes for his sustenance.

Cultural activities

Tertullian *seems* to assign the cultural activity to animal management (cf. *A Treatise on the Soul*). But his reference is not fully clear and certainly contrasts with the more complete understanding of cultural activity as described by The Clementine Homilies and Lactantius, *A Treatise on the Anger of God*. In these two documents man's dominion is understood as far-reaching. He hunts for sustenance, builds cities, codifies laws, applies medical skills, and puts to new and creative uses the elements of his environment. These passages were selected because they clearly show a very

Tradition influences

Such cultural activity was known in the tradition influences surrounding the fathers. An appropriate place to begin is with opposing attitudes on the development of man

¹ Ibid., 7:269-70.

in Greek literature.¹ One perspective understands man as beginning in a state of bliss and harmony and degenerating. The other (the antipodal view) "holds that man once lived like a wild beast, and only by a gradual ascent with the aid of the arts achieved a more humane and abundant life."² Given these two options Philo seems to follow the former,³ whereas Plato follows the latter (by assigning "the Golden Age to another cosmic era").⁴ The Stoics seem to have followed the perspective assumed by Philo, for Sextus, *Against the Physicists*, I (*Adversus Mathematicos IX*), 28:

And some of the later Stoics declare that the first men, the sons of Earth, greatly surpassed the men of to-day in intelligence (as one may, learn from a comparison of ourselves with men of the past), and that those ancient heroes possessed, as it were, in the keenness of their intellect, an extra organ of sense and apprehended the divine nature and discerned certain powers of the Gods.⁵

Given the perspective as outlined above, Philo, nonetheless, sought to balance the loss of the original state of bliss with the yet evident superiorities of man. Man seems still to bear within himself "endowments of nature that corre-

¹ For discussion of these points see PA, pp. 339-40; IOTT, pp. 248ff.; and the more complete collection of texts in A. O. Lovejoy and G. Boas, *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity* as cited by both of the above sources.

² PA, p. 339.

³ See p. 42, n. 4 above for elucidation of this assertion.

⁴ Cf. PA, pp. 339-40.

⁵ As translated by R. G. Bury, trans., *Sextus Empiricus*, 4 vols., The Loeb Classical Library (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1934), 3:17.

spond to the constellations. He has capacities for science and art, for knowledge, and for the noble lore of the several virtues" (cf. *De opificio mundi*, 82).¹

Philo's understanding is that man still possesses a remnant of resources to serve him in the arts and sciences, i.e., his cultural pursuits. These sentiments about man's cultural activity may be those intended by Sirach 17:1ff.

God created man out of dust, and turned him back thereunto. He granted them a [fixed] number of days, and gave them authority over all things on the earth. He clothed them with strength like unto Himself, and made them according to His own image. He put the fear of them upon all flesh, and caused them to have power over beasts and birds. With insight and understanding He filled their heart, and taught them good and evil. He created for them tongue, and eyes and ears, and he gave them a heart to understand . . .²

Summary

What this survey of dominion material opinion in the ancient period indicates is that many major interpretive options were entertained early in the church's history. Later eras build on these perspectives as these were communicated to later church generations through written traditions. The

¹ As translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, *Philo*, 10 vols. and 2 supplementary volumes, The Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), 1:67.

² Charles, *Apocrypha*, 1:375. For further study on the matter of tradition influences see Donald E. Gowan, *When Man Becomes God: Humanism and Hybris in the Old Testament*, Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series, no. 6 (Pittsburgh: The Pickwick Press, 1975), pp. 12ff.; Jean Danielou, *A History of Early Christian Doctrine Before the Council of Nicaea*, 3 vols., trans. and ed. John A. Baker (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964-77), 1:107ff., 2:107ff.

following analyses of dominion material interpretation will not attempt to be as broad as the above summaries. Rather, those major figures of church thought will be discussed, especially where these individuals forward in a new way the perception of the dominion materials and their attendant application. Further, increasing attention will be paid to the perception of the human agent as he operates in culture. This transition will enable a clearer understanding of the place occupied by the dominion materials within the context of the debate over the cultural mandate.

Medieval Interpretations

The purpose here is not to trace each opinion registered during the medieval period; rather, it is to focus attention on two primary individuals, Augustine and Aquinas, whose ideas permeated the medieval period. In particular these two made seismological analyses about cultural activities for the community of the church and within the context of these analyses interpreted the dominion materials.¹

¹ Some might question the appropriateness of Augustine's inclusion in the medieval period. To be sure there is debate about the inclusion, cf. M. C. D'Arcy et al., *Saint Augustine* (reprinted; New York: Meridian Books, Inc., 1958), p. 15: "St. Augustine has often been regarded as standing outside his own age--as the inaugurator of a new world and the first mediaeval man, while others, on the contrary, have seen in him rather the heir of the old classical culture and one of the last representatives of antiquity. There is an element of truth in both these views, but for all that he belongs neither to the mediaeval nor to the classical world. He is essentially a man of his own age . . ." But, while cautioned by this remark, the discussion will include Augustine in the medieval period because his views on culture are forward-looking, pointing toward the medieval configurations of culture.

Augustine

Evaluation of Augustine¹ must begin with the momentous events surrounding the fall of Rome. In this general context his remarks on the dominion material can be understood.

Context of interpretation

The fall of Rome signaled the "break-down of city-state culture."² This calamity was the historical setting for Augustine's *The City of God*. Cyprian years before had predicted the demise of the existing city-state culture in his *To Demetrian* 3:

. . . the world has grown old, does not enjoy that strength which it had formerly enjoyed, and does not flourish with the same vigor and strength with which it formerly prevailed. . . . In the winter the supply of rain is not so plentiful for the nourishment of seeds; there is not the accustomed heat in the summer for ripening the harvest. . . . To a less extent are slabs of marble dug out of the disembowelled and wearied mountains. . . . The farmer is vanishing and disappearing in the fields . . . Do you think that there can be as much substance in an aging thing, as there would have flourished formerly, when it was still young and vigorous with youth? . . . This sentence has been passed upon the world; this is the law of God; that all things which have come into existence die; and that those which have increased grow old; and that the strong be weakened; and that the large be diminished; and that when they have been weakened and diminished they come to an end.³

¹ For an excellent biographical treatment see Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo* (reprinted; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975).

² John C. Raines, *The Cosmic Kingdom in the Rise of the Christian Interpretation of the State: A Study of the Interaction of Religious and Political Mythology from Hebraic Prophetism through John Calvin* (Th.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York, 1967; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 67-12, 176, 1981), p. 127 (hereafter cited as CKRS).

³ Schopp, *Fathers*, 36:169-70.

Cyprian, writing one and one-half centuries in advance of Augustine, clearly anticipated the reality of the latter's day, the changing cultural configuration. But how could one account for this change?

The accounting of Rome's fall that Augustine gave based itself upon a polarity, a dramatic contrast so well-liked by one interested in rhetoric.¹ This polarity in his understanding led him to construct pairs. In his analysis of culture he saw a pair, culture's end and order.² The fall of Rome gave assured evidence of culture's end. But just as surely this end was but part of a larger order.

This same polarity is evidenced in Augustine's two cities, *civitas dei* and *civitas terrena*. Mankind itself (*De vera religione*, XXVII, 50) was of two *genera* corresponding to "the crowd of the impious who bear the image of the earthly man,' and 'the succession of men dedicated to the one God.'"³ These two groups of people form two societies, and each of these societies "loves a common end which all its members are associated together to obtain."⁴ This point is illustrated

¹ Cf. the discussion on this point by R. A. Markus, *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1970), pp. 45ff.

² Cf. the discussion of *CKRS*, p. 128.

³ For this citation see Markus, *Saeculum*, p. 45.

⁴ Etienne Gilson, *The Christian Philosophy of Saint Augustine*, trans. L. E. M. Lynch (New York: Random House, 1960), p. 173. Augustine's own words are (*The City of God*, XIV, 28): ". . . two societies have issued from two kinds of love. Worldly society has flowered from a selfish love which dared to despise even God, whereas the communion of saints is

by Augustine (*The City of God*, IV, 3):

Let us imagine two individuals--for each man, like a letter in a word, is an integral part of a city or of a kingdom, however, extensive. Of these two men, let us suppose that one is poor, or, better, in moderate circumstances; the other extremely wealthy. But, our wealthy man is haunted by fear, heavy with cares, feverish with greed, never secure, always restless, breathless from endless quarrels with his enemies. By these miseries, he adds to his possessions beyond measure, but he also piles up for himself a mountain of distressing worries. The man of modest means is content with a small and compact patrimony. He is loved by his own, enjoys the sweetness of peace in his relations with kindred, neighbors, and friends, is religious and pious, of kindly disposition, healthy in body, self-restrained, chaste in morals, and at peace with his conscience. I wonder if there is anyone so senseless as to hesitate over which of the two to prefer. What is true of these two individuals is likewise true of two families, two nations, two kingdoms; the analogy holds in both cases.¹

What bonds society together for Augustine is love.

Therefore, "if we give the name 'city' to any group of men united by a common love for some object, we say that there are as many cities as there are collective loves."² Thus man's love unites him with others whose love is of the same object. These all pursue common societal goals. And for Augustine there are but two loves. In the case of the *civitas dei* one is uncertain whether the Church is this city.³ With

rooted in a love of God that is ready to trample on self. In a word, this latter relies on the Lord, whereas the other boasts that it can get along by itself" (cf. Schopp, *Fathers*, 14:410).

¹ For this translation see *ibid.*, 8:193-94.

² Gilson, *Augustine*, p. 172.

³ For discussion of this problem see *CKRS*, pp. 151ff.

On balance the better view seems to be that the visible institutional church is not co-extensive with the *civitas dei*. And this is not surprising since "society" and "church" are not co-extensive.

respect to the *civitas terrena* it seems best not to define it as the State.¹ Therefore, the two loves bond together two societies, not Church and State.²

But if these two societies through their two loves are so distinct, do they in fact share anything in common? At first glance it might appear that there is no common level. But as Gilson points out, these two societies find their common ground at the level of earthly life:

Here below, inhabitants of the city of God seem to be identified with those who dwell only in the earthly city. How, indeed, could they help this? They are men like the others: their bodies need their share of the material goods for which the earthly city has been organized. They share, then, in its order and peace and, along with other men, benefit from the advantages that city provides and bear the burdens it imposes. And yet, in spite of an apparently common life, the two peoples dwelling together in the same earthly city never really mix. Citizens of the heavenly city live with the others but not like them. Even though they perform actions which are outwardly the same, they do them in a different spirit. Those who live only the life of the old man look upon the goods of the earthly city as ends to be enjoyed; for those in the same city who lead the life of the new man born of grace, these same goods are merely means which they use and refer to their true end.³

¹ Ibid., pp. 150ff. For further extended discussion of the *civitas terrena* see Markus, *Saeculum*, pp. 45-71.

² Thus with respect to the *civitas dei* "Augustine had sketched the outline of the ideal form of human society, consisting in the concord and peace of righteous men living in union among themselves under God and in God's presence. What need was there to expound the precise status of the many imperfect forms of human association which, in all their variety, inevitably failed to measure up to this ideal?" (ibid., p. 65).

³ Gilson, *Augustine*, p. 176. Gilson's expanded illustrative statement reflects Augustine's succinct remark in *The City of God*, I, 35: "On earth, these two cities are linked and fused together, only to be separated at the Last Judgment" (Schopp, *Fathers*, 8:72).

The final question to be raised about the interpretive context of Augustine's analysis of dominion materials is this: If these two societies co-exist on earth in this way, what achievements may the *civitas dei* expect? Answers to this question vary.¹ Generally speaking, Augustine's answer is after the sentiments expressed in *The City of God*, XIX, 17:

The heavenly city, meanwhile--or, rather, that part that is on pilgrimage in mortal life and lives by faith--must use this earthly peace until such time as our mortality which needs such peace has passed away. As a consequence, so long as her life in the earthly city is that of a captive and an alien (although she has the promise of ultimate delivery and the gift of the Spirit as a pledge), she has no hesitation about keeping in step with the civil law which governs matters pertaining to our existence here below.²

Equally clear is the intent of *The City of God*, XV, 1:

For, the true City of the saints is in heaven, though here on earth it produces citizens in whom it wanders as on a pilgrimage through time looking for the kingdom of eternity. When that day comes it will gather together all those who, rising in their bodies, shall have that kingdom given to them in which, along with their Prince, the King of Eternity, they shall reign for ever and ever.³

The interpretation flowing out of these citations operates against the conversionist or transformation motif usually associated with Augustine.⁴ Augustine here again

¹ For discussion cf. *CKRS*, pp. 157-60. J. N. Figgis, *The Political Aspects of St. Augustine's 'City of God'* (London: Longmans & Green, 1921), p. 80, stresses the view that Augustine entertained development of a Christian Empire, thus correlating the *civitas dei* with a christianized Church-State.

² Schopp, *Fathers*, 24:226-27.

³ *Ibid.*, 14:415.

⁴ For discussion on the transformational interpretation of Augustine see Niebuhr, *Christ*, pp. 207ff.: "Nevertheless, the interpretation of Augustine as the theologian of cultural

posits his polarity, now and then, the present community of believers waits for the future appearance of its kingdom. Augustine thus maintains a consistent antithesis. For him the individual believer exerts cultural influence through law-abiding. But the corporate redeemed community finds its *home* in the coming kingdom. Van Til's assessment, therefore, is judicious: "In Augustine we never find an antagonism to culture as such, but he takes the offensive when confronted by an antagonistic culture whose triumph would imply the liquidation of Christianity."¹

Interpretation of dominion materials

The following selected sources are to be interpreted in light of this evident polarity of Augustine's thought. Although the above analysis is certainly not the only contributing influence in his evaluation of dominion materials (others would be his allegorical hermeneutic and his monastic perspective), the polarity of his thought is a significant influence.

Selected sources

Augustine's writings are voluminous. Only these few

transformation by Christ is in accord with his foundational theory of creation, fall, and regeneration, with his own career as pagan and Christian, and with the kind of influence he has exercised on Christianity" (p. 208). Niebuhr's interpretation may be overly optimistic! And Webber, *Saint*, pp. 138-44 has seemingly followed Niebuhr's lead. Note in this connection the more mediating position of Van Til, *Culture*, pp. 87-88. And last, note the alternate view expressed by CKRS, pp. 160ff.

¹ Van Til, *Culture*, pp. 87-88.

citations are offered as a somewhat normative expression of his handling of dominion materials.

The City of God XII, 24:

When God made man according to His own image, He gave him a soul so endowed with reason and intelligence that it ranks man higher than all the other creatures of the earth, the sea, the air, because they lack intelligence.¹

Confessions, XIII, 23:

Now, that "he judges all things,"--that means that he has dominion over the fish of the sea and the fowl that fly in the heavens, and all domestic and wild animals, and every part of the earth, and all creeping creatures that move upon the earth. This he exercises by virtue of the understanding of his mind, through which he "perceives the things that are of the Spirit of God." Otherwise, "man when he was in honor did not understand; he has been compared to senseless beasts, and made like to them." . . . Thus, man, though now spiritual and "renewed unto the knowledge of God, according to the image of his Creator," should be a "doer of the law" not a judge. Nor does he judge concerning that differentiation, namely, of spiritual and carnal men, who are known to Thine eyes, our God, and have not yet appeared to us in any works, that we might know them from their fruits. . . . Therefore, man, whom thou hast made in Thy image, has not received dominion over the lights of the heavens, or over that hidden heaven, or over day and night, . . . or over the gathering of the water which is in the sea; but he has received dominion over the fish of the sea, and the fowl that fly in the heavens, and all beasts, and every part of the earth, and all creeping things which creep over the earth . . . The spiritual man judges, then, by approving what he finds wrong, in the works and behavior of the faithful, in their almsgiving, which is like the earth yielding its fruit; and he judges the living soul when its affections have been made meek in chastity, in fastings, and in holy cognitions upon those things which are perceived through the bodily senses. He is now said to judge concerning those things over which he holds the power of correction.²

¹ Schopp, *Fathers*, 14:290. Though the citation does not explicitly mention "dominion" wording, it certainly calls to mind the Gen 1:26-28 complex.

² The reason for this extensive quotation is that it so nicely joins together major elements in Augustine's interpretations of dominion materials: his allegorical hermeneu-

*Discourse On Psalm 8, 12:*¹

Thou has subjected all things under his feet. In saying *all things* the Psalmist excepts nothing. And for fear there might be room for understanding him otherwise, the Apostle commands us to believe it in this sense, saying: He is excepted who put all things under Him. To the Hebrews also he adduces the testimony of this very Psalm, wishing it to be understood that all things are so subjected to our Lord Jesus Christ that nothing is excluded.²

Commentary

Much contained within these citations is self-evident. Very self-evident is Augustine's implementation of the allegorical hermeneutic. This leads him to make imaginative, if not profound, remarks about dominion passages. But especially, this hermeneutic allows him to understand dominion terminology in keeping with the polarity of his thought. For Augustine (*Confessions*) dominion is exercised by the spiritual man as he approves the right and disapproves the wrong. This rule is understood to be a power wielded over those things of which man has the power of correction. This procedure for ruling is in keeping with the social-religious practices of the members

tic, his interpretation of "image" as man's rational capacities, and his application of seemingly divergent materials to the polarity of his thought. For this translation see *ibid.*, 21:437-49. For a more expansive treatment of "image" see Augustine's *The Trinity*, XIV 1-19 in *ibid.*, 45:411-49.

¹ Although no inclusions are given from Augustine's discourses on Genesis (this remark on Ps 8 and Heb 2 is sufficient), for further elucidation see Augustine, *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim*, trans. into French with notes by Paul Agahesse and A. Solignac, 2 vols. (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1972).

² For this translation see Quasten, Burghardt, and Lawler, *Writers*, 29:105. The underlined words indicate italicized words within this quotation. What follows in Augustine's commentary on Ps 8 gives further indication of his allegorical hermeneutic.

of *civitas dei* as they co-exist on earth with members of the other city. Albrecht Dihle sees in Origen a similar assessment; "the church has to bear witness to the existence of perfect and divine justice in the night, that is to say, when injustice and struggle still dominate the earth."¹ The church possesses not the power to establish a universal rule of God's justice. The task of the members of *civitas dei* is to live in keeping with God's norms, showing the results of those norms in society on earth, but always living with the realization that no christianized State-Church on earth is possible.²

A further point of commentary concerns Augustine's interpretation of the Psalm 8-Hebrews 2 dominion complex. Clearly (cf. his *Discourse on Psalm 8*) he interprets the material christologically, not anthropologically.³ But by use of an allegorical hermeneutic no particular interpretive problems are created, because, in assembling the Genesis 1-Psalm 8-Hebrews 2 materials, the shift from man to Christ is entirely legitimate.

Aquinas

The movement from Augustine to Aquinas must be accounted for, covering as it does so many centuries. Custom-

¹ Wilhelm Wuellner, ed., *The Center for Hermeneutical Studies* (Berkeley: The Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, 1974), Colloquy X: *Greek and Christian Concepts of Justice*, by Albrecht Dihle, p. 25.

² Cf. the excellent discussion of *ibid.*, pp. 25-28.

³ Cf. the discussion of *IOTT*, pp. 207-9.

arily, Aquinas' view of culture is interpreted in a way opposite that of Augustine. So Niebuhr says that "Aquinas, who is probably the greatest of all the synthesists in Christian history, represents a Christianity that has achieved or accepted full social responsibility for all the great institutions."¹ This contrast between these two thinkers may be explained by a brief outline of transitional figures whose thought represents the movement from Augustine to Aquinas.

The first of these, Pope Gelasius I toward the end of the fifth century "in a letter to the Eastern Emperor speaks of the '*potestas duplex*'—the one power with two aspects--which rules the *unum corpus* of society."² This effectively placed within one body two jurisdictions. His opinion is in some respects like the sanction issued in 554 by Justinian in which restoration of civil order was obtained through the church hierarchy:

§ 12. The bishops and chief men shall elect officials for each province who shall be qualified and able to administer its government, etc.³

The second of these transitional individuals is Stephen of Tournai who applies the meaning of Augustine's "two cities" in a new way. Stephen says the two cities or

. . . peoples are the two orders in the church, the clergy and laity. The two ways of life are the spiritual and the

¹ Niebuhr, *Christ*, p. 128.

² *CKRS*, pp. 169-70.

³ Cf. Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar H. McNeal, *A Source Book for Medieval History* (New York: n.p., 1905; reprint ed., New York: AMS Press, 1971), p. 87.

secular, the two authorities are the priesthood and the kingship, the two jurisdictions are the divine and human laws (canon and civil law). Give each its due and all things will agree.¹

And the third of these transitional individuals is Otto of Freisingen who frankly admits that he has

composed the history no longer of two cities, but almost entirely of one—which I call the Church (Ecclesia). For I should not, as before (i.e., in Augustine), speak of these two cities as two (since the elect and reprobate are now in one home), but strictly as one. . .²

In these three persons one is able to trace the conceptual movement from Augustine to Aquinas.

Context of interpretation

To understand the immediate context within which Aquinas interpreted dominion material several general analyses are necessary. Initially it is important to see that society and State are neutral institutions, since they are founded in the very nature of man. Man "is by nature a social or political being, born to live in community with his fellows."³ Thus, because society is founded in man's nature

¹ As quoted by CKRS, p. 171.

² As quoted by *ibid.*, p. 172.

³ The assessment about Aquinas by Copleston, *History*, 2:413. This opinion is in keeping with *De regimine principum*, I, 1: "It is natural for man to be a political and social animal, to live in a group. . . . For all other animals nature has prepared food, hair as covering, teeth, claws. . . . Man, on the other hand, was created without any natural provision for these things . . . one man alone is not able to procure them for himself for one man could not sufficiently provide life, unassisted. It is, therefore, natural that man should live in company with his fellows" (as quoted by CKRS, p. 200).

as God created him, society must be willed by God. This is, of course, also true of government. Therefore, society and government are not the result of sin's entrance so much as they are the result of the very nature God gave man in creation.

Further, the State has a God-given common good at which it aims: peace, unified direction of citizens' activities, and provisions for the sustenance of its citizenry.¹

In *De re qimine principum* the common good is summarized as a virtuous life.² But this is not the *final* end of man. That "end is entrusted to Christ and His Church, so that under the new Covenant of Christ kings, must be subject to priests."³ The *final* end of man is to attain unto divine enjoyment. The State cannot achieve this final end, but through its provisions for virtuous living the State does not impede, rather enhances, achievement of the *final* end. Therefore, the State facilitates the *final* end, which end is the Church's work. In this way the Church has indirect power over the State.⁴

Finally a word must be said about *originalis justitia* in Aquinas. In *Summa Theologica*, Ia. 95, 1 Aquinas defines this original justice: "For this rightness was a matter of the reason being submissive to God, the lower powers to the

¹ Copleston, *History*, 2:415.

² *Ibid.*, 2:416.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Cf. the entire discussion of *ibid.*, 2:412-22.

reason, the body to the soul."¹ This original justice was altered by the fall (*Summa Theologica*, Ia2ae. 85, 3):

Through the gift of original justice the spiritual part, in man had perfect hold over the inferior powers of soul, while it itself was perfected by God as being subjected to him. As has been said, original justice was taken away by the sin of the first parents. As a result all the powers of the soul are in a sense lacking the order proper to them, their natural order to virtue, and the deprivation is called the "wounding of nature."²

Divine grace is understood to address and correct this "wounding."

Interpretation of dominion materials

As will be seen, the citations taken from *Summa Theologica* are interpreted by Aquinas in ways consistent with his beliefs: (1) that man by nature is born to be in community, an organized community of persons; (2) that the Church, with a supportive, subservient role played by the State, serves man's final end; and (3) that the entrance of sin produces a lacking in the original justice whereby things naturally subject to man began to withstand him.

Selected sources

The one work of Aquinas dealing with the concept of dominion in some detail is *Summa Theologica*, Ia. 96, 1-4. The following selections from this source are given in the order of their appearance in articles 1-4.

¹ As translated in Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, 60 vols. (New York: Blackfriars in conjunction with McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963), 13:109 (hereafter cited as *STH*).

² *Ibid.*, 26:89-91.

Article 1: Did man hold sway¹ over the animals in the state of innocence?

. . . there is what Genesis says of man: "Let him rule the fishes of the sea, and the birds of the sky and the beasts of the earth," . . . As we have seen, things that ought to be subject to man started disobeying him as a punishment on him for his own disobedience to God. And so in the state of innocence before this first disobedience nothing that should naturally be subject to him withstood him. Now all the animals are naturally subject to man . . . since man is above the other animals, as one made to God's image, other animals are properly subjected to his government. . . All animals have a certain share of shrewdness and reason in proportion to their connatural power of assessing things; it is in virtue of this that cranes and wild geese follow their leader, and bees obey their queen. And thus all animals would of their own accord have obeyed man then in the same way that some domestic animals do now.²

Article 2: Did he hold sway over every creature?

In some way or another all things are in man, and therefore in the measure that he holds sway over what is in himself, in the same measure it falls to him to hold sway over other things. . . . Now it is reason in man that holds the sway, and is not subject to it. So man did not hold sway over the angels in the original state, and by "every creature" we must understand everything not made in God's image.³

Article 3: Would all men have been equal in the state of innocence?

. . . in the original state, which would have been supremely well ordered, you would have found disparity. . . . , disparity of sex . . . disparity of age . . . mental and moral differences . . . disparity in physical qualities . . .⁴

Article 4: Would men have held sway over men in that state?

. . . it is not derogatory to the state of innocence that man should lord over man. . . . lording it can be taken as relative to any sort of subjection in general, and in this

¹ The term "sway" translates the Latin *dominium*, meaning "control" or perhaps "ownership" (cf. *ibid.*, 13:221).

² *Ibid.*, 13:123-27.

³ *Ibid.*, 13:127-29.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 13:129-33.

sense even the man who has the office of governing and directing free men can be called a lord. . . . man is naturally a social animal, and so men in the state of innocence would have lived in social groups. But many people cannot live a social life together unless someone is in charge to look after the common good.¹

Commentary

In these citations a predictable pattern of interpretation of the dominion ideas emerges. Aquinas understood creation to have order. This exact ordering develops from the very nature God gave his objects of creation. Man by his nature holds dominion over animals by reason of rational capacity. And God made animals with a nature in concord with man's.

But there is equally impressive evidence that dominion in the state of innocence includes dominion of man over man. This dominion is a part of the very nature of what God has given. Hence, the state of innocence and any restorative work of grace following the fall is consistent with dominion of certain men over other men. Therefore, Aquinas interprets these dominion materials consistently with his understanding of the divine ordering of State and Church to achieve the final end. Thus, after the fall, the work of grace through the Church is able to restore both the lack of "original justice" and the establishment of dominion by some over others to achieve the final end God intends. These facts being so, Aquinas views the dominion materials as allowing for a societal, cultural structuring to achieve divine ends. To be

¹ Ibid., 13:133-35.

sure, he does not argue that the dominion account in Genesis 1:26-28 exegetically demands this view.

Summary

The medieval interpretations of dominion materials yield two contrasting patterns. The one (Augustine) emphasizes a witness of redemptive light against the darkness of human culture. The other (Aquinas) asserts the dominion over culture to achieve the final end which God intends. These two interpretations are not entirely new; in fact their antecedents are found in the ancient period of interpretation. What is new is the heightened sense of disparity between two potential views of the dominion materials as they relate to culture. What does not seem so divergent in the ancient period is very disparate in the medieval.

Modern Interpretations

The previous analyses have spent considerable time in analyzing the interpretive context out of which dominion materials were studied. The purpose of this section is to survey what appear to be three interpretive streams concerning dominion materials. These streams are associated with elements working concurrently in the Reformation era in the persons of Martin Luther, John Calvin, and leaders of the Anabaptist movement.¹ These three streams of interpretation represent

¹ Webber, *Saint*, pp. 75-165, refers to these three streams as three models for correlating Christ and culture: separational, identificational, and transformational. These three models correspond roughly to the Anabaptists, Luther, and Calvin respectively.

general movements finding expression in the twentieth century. Again, the method employed here will be to treat primary sources but in a more cursory way. As well, less space will be given to the interpretive context, although in each case that will be accounted for in a summary way.

Martin Luther

Luther's works are so expansive as to make one fear saying anything definitive about him. Added to this is the problem of the occasional and explosive nature of his writings wherein he wrote as the occasion demanded.¹ Undoubtedly this reality has been the occasion of finding either seemingly contrary material in Luther² or at least differing schools of interpretation on a given idea within Luther's thought.³ The following summary analysis of Luther's thought is fully aware of these implicit dangers in reading Luther.

Context of Interpretation

Central to understanding Luther's interpretive context is his idea of the "two kingdoms."⁴ Luther himself says:

¹ Cf. the discussion of *CKRS*, pp. 235-37.

² Cf. such a view as expressed by Niebuhr, *Christ*, p. 170.

³ Cf. the listing of interpreters who take opposing views of Luther's view of social ethics in *CKRS*, p. 237.

⁴ For more extensive treatment of Luther's thought see the following rather divergent treatments: Paul Althaus, *The Ethics of Martin Luther*, trans. Robert C. Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972); Heinrich Bornkamm, *Luther and the Old Testament*, trans. Eric W. and Ruth C. Gritsch (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969); Gerhard Ebeling, *Luther:*

. . . we must divide the children of Adam and all mankind into two classes, the first belonging to the kingdom of God, the second to the kingdom of the world. Those who belong to the kingdom of God are all true believers who are in Christ and under Christ . . . All who are not Christians belong to the kingdom of the world and are under the law. For this reason God has provided for them a different government beyond the Christian estate and kingdom of God. He has subjected them to the sword so that, even though they would like to, they are unable to practice their wickedness, and if they do practice it they cannot do so without fear or with success and impunity.¹

Luther understood these two kingdoms as two God-ordained governments. "Both," argued Luther, "must be permitted to remain; the one to produce righteousness, the other to bring about external peace and prevent evil deeds."²

If, then, there are two kingdoms, how are these joined? Or more precisely, what is the Christian's relationship to the State? Luther's answer is that one submits to government for the sake of his neighbor. Therefore,

An Introduction to His Thought, trans. R. A. Wilson (London: William Collins Sons & Co., 1970; Fontana Library of Theology & Philosophy, 1972); Kenneth Hagen, *A Theology of Testament in the Young Luther: The Lectures on Hebrews*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, vol. 12 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974); William A. Mueller, *Church and State in Luther and Calvin* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1954; New York: Anchor Books, 1965). Two further sources on Luther's thought as it more directly applies to the present discussion are CKRS, pp. 235-322 and Webber, *Saint*, pp. 113-27.

¹ From Luther's *Temporal Authority: To What Extent it Should be Obeyed*, 1523, as translated in Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehmann, gen. eds., *Luther's Works*, 55 vols. (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959-67), 45:88-90 (hereafter cited as *LW*). In *An Open Letter on the Harsh Book Against the Peasants* Luther even marvels that some do not understand the concept of his two kingdoms: "I have written this so often that I am surprised that there is anyone who does not know it or remember it" (cf. *ibid.*, 46:69).

² *Ibid.*, 45:92.

. . . the Christian submits most willingly to the rule of the sword, pays his taxes, honors those in authority, serves, helps, and does all he can to assist the governing authority; that it may continue to function and be held in honor and fear.¹

The result is for the benefit of one's neighbor. Thus

. . . he performs all other works of love which he himself does not need . . . he serves the governing authority not because he needs it but for the sake of others, that they may be protected and that the wicked may not be worse.²

Therefore, the Christian's role is this. "In society the believer functions under the rule of God immediately by obeying the laws of creation and mediately by living in submission to God's appointed rulers in the land."³ The two kingdoms are in reality two aspects of the same existence.

To conclude, when Luther emphasizes the two kingdoms, he means that, while there are two spheres with respective domains of influence, the Christian "must affirm both in a single act of obedience to the one God. . . ."⁴

Interpretation of dominion materials

Predictably Luther interprets the dominion materials in light of his "two kingdoms" concept. This point is especially clear in the first of the selected sources.

¹ Ibid., 45:94. In *An Open Letter on the Harsh Book Against the Peasants* Luther describes this kingdom of the world as "a kingdom of wrath and severity. In it there is only punishment, repression, judgment, and condemnation to restrain the wicked and protect the good" (cf. *LW*, 46:69-70).

² Ibid.

³ The appropriate summary of Webber, *Saint*, p. 117.

⁴ Niebuhr, *Christ*, p. 172.

Selected sources

Luther's interpretation of the dominion materials is far less allegorical than his predecessors, especially Augustine. "Luther's greatest achievement in the history of biblical interpretation is his mistrust of the allegorical method.¹ However, Luther was not above employment of allegory in explaining Scripture.² Both the allegorical and non-allegorical are evidenced in these sources. Both types of hermeneutic are employed within the context of the "two kingdoms."

Temporal Authority: To What Extent it Should be Obeyed:

. . . over what is on earth and belongs to the temporal, earthly kingdom, man has authority from God; but whatever belongs to heaven and to the eternal kingdom is exclusively under the Lord of heaven. Neither did Moses forget this when he said in Genesis 1 [1:26], "God said, 'Let us make man to have dominion over the beasts of the earth, the fish of the sea, and the birds of the air.'" There only external dominion is ascribed to man. In short, this is the meaning as St. Peter says in Acts 4 [5:29], "We must obey God rather than men."³

Lectures on Genesis (1:26):

Here the rule is assigned to the most beautiful creature, who knows God and is the image of God, in whom the similitude of the divine nature shines forth through his enlightened reason, through his justice and his wisdom. Adam and Eve become rulers of the earth, the sea, and the air. But this dominion is given to them not only by way of advice but also by express command. . . . Therefore the naked human being . . . was given the rule over all birds, wild beasts, and fish. Even this small part of the divine image we have lost. . . . Among the saints there is evident in this life some knowledge of God. Its source is the

¹ Bornkamm, *Luther*, p. 249.

² Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 247-60.

³ *LW*, 45:111.

Word and the Holy Spirit. But the knowledge of nature--that we should know all the qualities of trees and herbs, and the dispositions of all the beasts--is utterly beyond repair in this life. . . . What we achieve in life, however, is brought about, not by the dominion which Adam had but through industry and skill. Thus we see the birds and the fish caught by cunning and deceit; and by skill the beasts are tamed. . . . even now, by the kindness of God, this leprous body has some appearance of the dominion over the other creatures. But it is extremely small and far inferior to that first dominion. . . . Therefore we retain the name and word "dominion" as a bare title, but the substance itself has been almost entirely lost. Yet it is a good thing to know these facts and to ponder them, so that we may have a longing for that coming Day when that which we lost in Paradise through sin will be restored to us.¹

Lectures on Hebrews, 2:7:

A great number of teachers, especially Jerome and, at different times, Augustine, Ambrose, and Chrysostom, seem to understand it as referring to mankind alone. But we state briefly that though it is possible to understand this verse in an improper sense as referring to man, . . . yet in the proper sense this verse can be understood only as referring to Christ. . . . Therefore the meaning is this: Thou madest Him to be forsaken and deserted by God or the angels, and not for a long time but for a little while, yes, less than a little while, that is, for a very short time, namely, for three days, because Thou didst deliver Him over into the hands of sinners.²

Commentary

What these sources yield about Luther's understanding of the dominion materials may be conveniently grouped about three ideas: his interpretive matrix, his definition of "dominion," and his diachronic treatment of dominion materials.

¹ Ibid., 1:66-67. A bit more allegorical treatment of Psalm 8 is given by Luther in *First Psalm Lectures*, cf. *LW*, 10:89-90.

² Ibid., 29:125-27. For further discussion on this subject of Luther's interpretation of Heb 2:7 see Hagen, *Lectures on Hebrews*, pp. 93-96.

The first of these concerns the "two kingdoms" concept which allows Luther to assign "dominion" to the work of the temporal, earthly kingdom. Within this kingdom the fall affected man's dominion; in this case, therefore, the restorative grace of God finds future application.

The second of these ideas, his definition of "dominion," is best summarized by the word "rule." This rule was granted by divine fiat, and therefore, as a consequence of the fall, the dominion is removed by divine fiat. Further, this "rule" springs from man's being made in God's image, and a part of that image is man's rational capacity. This being so, if man loses dominion, Luther must be understood to say that the fall had noetic effects. More precisely this rule of man, by virtue of his rational capacity, Luther understood to be man's ability to know the nature of animals. He lost this capacity along with ability to *control* them.

A third idea about Luther's view is his diachronic treatment of the dominion materials themselves. The origin of dominion is divine fiat; the loss of dominion is a consequence of the fall. Therefore, dominion presently is more a title than a substance. The rule is almost entirely lost, only in a faint way resembling the original dominion. If at the present man appears to have dominion, it must be attributed more to man's industry and skill than to his *dominion*. In the future, however, dominion will be restored to man because Christ will restore all things lost in Paradise.

In light of this summary Luther's contribution to the

interpretive history of the dominion materials is twofold: his emphasis on the noetic implications of the fall for understanding dominion and his diachronic treatment of the dominion materials themselves. This latter point is a most important contribution.

John Calvin

The biographical details of Calvin's life are well known. However, the nature of his thought is not as well known, due, no doubt, to its complexity.¹ For purposes of this study the general nature of Calvin's thought may be developed along three lines.²

Context of interpretation

The first formative element of his thought is his attention to order. He developed sensitivity to the collapse of *corpus Christianum*. In his mind confusion and reformation were mutually exclusive.³ Calvin in his commentary on John 12:31 alludes to this conception:

Now we know that out of Christ there is nothing but confusion in *the world*. And though Christ had already begun to erect the kingdom of God, yet His death was the com-

¹ A similar sentiment is expressed by Webber, *Saint*, p. 145.

² I am indebted here to the very helpful analysis of *CKRS*, pp. 323-94. Note an alternate appraisal which nonetheless draws similar conclusions in Webber, *Saint*, pp. 144-48. Cf. also the discussion, though not as helpful, of Niebuhr, *Christ*, pp. 217-18.

³ *CKRS*, pp. 323-28.

mencement of a well-regulated condition and the full restoration of the world.¹

At Geneva this conception of order as issuing from *ordo salutis* was implemented in a re-forming of life's totality. John Knox in a letter to his wife, dated Dec. 9, 1556, shows that the Scottish reformer was duly impressed by this ordering of society in Geneva.² Calvin understood that all of life (religion and culture) stood subject to the ordinance of salvation.

The second element is Calvin's understanding of "in-different things," to use an expression employed by Duns Scotus and taken from the Stoics.³ These ἀδιάφοροι are to be used to God's glory as his revealed will indicates. This use of the cosmos is in keeping with the utilitarian purpose of creation.⁴ All of creation is to be used for the purpose of God's glory.⁵ Thus, the world is open for investigation, and

¹ John Calvin, *Calvin's Commentaries*, 22 vols., trans. John King et al. (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1843; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979), 18:36. The underlined words indicate italicized words within the quotation.

² In the letter Knox wrote to his wife that Geneva was a "place, whair I nether feir nor eschame to say is the most perfect schoole of Chryst that ever was in the earth since the dayis of the Apostillis. In uther places, I confess Chryst to be trewlie preachit; but manneris and religioun so sinceirlye reformat, I have not yit sene in any uther place . . ." For this account see the letter in David Laing, ed., *The Works of John Knox*, 6 vols. (Edinburgh: James Thin, 1895; Los Angeles: Images Enterprises, n.d.), 4:240.

³ CKRS, p. 363.

⁴ For discussion of Calvin's understanding of this point see T. F. Torrance, *Calvin's Doctrine of Man*, new ed. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957), pp. 24-25.

⁵ So Calvin argues in *Institutes of the Christian Religion* I.V.6: "Let us therefore remember, whenever each of us

it must be shaped by the order of ultimate priority, God's glory.¹

A third line of Calvin's thought concerns the congruity he finds between *Lex Dei* and *Lex naturae*. These two laws form Calvin's "two swords" doctrine in which the laws of God and nature conjoin.² What forges this conjoining is common responsibility to the Word of God.³ Calvin, therefore, says:

. . . civil government has as its appointed end, so long as we live among men, to cherish and protect the outward worship of God, to defend sound doctrine of piety and the position of the church, to adjust our life to the society of men, to form our social behavior to civil righteousness, to reconcile us with one another, and to promote general peace and tranquility.⁴

contemplates his own nature, that there is one God who so governs all natures that he would have us look unto him, direct our faith to him, and worship and call upon him." Cf. this translation in John Baillie, John T. McNeill, and Henry P. Van Dusen, gen. eds., *The Library of Christian Classics*, 26 vols. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), vols. 20 and 21: *Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion*, by John Calvin, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, 20:58 (hereafter cited as *INST*),

¹ *CKRS*, p. 365. So Calvin says in *Institutes of the Christian Religion* III.X.1: ". . . but inasmuch as Scripture gives general rules for lawful use, we ought surely to limit our use in accordance with them" (*INST*, 20:720).

² *CKRS*, p. 377.

³ So August Lang, "The Reformation and Natural Law," *Calvin and the Reformation*, ed. William P. Armstrong (Princeton: The Princeton Theological Review Association, 1909; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980), p. 70 says: "if . . . for the state and for law as well as for other things, despite all accidental differences, still the eternal norm is to be found in the rightly understood revelation of the divine will in Scripture."

⁴ See *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, translated in *INST*, 21:1487.

And, of course, the church is directed by the normative precepts of Scripture.¹

Interpretation of dominion materials

The context within which Calvin interprets the dominion materials is that of the order established by *ordo salutis*, the doctrine of "indifferent things," and the doctrine of "two swords."

Selected sources

Numerous passages on dominion material interpretation could be cited from Calvin's works. Those that follow are selected to indicate something of the breadth of his understanding of dominion. These selections on their very surface indicate Calvin's grammatical exegesis.

Psychopannychia:

I hear that some triflers say that the image of God refers to the dominion which was given to man over the brutes, and that in this respect man has some resemblance to God whose dominion is over all. . . . But Scripture does not allow its meaning to be thus evaded.²

Institutes of the Christian Religion, I.XIV.22:

. . . from Moses we hear that, through His liberality, all things on earth are subject to us [Gen. 1:28; 9:2]. It is certain that He did not do this to mock us with the

¹ Cf. John Calvin, "The Word Our Only Rule," *The Mystery of Godliness and Other Selected Sermons* (New York: S. & D. A. Forbes, 1830; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1950), pp. 67-80.

² John Calvin, *Calvin's Tracts and Treatises*, 3 vols., trans. Henry Beveridge (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1851; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1958), 3:423.

empty title to a gift. Therefore nothing that is needful for our welfare will ever be lacking to us.¹

Commentaries Upon the First Book of Moses (1:26):

And let them have dominion. Here he commemorates that part of dignity with which he decreed to honour man, namely, that he should have authority over all living creatures. He appointed man, it is true, lord of the world; but he expressly subjects the animals to him, because they, having an inclination or instinct of their own, seem to be less under authority from without. The use of the plural number intimates that this authority was not given to Adam only, but to all his posterity as well as to him. And hence we infer what was the end for which all things were created; namely, that none of the conveniences and necessities of life might be wanting to men. . . . Yet, that he often keeps his hand as if closed is to be imputed to our sins.²

Commentary upon the Book of Psalms (8:6):

The only thing which now remains to be considered is, how far this declaration extends--that all things are subjected to men. Now, there is no doubt, that if there is any thing in heaven or on earth which is opposed to men, the beautiful order which God had established in the world at the beginning is now thrown into confusion. The consequence of this is, that mankind, after they were ruined by the fall of Adam, were not only deprived of so distinguished and honourable an estate, and dispossessed of their former dominion, but are also held captive under a degrading and ignominious bondage. Christ, it is true, is the lawful heir of heaven and earth, by whom the faithful recover what they had lost in Adam; but he has not as yet actually entered upon the full possession of his empire and dominion. Whence the apostle concludes, that what is here said by David will not be perfectly accomplished until death be abolished.³

¹ *INST*, 20:182.

² Calvin *Calvin's Commentaries*, 1:96.

³ *Ibid.*, 4:106. For a helpful discussion of Calvin's messianic interpretation of the Psalms (though not directly Ps 8) see S. H. Russell, "Calvin and the Messianic Interpretation of the Psalms," *SJT*. 21 (1968): 37-47.

Commentary

A synthesis of Calvin's view must include these few points. Calvin defines dominion not as mere control over animals but as an appointment to a position of royalty, a lordship, a distinguished and honorable estate. This appointment was for a purpose, to do service to one's Creator. In this sense, there is a teleological orientation to man's in this appointment. Adam was not the sole recipient of this purpose, rather, mankind was. Moreover, mankind's purpose must be seen in the context of God's liberality. God furnished mankind with all conveniences necessary for the fulfillment of this purpose.

Further, Calvin gives, as did Luther, a diachronic treatment to the dominion materials. These are interpreted within Calvin's restoration model, the "Creation-Fall-Redemptive Restoration" motif. The redemptive restoration aspect may be further analyzed as being composed of two chronological elements: *now*, a partial exercise of dominion (death is still present), and *then*, a complete exercise of dominion (death is abolished).

Calvin, then, forcefully presents the restorative theme. For him the dominion materials are to be interpreted as but another evidence of the restored order springing from the *ordo salutis*. There is a *transformation* of creation wrought by redemption, a redemption one day to be fulfilled in Christ's complete exercise of dominion.

The Anabaptists¹

Analysis of the Anabaptist approach to dominion material must of necessity differ a bit from the preceding analyses. The reasons for this necessity will become clear momentarily. Much of our attention must be given to the general Anabaptist interpretive context. Then brief evaluation of dominion material allusions will prove helpful.

Context of interpretation

To understand Anabaptism in general terms one must pay attention to four of its interpretive orientations: the "two kingdoms" orientation, the New Testament orientation, the ecclesiastical orientation, and a pessimistic cultural orientation. The first of these is alluded to in *The Schleitheim Confession* (1527), article 4:

For truly all creatures are in but two classes, good and bad, believing and unbelieving, darkness and light, the world and those who [have come] out of the world, God's temple and idols, Christ and Belial; and none can have part with the other.²

The hymn (Sattler, 1535-40), "When Christ with His Teaching True," indicates this same sentiment.³ More precisely is

¹ The Anabaptists have been grouped together because their theological formulations are not to be found in great, sweeping systematic statements; rather the statements are scattered and personal. Thus, greater benefit comes from syntheicizing a "theology" from a host of sources. This same conclusion is reached by Cornelius Krahn, "Prolegomena to an Anabaptist Theology," *MQR* 24 (January 1950): 5ff.

² W. R. Estep, ed., *The Reformation: Luther, the Anabaptists*, Christian Classics series (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1979), P. 326.

³ For the German words (and their English translation) of this song see John H. Yoder, ed. and trans., *The Legacy of*

this formulation stated in *A Waterlander Mennonite Confession of Faith* (1580), article XXXVII:

Government or the civil Magistrate is a necessary ordinance of God (a), instituted for the government of common human society and the preservation of natural life and civil good, for the defense of the good and the punishment of the evil. We acknowledge, the word of God obliging us, that it is our duty to reverence magistracy (b) and to show to it honor and obedience in all things which are not contrary to the word of God (c). It is our duty to pray the omnipotent God for them (d), and to give thanks to him for good and just magistrates and without murmuring to pay just tribute and customs (e). This civil government the Lord Jesus did not institute in his spiritual kingdom, the church of the New Testament, nor did he join it to the offices of his church (f): nor did he call his disciples or followers to royal, ducal or other power . . . but everywhere they are called away from it . . .¹

The second orientation that provides helpful understanding is the Anabaptists' orientation toward the New Testament. Whereas "Calvinism approaches the Bible as a whole, a revealed unit, . . . Anabaptism views the whole from the New Testament. The Old Testament is preparatory to the New Testament."² This concentration on the New Testament is because there the message of Christ is found, and He alone is able to place one

Michael Sattler, *Classics of the Radical Reformation*, no. 1 (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1973), pp. 140-45.

¹ This translation is found in Estep, *The Reformation*, p. 409. For further discussion of the "two kingdoms" see Guy F. Hersberger, ed., *The Recovery of the Anabaptist Vision* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1957); James M. Stayer, *Anabaptists and the Sword* (Lawrence, KS: Coronado Press, 1972); and the article by Clarence Bauman, "The Theology of 'the Two Kingdoms': A Comparison of Luther and the Anabaptists," *MQR* 38 (January 1964): 37-49 and 60. Cf. also *The Schleithem Confession*, article 6 concerning the sword, Estep, *The Reformation*, pp. 327-29.

² Krahn, "Prolegomena to an Anabaptist Theology," 9.

into the kingdom of God.¹

From this a third orientation naturally follows, a special concentration on the church.² Inclusion in the church required imitation of Christ through discipleship.³ These disciples, collected into the church, represented the important nucleus of what God was doing.⁴ This church represented those who were reclaimed from the loss initiated by Adam. And these church members followed Christ.

A fourth orientation was their pessimistic cultural perspective. Within the circle of Anabaptism was at least some interest in "the relation of man to the universe, and of both to God."⁵ For some these questions over relationship

¹ Cf. the letter of Michael Sattler written to Capito and Bucer in 1526-27 as translated in Yoder, *Legacy*, pp. 21-24 for confirmation of this point.

² This correlation is clearly made in a remark in 1531 by Hans Pfistermeyer, an Anabaptist minister: "The New Testament is more perfect than the Old, and the Old was fulfilled and interpreted by Christ. Christ has taught a higher and more perfect doctrine and made with His people a New Covenant. Therefore, whatever is found in Christ's doctrine and life, I shall recognize as binding for the Christian, and whatever is found otherwise, I shall not so recognize," as quoted by Gordon D. Kaufman, "Some Theological Emphases of the Early Swiss Anabaptists," *MQR* 25 (April 1951): 84.

³ Cf. J. Denny Weaver, "Discipleship Redefined: Four Sixteenth Century Anabaptists," *MQR* 54 (October 1980): 255-79.

⁴ Therefore Menno Simons could say on his deathbed "that nothing on earth was as precious to him as the church"; from N. Van der Zijpp, "The Conception of our Fathers Regarding the Church," *MQR* 27 (April 1953): 91. For further discussion on the church see Franklin H. Littell, "The Anabaptist Doctrine of the Restitution of the True Church," *MQR* 24 (January 1950): 33-52.

⁵ E. Gordon Rupp, "Thomas Muntzer, Hans Huth and the 'Gospel of All Creatures,'" *BJRL* 43 (March 1961): 494.

issued in a "gospel of All Creatures" which understood that "the whole world with all the creatures is a book in which a man may see in the work, all those things which are read in the written book."¹ But perhaps the predominant view of culture is that it is "man's autonomous creation and setting of values."² Culture is a Classical-Renaissance construction, not a Christian.³ Therefore, culture is not a part of kingdom theology, since the former misses "the essentials of Christ's message and world outlook."⁴ None of this implies that Anabaptists are disinterested in cultural activities. To the contrary they were interested in activities such as education, but they emphasized the gap between Christ and culture.⁵

Interpretation of dominion materials

Because of the scarcity of primary source material, one must understand these interpretations as *allusions* to dominion materials. Hubmaier in his *Christliche Lehrtafel* (1526) said: "The image of God is not altogether erased in us."⁶

¹ As quoted by *ibid.*, 515.

² Hershberger, *The Recovery of Anabaptist Vision*, p. 113.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Cf. the discussion in *ibid.*, pp. 219-36. For a brief synopsis of Anabaptism's view of the Christ-culture question see Webber, *Saint*, 86-96. Anabaptism's cultural views still find interesting expression in the contemporary world, *ibid.*, pp. 96-103.

⁶ The German runs: "Die Bildung [Bild] Gottes ist je noch nicht gar in uns ausgewischt." For this see Robert

Two selections from Menno Simons are a bit more helpful. In his *Foundation of Christian Doctrine* (1539), II. A, he refers briefly to a dominion passage:

God in the beginning made man after His image, incorruptible, placed him in Paradise, and subjected all creatures to him. Then when he had been beguiled by the serpent, he was gladdened and comforted at the thought of the coming Conqueror and Saviour Christ.¹

Later in this same work (II. G) he writes of things appropriate for man's use: ". . . to which end these things are created by God and given to the use of men."²

There is nothing within these interpretations that would be other than one would expect. They emphasize a focus on a New Testament, Christocentric interpretation, utilizing these passages for the church, whose members realize the existence of a gap between the Kingdom of God and culture.

Summary

In these three (Luther, Calvin, and the Anabaptists) are representatives of three distinct views of culture. Luther identified religion and culture by claiming the two are but aspects of one existence. The Christian man satisfies both

Friedmann, *The Theology of Anabaptism*, Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History, no. 15 (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1973), pp. 59 and 75.

¹ Menno Simons, *The Complete Writings of Menno Simons*, trans. Leonard Verduin and ed. John C. Wenger (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1956), p. 144.

² *Ibid.*, p. 183. For further study on Menno Simons' theology see J. A. Oosterbaan, "The Theology of Menno Simons," *MQR* 35 (July 1961):187-96 and 237 and Henry Poettcker, "Menno Simons' Encounter with the Bible," *MQR* 40 (April 1966):112-26. trans. Leonard Verduin and ed. John

religion and culture in a single act of obedience. Calvin understood culture to be the object religion should transform as the latter obeyed Scripture. The Anabaptists emphasized the separateness of religion and culture, the former being the Christian man's true object of concern. Each of these three indicates that cultural perception provides the context for interpreting the dominion materials.

Recent Interpretations

This survey would not be complete without special mention of a host of recent materials on culture and dominion. The list of individuals below whose views are summarized is not exhaustive; it is merely suggestive for further research, research beyond the bounds of this work. The procedure will be simply to suggest a skeletal outline of the individual's cultural and dominion material views.

Karl Barth

The general outlines of Barth's thought are well known.¹ His starting point is the otherness of God, which asserts itself in the very relationship God sustains with his creation; the Creator is "over against the world."² This "over-againstness" provides freedom for man to make use of nature without fearing he tampers with the divine. "We are

¹ His general views with respect to the Creator-creation-fall-redemption complex are nicely summarized in Norman Young, *Creator, Creation and Faith* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), pp. 82-102.

² *Ibid.*, p. 86.

set free to prove, test and inquire, to gain knowledge and to develop the science and technology that makes use of the world and its resources.”¹

One ought never to equate any human activity with the work of God.² Salvation fits this schema by being defined as "God's gracious election of all humankind to participation his kingdom."³ This salvation rids the world of the chaos and nothingness that resulted from man's rebellion. Man's rebellion, namely his attempt to bridge the chasm between God and man, produced chaos and nothingness in the creation because the rebellion tried to obliterate the Creator-creation distinction, a distinction to which the creation itself had testified.

Therefore, bearing in mind the Creator-creation distinction, one cannot Christianize culture. That would be to make it divine, which it is not. The most that can be done is to humanize it.⁴ In this light Barth interprets dominion material, an example of which is from his discussion of Genesis 1:26-28.

More than this must not be read into man's dominion over the beasts. Man is not their Creator; hence he cannot be their absolute Lord, a second God. In his dignity and position he can only be God's creaturely witness and

¹ Ibid., p. 95.

² However, when Barth faced the likes of Hitler this point about his theology certainly was of least pragmatic importance (cf. *ibid.*, p. 97).

³ Donald-G. Bloesch, "Soteriology in Contemporary Christian Thought," *Int* 35 (April 1981):133.

⁴ Cf. the discussion of *ibid.*, 134-35.

representative to them. . . . He can carry out a commission. But he does not possess the power of life and death; the right of capital punishment. Man's lordship over the animals is a lordship with internal and external limitations. . . . Nor does the sage wish to say anything about an expansion of human lordship beyond the animal kingdom. . . . It is thus foreign to the passage when Gunkel discerns here "the whole programme of the cultural history of the human race" . . .¹

Here is clear evidence that Barth's interpretation stresses both the Creator-creation distinction and the non-Christianizing of culture.²

Dietrich Bonhoeffer

Students of Bonhoeffer are in disagreement over the exact interpretation to be given to his works.³ Therefore, the following summary is offered with a bit of caution.⁴ For

¹ Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, Vol. 3: *The Doctrine of Creation*, Part 1, eds. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, trans. J. W. Edwards et al. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1958-69), pp. 187 and 205.

² For a helpful discussion of philosophical background material valuable in the interpretation of Barth see S. U. Zuidema, "Man in Philosophy," *Free University Quarterly* 5 (March 1958):77-96.

³ For a discussion of the interpretive problems related to Bonhoeffer studies see Clifford J. Green, *The Sociality of Christ and Humanity: Dietrich Bonhoeffer's Early Theology, 1927-1933*, American Academy of Religion Dissertation Series, no. 6 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1972), pp. 1-42.

⁴ For an excellent, brief synopsis of the details of Bonhoeffer's biography which so profoundly influenced his theology see William W. Butler, *A Comparison of the Ethics of Emil Brunner and Dietrich Bonhoeffer With Special Attention to the Orders of Creation and the Mandates* (Ph.D. dissertation, Emory University, 1970; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 71-15, 591, 1970), pp. 234-48. A much more complete account is that of Eberhard Bethge, *Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, trans. Eric Mosbacher et al., ed. Edwin Robertson (New York: Harper & Row, 1970).

purposes of this summary attention should be given to Bonhoeffer's notion of freedom, a fundamental relationship between God and man. This freedom is a relationship whereby the Creator sees His image mirrored in man who is created free.¹ This freedom is given man for the Creator's benefit. "In the language of the Bible, freedom is not something man has for himself but something he has for others."² This is the meaning of "being free for the other." God, on the other hand, "in Christ is free for man."³ The freedom of man, as expressed in relationship to the rest of creation, is a freedom *from* it.⁴

That means that he is its master, he has command over it, he rules it. And here is the other side of man's created likeness to God. Man is to rule--of course as over God's creation, as one who receives the commission and power of his dominion from God. . . . But my freedom from it consists in the fact that this world, to which I am bound as a lord to his servant, as the peasant to his soil, is subjected to me, that I am to rule over the earth which is and remains my earth, and the more strongly I rule it the more it is my earth . . . Technology is the power with which the earth grips man and subdues him. And because we rule no more, we lose the ground, and then the earth is no longer our earth, and then we become strangers on earth. We do not rule because we do not know the world as God's creation, and because we do not receive our dominion as God-given but grasp it for ourselves. . . . Man's being-free-for God and the other person and his dominion over it is the image of God in the first man.⁵

¹ Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Creation and Fall; Temptation*, trans. John C. Fletcher and Kathleen Downham (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959), p. 37.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid., p. 39.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 39-40. The underlined words indicate italicized words within the quotation.

For Bonhoeffer the fall of man, then, includes the fall of nature. Nature is without her lord and therefore rebellious.¹

These few points summarize Bonhoeffer's thought on the dominion materials. Dominion is the concurrent being-free-for and being-free-from. The moment one grasps his dominion for himself, he loses it. Man's dominion is exercised by using creation, though not in harshness, since creation is man's brother.²

Emil Brunner

There is hardly justice in so briefly summarizing Brunner's conception of culture since it is a subject in much of his writing.³ Being duly cautioned against over-generalization, one may sketch Brunner's understanding of culture as follows. Man's nature impels him to create culture.⁴ This impulse to create culture is a spiritual impulse to create implanted within man at his creation. "Hence culture is both God's gift and man's appointed duty."⁵ Through use of his rational capacity man fulfills the purpose of his being by

¹ Ibid., p. 85.

² Ibid., p. 40.

³ Cf. the following works of Brunner: *Christianity and Civilisation*, Part 2 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949); *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption, Dogmatics*, Vol. 2, trans. Olive Wyon (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1952); *The Divine Imperative*, trans. Olive Wyon (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1947); and *Man in Revolt: A Christian Anthropology*, trans. Olive Wyon (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1947).

⁴ Brunner, *The Divine Imperative*, p. 484.

⁵ Ibid.

creating culture. "Reason can only realize itself in freedom --that is, in the fact that man seizes the opportunity provided by his own powers."¹ In every rational act this freedom lives. However, this reason when divorced from faith makes idols out of culture.² "The more splendid the system of culture which man erects the more it tends to beget the pride which claims equality with God."³ For this reason faith is always critical towards culture. Then, what is the Christian's relationship to culture? Brunner summarizes an answer:

It is not the business of the believer as such to create culture. That is rather the task of man, apart from faith; or rather, it is not so much a task as it is the result of a sense of compulsion. But since the believer, the Christian, must express his faith not outside, but inside the natural orders and in things as they are, to him too it becomes a positive duty to help to create culture in accordance with its own laws.⁴

In this way "faith" serves a regulative function within culture.⁵ Thus, in a *restricted* sense one is able to speak of "Christian" cultural activity.

In keeping with this analysis of cultural activity Brunner interprets the dominion materials. An example from Brunner's *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption* sufficiently shows this sort of interpretive correlation.

¹ Ibid., 485.

² Cf. the discussion of Butler, *A Comparison*, pp. 204-5.

³ Brunner, *The Divine Imperative*, p. 488.

⁴ Ibid., p. 489. The underlined word indicates an italicized word within the quotation.

⁵ Ibid., p. 490.

Because man . . . has been created in the image of God, and for communion with the Creator, therefore he may and should make the earth subject to himself, and should have dominion over all other creatures. The call to create civilization which this involves is not indeed the essence of real humanity, but it is its necessary presupposition. Man is only capable of realizing his divine destiny when he rises above Nature and looks at it from a distance . . . man also loses his true human quality when he believes that this consists in his mastery of Nature, in his civilization, or even in his technics. . . . When . . . man seeks his supreme end in culture and civilization, and puts this in place of God, and turns it into an absolute, the germ of inhumanity has been introduced into his life. . . . True civilization and true culture can only develop where the cultural creation and activity is directed and ordered from a centre which transcends culture.¹

Therefore Brunner sees dominion partially expressed in human cultural activity and fully expressed when man seeks his true end which is to transcend this cultural activity. In this way reason and faith are coordinated.

Paul Tillich

The method of Tillich is that of correlation, emphasizing in the case of this discussion the correlation of religion and culture.² Religion for Tillich "is being ultimately concerned about that which is and should be our ultimate concern."³ Being grasped by this ultimate concern is faith. This existential concept of religion causes the gap between the sacred and secular to disappear.

¹ Brunner, *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption*, pp. 67-68.

² Young, *Creator, Creation and Faith*, p. 103.

³ Paul Tillich, *Theology of Culture*, ed. Robert C. Kimball (London: Oxford University Press, 1959), p. 40.

If religion is the state of being grasped by an ultimate concern, this state cannot be restricted to a special realm. The unconditional character of this concern implies that it refers to every moment of our life, to every space and every realm. The universe is God's sanctuary. Every work day is a day of the Lord, every supper a Lord's supper, every work the fulfillment of a divine task, every joy a joy in God. In all preliminary concerns, ultimate concern is present, consecrating them. Essentially the religious and the secular are not separated realms. Rather they are within each other. But this is not the way things actually are. In actuality, the secular element tends to make itself independent and to establish a realm of its own. And in opposition to this, the religious element tends to establish itself also as a special realm. . . . One could rightly say that the existence of religion as a special realm is the most conspicuous proof of man's fallen state.¹

Then how are religion and culture to be correlated in this life? Tillich concludes that "religion is the substance of culture, culture is the form of religion."² Because of Tillich's interest in an existential definition of religion and culture, his attention in a direct way to dominion materials *per se* is virtually non-existent.³ However, he does assign somewhat of a dominion status to man, more exactly a pre-eminent position in ontology.⁴ This means man's preeminence is so because he is able to ask the ontological question and find its answer. All of this is, of course, a considerable distance from the dominion materials within Scripture!

¹ Ibid., pp. 41-42.

² Ibid., p. 42. For further study on Tillich's view of culture, see Richard Quinney, "The Theology of Culture: Marx, Tillich, and the Prophetic Tradition in the Reconstruction of Social and Moral Order," *USQR* 34 (Summer 1979) : 203-14.

³ Cf. Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols. in 1 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1967), 1:168-89 as a confirmation of this assessment.

⁴ Young, *Creator, Creation and Faith*, p. 105.

Summary

There are certainly others whose views could be summarized.¹ But these few demonstrate a recent interest in the whole question of culture and in giving some innovative twists to views on culture that are ancient. What is clearly evident in this recent literature is an existential understanding of religion, culture, and dominion materials. Again there is clear indication that perception of culture is very influential in one's selection of a given view of the dominion materials.

Concluding Assessment

There are but two factors to note in this survey. The first concerns the general categories of interpretation given to the dominion materials. Most of the views are very ancient. These are viewing (1) dominion as a present possession, (2) dominion as *subordinate* in man and *preeminent* in God, (3) dominion as a promise fulfilled in various persons and ways, (4) dominion as lost or diminished, (5) dominion as materialized in an eschatological figure, and (6) dominion as a cultural expression.

¹ See for example Jurgen Moltmann as his views are expressed in his *Man*, trans. John Sturdy (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974). For a recent assessment of cultural matters in theological discussion see also Stephen Mayor, "Jesus Christ and the Christian Understanding of Society," *SJT* 32 (February 1979):45-60. For a brief analysis of the cultural views of Process and Liberation Theology, see Bloesch, "Soteriology in Contemporary Christian Thought," 137-40. For other analyses of Liberation Theology see Gary Parker, "Evangelicals Blossom Brightly amid El Salvador's Wasteland of Violence," *Christianity Today* 25 (8 May 1981):34-35 and Alistair Kee, *A Reader in Political Theology* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974), pp. 92-112.

Augustine introduced into the discussion of the dominion materials the idea of polarity (in his case the polarity of the two "cities"). This notion of (7) polarity is so pervasive an element that from the days of Augustine onward it influenced dominion interpretation. Aquinas built upon this polarity but introduced into dominion interpretation the notion of man ruling man, or (8) a religious institution ruling over other earthly institutions in order to achieve divine ends. Luther, still operating under the shadow of Augustinian polarity, stressed more clearly the importance of (9) treating the dominion materials diachronically (a notion incipient in the ancient eschatological interpretation of dominion). Calvin stressed the importance of understanding (10) dominion as being a restoration, an expression of obedience to the divine precepts of Scripture. In an alternate way the Anabaptists stressed (11) a Christocentric (i.e., New Testament) interpretation of dominion, while viewing culture as merely a Classical-Renaissance construction. Finally, several recent interpreters have stressed the importance of (12) understanding dominion existentially because religion and culture were so understood. These twelve interpretive elements should not be understood as expressions found only in these individuals. Rather, these individuals have tended to highlight the respective interpretive points.

A second factor to be noted in this historical survey of dominion interpretation is the impact made upon dominion interpretation by seemingly tangential concerns. The various

interpretations give indication of having been influenced by the cultural milieu of the interpreter, by perceptions of culture in general, by ecclesiastical concerns current in a given period of history, by philosophical perspectives. That is, the history of dominion interpretation indicates in a rather profound way the scope and degree to which one's interpretation of Scripture is impacted by one's milieu, cultural, ecclesiastical, philosophical, and otherwise.

Therefore, it is fitting that one's own milieu be clearly focused upon before studying closely the dominion materials. Chapter two of this work attempts to do just this. The word "philosophic" is an attempt to give a broad designation to a host of concerns that form the milieu of this study of dominion materials. What will be indicated more clearly in the following chapter is already somewhat evident: The interpreter is never objective in the sense that he stands apart from this milieu. Rather he constantly interacts between the milieu and the Biblical text.

CHAPTER II

A PHILOSOPHIC PERSPECTIVE

The intention of this chapter is to engage in both analytic and speculative matters. The analytic matters concern matters of definition and distinction. Speculative matters concern summary of a working model of a world-and-life-view (*Weltanschauung*).¹ This Kuyper referred to as a "life-system."² It involves a coherent ordering of the totality of the known. Within this life-system one does his interpretive work. The issues raised here are so broad and pervasive that all the interpreter is and does finds habitation within these issues. This life-system as the ordering milieu is where the following discussion begins.

¹ James Orr, *Christian View of God and the World* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897), p. 3 comments on the implication of *Weltanschauung*, meaning "view of the world." He says: ". . . whereas the phrase in English is limited by nature, in German the word is not thus limited, but has almost the force of a technical term, denoting the widest view which the mind can take of things in the effort to grasp them together as a whole from the standpoint of some particular Philosophy or theology." Therefore it is in this sense a world-wide (*Weltanz*). For a brief history of the term *Weltanschauung* see *ibid.*, pp. 365-67.

² This reference was made by Kuyper during his 1898 Stone Lectures at Princeton Seminary. Cf. Abraham Kuyper, *Lectures on Calvinism* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1931), pp. 9-40.

Man's Life in an Order

Man as Contextualized

The Genesis 1 and 2 creation account assures man that he is contextualized.¹ This appears true on the surface of things. Being created by his Creator, man sees that he is brought into this creation order as an integral part of what is. Both the creation and the fall accounts assure man that he is not divine. He is good (pre-fall, Gen 1:31) but not divine. Man's habitation is not his in the sense of origin, for man's world (in the sense of habitation) is God's world in the sense of origin, sustenance, and consummation.² To be sure, this Creator has graciously provided for man's fashioning activity, but man is still within God's world. Even Psalm 19 assures that this creation is God's in a most unique revelatory sense. Thus the very being of man is conditioned to exist *within* an environment which may be described as created by God, mediately sustained by Him, and to be consummated by Him.

¹ The appeal is made here to Scripture because this Word of God, as Van Til (*Culture*, p. 157) says, is "the final reference point for man's thinking, willing, acting, loving and hating, for his culture as well as his cultus." However, there is the prevailing pessimism of modern man that he lives in chaos and that his relationship is with chaos. Heidegger's authentic man reflects this pessimism as *Angst* brings upon him the realization of his fatedness, death. Camus underscored the idea that the cosmos is a chaotic absurdity. Sartre spoke of nausea over life's mere trifling facticity. For a brief discussion on meaninglessness in recent literature see E. W. Kemp, ed., *Man: Fallen and Free* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1969), pp. 59-77.

² This conception is succinctly summarized by the trilogy of prepositions in Rom 11:36: ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα· αὐτῷ ἢ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν.

Man is dependent

What relationship this contextualization of man suggests is a *dependent* relationship, after the model described in Colossians 1.¹ Man within this context is dependent in terms of his whole history (origin, existence, and goal). Kalsbeek, therefore, says that "since creaturely being, in origin, existence and goal, is essentially dependent being, we can say that 'being is meaning.'"² To say that "being is meaning" means nothing more than to say that being is dependent; that is, being is created as dependent in order that it might point beyond itself to its Creator, Sustainer, and Finisher. This dependency stands in sharp contrast to the Thomistic conception that being has meaning, that is that being has independent meaning as a within-itself.

Within a whole

This notion of dependency may be taken a step further. As man lives out this dependent existence in this cosmos he is confronted with a state of affairs, the very notion implicit

¹ This point is corroborated by H. Wheeler Robinson in his discussion on "The Hebrew Conception of Nature" in his work, *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946; Oxford Paperbacks, 1963), p. 1: "The Hebrew vocabulary includes no word equivalent to our term 'Nature.' This is not surprising, if by 'Nature' we mean 'The creative and regulative physical power which is conceived of as operating in the physical world and as the immediate cause of all its phenomena.' The only way to render this idea into Hebrew would be to say simply 'God.' . . . In fact, we may say that such unity as 'Nature' possessed in Hebrew eyes came to it through its absolute dependence on God, its Creator and Up-holder."

² L. Kalsbeek, *Contours of a Christian Philosophy* (Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1975), p. 81.

in Psalm 19: "Every item that man meets in his temporal horizon is already interpreted by God."¹ There in the very face of his habitation man is confronted by the owner of the estate and this owner has interpreted his estate. Though the *details* of ownership by God are there, what strikes man in his "theoretical analysis, through which reality appears to split up into various modal aspects . . . is the original *indissoluble interrelation* among these aspects."² That is, the reality of man's context has an inter-relatedness; there is a wholeness, an order. Thus, as Kuyper says, the world of phenomena is organic.³ Even in man's naive experience he discerns the modes⁴ of the cosmos as a whole.⁵

¹ From Cornelius Van Til's response to Herman Dooyeweerd, "Cornelius Van Til and the Transcendental Critique of Theoretical Thought," in *Jerusalem and Athens*, ed. E. R. Geehan (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974), p. 109.

² Herman Dooyeweerd, *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought*, 4 vols., trans. David H. Freeman and William S. Young (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1969), 1:3.

³ Abraham Kuyper, *Principles of Sacred Theology*, trans. J. Hendrik de Vries, with an introduction by Benjamin B. Warfield (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Company, 1954), p. 28.

⁴ The word "modes" is used here in the general sense of *modus quo*, "manner in which." By this is meant the "manner or way in which a thing exists or functions, and not a thing itself" (Kalsbeek, *Contours*, p. 350). Of these manners or ways Dooyeweerd identified fifteen: Arithmetic, spatial, kinematic, physical, biotic, sensitive, analytic, historical, lingual, social, economic, aesthetic, juridical, ethical, and pistic. For discussion of these see Dooyeweerd, *New Critique*, 2:3-426; Kalsbeek, *Contours*, pp. 35-43; and J. M. Spier, *An Introduction to Christian Philosophy* (Nutley, NJ: The Craig Press, 1966), pp. 30-130.

⁵ Cf. the discussion of *ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

Within an "ordered" whole

Now one cannot merely say that man, as dependent, is contextualized in a whole. One must go on to say that the whole which confronts him is nonetheless an ordered whole. This is clear in the creation account itself in Genesis 1 and 2. Man sustains a relationship to animals, an ordered relationship. And animals are in an ordered relationship with vegetation. And between Adam and Eve there is this same ordered relationship as well. In this latter case there is even a microcosmic societal ordering. And man, male and female, stands in a given ordered relationship to the Creator. So in each case the order is there and is determined by the Creator.

The context, therefore, in which man lives is an ordered context. In this way the fall may be partially understood as a radical re-ordering of relationship with a penal consequence. Genesis 3 (especially vss. 8ff.) describes the consequences of the fall in terms of an alteration by divine fiat of the original ordered relationships. Redemption then may be partially understood by re-arrangement of the fallen ordering. Thus in creation, fall, and redemption there is an ordered relationship, a divinely ordered one.¹ In this light Van Til argues:

If the creation doctrine is thus taken seriously, it follows that the various aspects of created reality must sustain such relationships to one another as have been ordained between them by the Creator, as superiors, infe-

¹ Of course, viewed from the perspective of divine decree these various ordered relationships are but one homogeneous divine whole, not manifestations of contingency plans.

riors or equals. All aspects being equally created, no one aspect of reality may be regarded as more ultimate than another.¹

No, not as more ultimate than another, but certainly ordered. Thus it is true, as Schnackenburg says, that "the Bible views man precisely as a creature and as the crown of God's creative act in the midst of the world."²

Within a law-structured whole

Thus the creation account assures man that he lives in an *ordered whole* and that this order is designed by the Creator. And man's dependence is to be viewed from within this whole. Now the question is: Is one able to say any more about this ordered whole? Obviously there is a long history to man's analysis of this ordered whole. Each historical period of philosophic thought has entertained the analysis, some with more seriousness than others. As is well known, Plato argued for the existence of Forms in which objects within

¹ Cornelius Van Til, *The Defense of the Faith* (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1955), p. 27.

² Rudolf Schnackenburg, "Man Before God: Toward a Biblical View of Man," in *Man Before God: Toward a Theology of Man, Readings in Theology*, compiled at the Canisianum (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1966), p. 3 (underlined words indicate italicized words within the quotation). However, the naming of the animals may be understood as man's ordering (*ibid.*, p. 11), yet even the naming can only be in keeping with the order that the Creator established for these beasts. Therefore, the remark of Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis, The Old Testament Library*, revised edition based on the 9th German edition (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1972), pp. 82-83 that the naming refers to a re-creation of order out of chaos misses the point, it seems to this writer. The creation account, rather, emphasizes an order into which man is placed.

nature participated as copies. This perception of the ordered whole is the foundation of Plato's famous "cave allegory" as recounted in his *Republic*, VII.¹ Lucretius in his *De Rerum Natura*, III, wrote that the ordered whole should be understood as an atomistic materialism:

And since I have shown of what kind are the beginnings of things, and in how varying and different shapes they fly of their own accord driven in everlasting motion, and how all things can be produced from these . . .²

That man *is*, therefore, means that he is submerged into this atomistically conceived materialism.

In a contrasting way the answer of idealism as expressed by George Berkeley has been offered. Idealism has generally argued that nature should be conceived as reduced to the experiences of individuals. As such the *material* world does not possess real existence. Toward the end of the first of his *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous* Berkeley has this exchange:

Phil. Ideas then are sensible, and their archetypes or originals insensible.

Hyl. Right.

Phil. But how can that which is sensible be like that which is insensible? Can a real thing in itself *invisible* be like a *colour*; or a real thing which is not *audible*, be like a *sound*? In a word, can any thing be like a sensation or idea, but another sensation or idea?

Hyl. I must own, I think not.

Phil. Is it possible there should be any doubt in the

¹ For translation of this book of the *Republic* see Francis MacDonald Cornford, trans., *The Republic of Plato*, 1st American ed., 2nd printing (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), pp. 227-35.

² For this translation see Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura*, trans. W. H. D. Rouse, The Loeb Classical Library (London: William Heinemann, 1924), p. 173.

point? Do you not perfectly know your own ideas?

Hyl. I know them perfectly; since what I do not perceive or know, can be no part of my idea.

Phil. Consider therefore, and examine them, and then tell me if there be anything in them which can exist without the mind: or if you can conceive anything like them existing without the mind.

Hyl. Upon inquiry, I find it is impossible for me to conceive or understand how anything but an idea can be like an idea. And it is most evident, that no idea can exist without the mind.

Phil. You are therefore by your principles forced to deny the reality of sensible things, since you made it to consist in an absolute existence exterior to the mind. That is to say, you are a downright sceptic. So I have gained my point, which was to show your principles led to scepticism.

Hyl. For the present I am, if not entirely convinced, at least silenced.¹

Clearly materialism and idealism give answers that are in sharp contrast. Typically, however, dualism has been offered as the way of perceiving the nature of things. Generally, dualism divides what is here into two categories: the physical (spatial) and the non-physical (mind or consciousness). This is the understanding Rene Descartes developed in his *Meditations on First Philosophy*, meditations five and six, and his *The Passions of the Soul*, especially articles XXX-XXXII.²

Others, however, emphasized that nature should not be conceived as static, but rather dynamic (laying claim to

¹ George Berkeley, *The Principles of Human Knowledge and Three Dialogues Between Hylas and Philonous*, introduction by G. J. Warnock, Meridian Books (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1967), p. 191.

² For translation of these passages see Elizabeth S. Haldane and G. R. T. Ross, trans., *The Philosophical Works of DesCartes*, 2 vols., unabridged republication of the last corrected edition of 1931 (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1955), 1:179-99 and 345-46.

philosophical schema consistent with biological evolution).

As man's existence changes within a world that changes, adaptation is required. Pragmatism, of course, emphasized the importance of this adaptation. The following words of John Dewey in his *Experience and Nature* appropriately illustrate the dynamic nature of the world to which adaptation is required.

Anthropologists have shown incontrovertibly the part played by the precarious aspect of the world in generating religion with its ceremonies, rites, cults, myths, magic; and it has shown the pervasive penetration of these affairs into morals, law, art, and industry. Beliefs and dispositions connected with them are the background out of which philosophy and secular morals slowly developed, as well as more slowly those late inventions, art for art's sake, and business is business. Interesting and instructive as is this fact, it is not the ramifications which here concern us. We must not be diverted to consider the consequences for philosophy, even for doctrines reigning today, of facts concerning the origin of philosophies. We confine ourselves to one outstanding fact: the evidence that the world of empirical things includes the uncertain, unpredictable, uncontrollable, and hazardous.¹

Each of these several views on the orderliness of nature falls short in terms of the Biblical perspective. Each one (acknowledging DesCartes' interest in the divine) does not fully grasp the dependent nature of creation, especially as it is dependent on the Creator.²

¹ John Dewey, *Experience and Nature* (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1958), pp. 41-42.

² While not agreeing with the general sentiments of the context of the quotation that follows, this writer does agree with the remark on Gen 1 made by Henricus Renckens, *Israel's Concept of the Beginning* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964), p. 83: "The point of it is to convey the conviction that God is in principle the ultimate source of the intelligibility of everything that exists, whether it is mentioned or not, and indeed whether its existence is even known or not."

In rejecting these models offered to explain the orderliness of the whole in which man lives, one must ask whether the Bible at all offers any more detailed analysis of this order. In a word the answer is a cautious "Yes." But the Biblical perspective does not treat its answer in terms of a rigidly scientific philosophical mechanization. Rather, the focus is on a constantly reiterated norm: Creation in its totality moves at the beck and call of its Creator. This control may happen mediately through the normative divine law-structures continually sustained by the Creator (providence, i.e., preservation, concurrence, and government) or immediately through His miraculous activity (providence extraordinary).¹ Thus, the reader of Scripture is assured that God, the Creator, orders and configures stars (Isa 40:26). Planetary movement and therefore change of seasons are ascribed to Him (Ps 74:16 and Jer 31:36). He controls water forms (Job 37:6-16). In fact, Job 38:4-41 serves as something of a catalog of divine law structuring, a function similar to that of Psalm 104.² This understanding of a law-structured

¹ Lester J. Kuyper, "The Biblical View of Nature," *Reformed Review* 22 (1969): 12-17 argues that there is both the normative (providence) and the dynamic (providence extraordinary). However, he sees these as the two perspectives of the priestly (static, normative) and the prophetic (dynamic extraordinary). This dichotomy will hardly do since it seems there exists in the Old Testament a *continuum* (not dichotomy) of both the static and dynamic. However, Thomas Wieser, "The Biblical View of the World," *Encounter* 20 (1959): 484-93 understands the orderliness of the world to consist in the order given by the Christ-event.

² Indeed as Marvin H. Pope, *Job*, AB (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965), p. 250 says, "God assails Job with questions he cannot answer about the wonders of

arrangement to the orderly whole seems to permeate the entire Old Testament. The argument here is not that the Biblical material presents a philosophically analytic evaluation of the intricacies of scientific law-structuring. To the contrary, the material calls attention to a divine regimen by which one is assured that through divine operation the origin, maintenance, and destination¹ of creation are secured and this with a divine regularity.²

nature and the control of the world." For further discussion on divine control over the constituent parts of creation see E. C. Rust, *Nature and Man in Biblical Thought* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1953), pp. 64ff. However, some will argue, as K. V. Mathew, "The Concept of God and Nature in the Psalms," *Indian Journal of Theology* 20, (1971): 142-49, that the Psalmic material describing nature is a cultic expression of faith, not an historical statement. Langdon Gilkey, *Maker of Heaven and Earth, Christian Faith Series* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1959), pp. 24ff. forces this same dichotomy. But this distinction between cultic and historical cannot be too sharply drawn since cultic faith did not develop out of a vacuum. It seems to have had a root other than the worshiper's experience of merely coping with the vicissitudes of nature. For further discussion on the concept of nature in the Old Testament see H. W. Huppenbauer, "God and Nature in the Psalms," *Ghana Bulletin of Theology* 3 (1969): 19-32.

¹ For reasons other than this writer's, Eugene H. Maly, "Man and Nature in the Old Testament," *Studia Missionalia* 20 (1970): 313 concludes "that we are justified in speaking of a true community of man and nature, a community that is not sacralized or mythicized by the covenant relationship with Yahweh but that is eschatologized. It is in the eschatological perspective, as presented especially in the prophetic descriptions of the messianic age, that we can argue for a perfect harmony between man and nature as being the intent and goal of God's creative activity. It is sin that accounts for the present distortion of that harmony."

² James Robinson, "The Biblical View of the World," *Encounter* 20 (1959): 470-83 argues that this is an uncritically religious stance expressing a merging of the scientific and religious viewpoints. However, one must envision here a collision of the scientific and uncritically religious perspectives. Further discussion on the nature of Hebrew thought

Man is in a continuum

This might be called the naive experience-scientific inquiry continuum. At the level of naive experience¹ Israel witnessed this structured orderliness of divine law. Her perception was not at the theoretical, scientific level at which she made critically, analytically theoretical abstractions of sets or complexes of scientific laws. For example, Israel may have known a good deal about the laws of life by her observations of what constitutes disease and health. Though these observations were at the level of naive experience, that does not necessarily make them unsophisticated. What Israel does not seem to have done, as her life, history, and faith are reflected in Scripture, is to abstract from creation those theoretical, scientific laws which comprise the biotic function of being.

A contemporary appraisal

Just here is where contemporary thought flounders. The scientism of this century views the naive experience reflected in the Biblical material as unscientific and therefore unsophisticated. In this sort of naivety Israel is

can be found in Ludwig Kohler, *Hebrew Man*, trans. Peter R. Ackroyd (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1956), pp. 115ff.

¹"Naive experience" should be defined as does Kalsbeek, *Contours*, p. 351: It is "human experience insofar as it is not 'theoretical'" or scientific. This, however, does not mean "unsophisticated" knowledge. Naive experience is what confronts man in his everyday life. For those who argue that modern culture's heavy orientation in scientific inquiry has made it impossible to have naive experience see Dooyeweerd, *New Critique*, 3:30-32.

viewed as giving cultic expression to her unsophisticated perspective. Thus, what is preserved in the Biblical record is a sacred "history." Using this model of scientism, one must understand that a great chasm exists between Israel's naive experience and true scientific understanding. Therefore, the argument runs, the Biblical world's view of ordering is more mythical than scientific.

However, does this chasm in fact exist? Can it be that scientific knowledge has so little correlation with naive experience? Do science and naive experience live in separate worlds? Was Plato right after all when he concluded that only philosopher-kings had sufficient insight into the nature of reality, thereby being able to rule the world? Was Kant's dichotomizing between the theoretical and practical correct?

A rebuttal

The answer is "No," and for this reason. The world of naive experience (concrete reality) is the very world in which scientific inquiry is and must be done. There is no other world. Whatever naive experience and scientific inquiry are, they must be a part of the same continuum. One is not other-worldly. There is no autonomous standing place from which scientific investigation is done. The context of this ordered world is the context of both the skilled scientist and the man-on-the-street. The expression which describes scientific inquiry and naive experience is not rigid dichotomy; it is contextualized continuum. Thus the world of scientific work and naive experience is the same.

But the question is asked, are there no differences between science and naive experience? There are differences these may be summarized as follows:

The scientific view of the created cosmos is not superior to the naive view of everyday experience. In fact philosophy cannot do without naive experience, as it is based upon it. And naive experience remains always a touchstone of the philosophical truth. . . . The distinction between naive experience and scientific analysis is that the former places itself concretely within reality, whereas the latter abstracts a distinct aspect of reality and views it in an *antithetical* relation in which a particular aspect is exposed to scientific analysis.¹

Using this understanding of a continuum between scientific inquiry and naive experience, one may address the matter of order within the creation more fully.² The argument here is not saying that this order was at all perceived in a scientific way in the Biblical world; but the order was perceived. This perceived order from the perspective of naive experience, as this perspective has been divinely interpreted within the context of Scripture, is that context by which contemporary scientific inquiry proceeds. The opposite way

¹ Spier, *Introduction*, pp. 14-15. In Spier's terminology (the Dooyeweerdian School's) scientific inquiry occurs when one *theoretically* abstracts the analytic modality from the cosmos and interfaces that modality with some other modality within the cosmos, such as the juridical or aesthetic. Underlining indicates an italicized word within the quotation.

² A contemporary evidence of the breakdown in the naive experience-scientific inquiry continuum is found within the Christian community when a supposed dichotomy is stressed between so-called practical Christianity (naive experience) and theological study (scientific inquiry). The Scripture understands these as a continuum (cf. the placement and use of οὖν in Eph 4:1 as an example). This dichotomy which supposedly frees some to concentrate on the "practical" issues of the spiritual life betrays a Kantian dichotomy between the scientific and moral.

of doing things is not to be. To proceed in an opposite way is to claim autonomy from the authenticated interpretation of naive experience within Scripture. This opposite way is equivalent to using the very law structured creation of the sovereign God as a place to stand in order to challenge and "re-make" His world according to the contemporary perspective of scientism. This is acknowledging Him by our continued existence and denying Him by thought.

A suggestion

There remains one last question concerning this order, a law-structured order, of creation. Is there any model of law ordering which correlates better with the Biblical perspective? This is not to argue that any contemporary analysis is the same law-structured order as that in Scripture. No interpretation can make such a claim.¹ On the other hand any contemporary scientific analysis which interprets cosmic reality with reference to God, and not intra-cosmically, surely must be closer to the naive experience reflected in Scripture and more willing to admit its (scientific analysis) fallibility and lack of autonomy.²

¹ On this very point Van Til has given a most important reminder in his *Defense*, p. 44: "The things of this universe must be interpreted in relation to God. The object of knowledge is not interpreted truly if though brought into relation with the human mind, it is not also brought into relation with the divine mind. God is the ultimate category of interpretation. Now we cannot fully understand God's plan for created things and so we cannot fully understand things."

² And certainly, though seeming antinomies exist in our thinking about the creation, the Christian is called upon

Therefore, as a working model of this order Dooyeweerd's modality structures may be considered.¹ Before looking directly at this suggestion several matters should preface the analysis. The first is that Dooyeweerd realized his analysis was certainly subject to correction and elaboration.² A second is that Dooyeweerd himself argued that his analysis was not entirely new.³ Third, there have been a number of questions raised about Dooyeweerd's thought. One certainly has been his concept of Scripture, especially as that concept has been articulated by the Toronto group, the Institute for Christian Studies and its sponsor, the Association for the Advancement of Christian Scholarship. The issue at stake is the understanding of Scripture as "a third mode of being."⁴ A leading critic of this view of Scripture has been John Frame.⁵

to interpret God's world as consistently as possible with the Biblical data.

¹ For his own extensive explication of the modality structures see his *New Critique*, vols. 2 and 3.

² Cf. Kalsbeek, *Contours*, p. 38.

³ Cf. the remark of Spier, *Introduction*, pp. 43-44.

⁴ Cf. Robert A. Morey, *The Dooyeweerdian Concept of the Word of God* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1974), pp. 2ff. where in polemical fashion he critiques this Dooyeweerdian conception.

⁵ For a brief historical survey of this debate see John M. Frame, "The Quiet Crisis," *The Presbyterian Guardian* 41 (April 1972): 52-57; John W. Van Dyk, "Why I Support the A.A.C.S.," *The Presbyterian Guardian* 41 (August-September 1972): 102-3. James H. Olthuis and Bernard Zylstra, "Confessing Christ in Education," *The Presbyterian Guardian* 41 (August-September 1972): 104-6; John J. Mitchell, "Educational creeds' for Christian Schools? NO!," *The Presbyterian Guardian* 41 (August-September 1972): 107; James H. Olthuis

Another critique against Dooyeweerd is that of Van Til, that concerning transcendental method, the idea of "states of affairs," and the distinction between the realm of man's conceptual activity and man's religious activity.¹ Other criticisms leveled against the Dooyeweerdian circle concern the particulars of their view of the kingdom and the church, creation and redemption, creeds and confessions, and world-and-life view, philosophy and theology.²

The modality structure of Dooyeweerd is a scientific analysis of the creational law structure.³ The Dooyeweerdian model of the cosmic law order indicates that there exists within creation a multiplicity of divine laws by which the

and Bernard Zylstra, "Confessing Christ in Education," *The Presbyterian Guardian* 41 (October 1972): 120-22; John J. Mitchell, "Editor's Comment," *The Presbyterian Guardian* 41 (October 1972): 122; John M. Frame, "The Word of God in the Cosmological Philosophy," *The Presbyterian Guardian* 41 (October 1972): 123-25; etc. There is a long history of articles! Note also the appendix by John M. Frame, "What is God's Word," in Morey, *Concept*, pp. 32-37. For a view of at least a significant point in the debate see Bernard Zylstra, "The Word of God, the Bible, and the AACS: In defense of a reformational movement," *The Presbyterian Guardian* 42 (March 1973): 40-43. Other discussion on these same general subjects may be found in issues of *The Christian Patriot*, *The Banner*, *The Outlook*, *The Reformed Journal*, *The Canadian Reformed Magazine*, and *Calvinist-Contact*.

¹ Cf. Geehan, *Jerusalem and Athens*, pp. 89-127.

² Zylstra, "The Word of God, the Bible, and the AACS," 40.

³ The following analysis of the modality structure, for sake of brevity will employ the excellent summary of Spier, *Introduction*, pp. 30-130. Along the way this writer has attempted to explicate and harmonize points within Dooyeweerd's system which seem inconsistent. For analysis of Dooyeweerd's own analysis of the modality structure see his *New Critique*, especially volume 3.

Creator has sovereignly chosen to order his creation. Not all of these laws are of the same type. Logical laws and biotic laws differ. A social law is not an aesthetical law. "Now all laws of one specific sort, taken together, form a law-sphere" or aspect.¹ These law-spheres--fifteen have been identified by Dooyeweerd--work together harmoniously and are those law-spheres by which the Creator subjects His creation. These are not, therefore, scientific laws, in the sense that science develops these laws. These law-spheres are creational law-spheres which the various sciences only partially discover, never completely, exhaustively. Any assurance that the scientist has discovered a law-sphere may be held only in proportion to the degree of correspondence between the discovered law-sphere and the normative divine interpretation of naive experience recorded in Scripture. To the degree no human interpretation is infallible, to that same degree no scientific analysis of law can claim infallibility.

The law-spheres Dooyeweerd isolated may be summarized as follows:

15. Pistic (faith)
14. Ethical (love)
13. Juridical (judgment)
12. Aesthetic (harmony)
11. Economic (saving)
10. Social (social intercourse)
9. Lingual (symbolical meaning)
8. Historical (cultural development)
7. Analytic (thought)
6. Sensitive (feeling)
5. Biotic (life)
4. Physical (energy)
3. Kinematic (motion)

¹ Spier, *Introduction*, p. 35.

2. Spatial (space)
1. Arithmetic (number)

The understanding of this list is as-follows.¹ The movement from one through fifteen is one from the more foundational to the less foundational, that is number ten assumes number eight, number thirteen assumes number twelve, etc. Each individual sphere is not self-sufficient and operates harmoniously with the others, a fact to which naive experience readily attests. Scientific inquiry is the *theoretical* extrapolation of the analytic law-sphere and another of the law-spheres and the interfacing of these. Thus, the scientific investigation of linguistics is in fact the *theoretical* interfacing of the analytic law-sphere and the lingual law-sphere.

In any case, one must remember that the interfacing is theoretical. The Creator designed them to work in harmony, not in isolation. Therefore, one law-sphere cannot be made more important than another law-sphere. That is idolatry. One who seeks to interpret all of creation only through the biotic law-sphere has distorted what is here. And finally, one must understand that these law-spheres have validity only as they find correlation with the normative, divine interpretation of naive experience as found in self-attesting Scripture.² For

¹ For similar treatments see Kalsbeek, *Contours*, pp. 40-42, and Spier, *Introduction*, p. 43.

² The obvious question at this point is: But how does one determine what is Scripture's interpretation of naive experience? Though the answer to this question is itself a dissertation, these, few remarks seem pertinent. To begin with, man's knowledge must be analogical to God's knowledge, since His is the original. Because His knowledge is original, it is

the Dooyeweerdian law-structure to be used beyond these parameters herein surveyed would be inappropriate, since this would be to press the claims and finds of scientific inquiry beyond their creational limitation, namely operating within the context of Scripture's normative interpretation of naive experience.

With these cursory remarks on the nature of man's contextualization within an ordered whole in hand, this philosophical analysis can proceed to an inquiry into man's relational orientation within this ordered context.

Man as Relational

By this is meant that man finds himself sustained within the context of three concurrent relationships. Kuyper in his Stone Lectures had argued that any life-system of necessity possesses three fundamental relations: "(1) our relation *to God*, (2) our relation *to man*, and (3) our relation *to the world*."¹ A cursory review of the creation-fall-redemption

authoritative; man's is not. This authority man cannot establish; he can only acknowledge. How, then, does he acknowledge this authority? The summary to this answer may be outlined as follows: 1) Man must acknowledge that the one who speaks is a truth-teller. 2) Man must acknowledge that he is studying a faithful record of that truth-teller. 3) Both the truth-teller and his interpreter must be cognizant of a communicative, law-structured tool, language. 4) The interpreter must acknowledge the rightful claim of the authority to order his life and thought. 5) The interpreter must acknowledge that as interpreter he lives in the authority's continuum which has conditioned him. 6) The interpreter thereby acknowledges his dependence, and in this condition of dependence he reciprocates between his law-structured creational order and his interpretation of the authoritative truth-teller's claims.

¹ Kuyper, *Lectures*, p. 19. Underlined words indicate italics within the quotation.

account suggests that man finds himself in these very relations.

In relation to God

The assurance of Genesis 1:26-28 is that man is God's creature. This Creator-creature relationship is explicated in terms of the creature's work assignment (2:15; cf. 2:5 and 8)¹ and proscriptive commandment (2:16-17; cf. 3:13).² Even in the naming of animals Adam's cognitive skills gave titles appropriate to the natures to which the Creator had already disposed them (cf. 2:19-20). The circumstances of Eve's appearance (2:21) remind Adam of his creaturely vulnerability before his Creator. Man has no existence apart from his self-existent God. There is no other place for man to live and work and be than within the habitation prepared for him by God. His creation is a reminder that his relationship to his maker is creaturely; he is from the dust of the ground (2:7).³

¹ The notion of divine assignment is indicated by the verbals **יָהָה** and **יִנְחָהוּ** which are used to describe the placement. A part of that relationship was functioning within the context of divine placement. The work is described as **לְעֵבֶדָה** **לְשָׂמְרָהּ**. The latter of these terms (**שָׁמַר**) suggests more than tillage; it implies the idea that to Adam was given a domain to keep; he was in charge of it. There may well be an intended correlation between the first two usages of **שָׁמַר** in Gen, here and in 3:24; cf. Gerhard Lisowsky, *Konkordanz zum hebraischen Alten Testament* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958), pp. 1473-77. As man was given the charge to take care of the garden, so, following the fall, God placed cherubim and a flaming sword to take care of the way to the tree of life (3:24).

² The command is appropriately termed **יִצְוָה**. The grace (**אָכַל תֹּאכֵל**) and limitation (**לֹא תֹאכֵל**) of the prohibition are both emphasized. And, as expected, the penal aspect accompanies the prohibition (**מוֹת תָּמוּת**). The grace of the prohibition is even indicated in the earlier account in Gen 1:29.

³ Maly, "Man and Nature in the Old Testament," 303,

Obviously, if man initially stands in such a dependent relation to his God, whatever else may occur in his history does not alter this relation. At his fall man's relation to his God changes, this being graphically portrayed in Genesis 3:7-24. But that he still stands in relation to God is not obliterated. This truth is reiterated by Paul in so distant a passage as Acts 17:24-28.¹ The change in relation resulting from the fall undergoes modification upon the coming of redemption (Eph 1:11-12).²

As these materials indicate, man is always in relation to God, whether the relation undergoes change. And this relation is one which is determinative for all others: it is the interpretation of our relation to God which dominates every general life system."³ The centrality of this

following the lead of A. Diez Macho, offers an intriguing analysis of the use of "dust" (אֲפָרָה) in this passage: ". . . *min-ha'adama* is not to be referred to '*apar*', as though the latter were the material from the earth out of which man is formed, but directly to *wayyiser*, and the word 'dust' or '*apar*' is to be considered the 'second direct complement or object of the verb "he formed." The translation then would be something like this: And the Lord God formed man (as) dust from the ground." In keeping with this interpretation we would have emphasized by this remark two points: man's being from the earth and man's being dust, i.e., frail, perishable.

¹ In this remarkable statement Paul declares that God is creator of all (17:24), that he gives all things to them (25), that he has determined law structures (26). The summary of this is: Ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν . . . (28).

² The passage assures that in redemption we still have to do with him: τοῦ τά πάντα ἐνεργοῦντος κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ . . . (1:11).

³ Kuyper, *Lectures*, p. 19.

relation is shown in the fall (Gen 3). There the changed relation to God brought changes in relation to the world, as toward hostility (Gen 4:1-9).¹ Thus, early in the Genesis account the relation of man to God is pivotal.

This relation to God springs from a man's heart.²

¹ The hostility is most graphically presented in Cain's response, after killing his brother, to God's inquiry: לֹא יָדַעְתִּי הֲשִׁמְרָ אָחִי אֲנֹכִי. Of this response two points are worthy of note. (1) As von Rad has pointed out (*Genesis*, pp. 105-6) the question which elicited this response was a social question: "Where is your brother?" (2) The nature of the response is striking because it is an emphatic rebellion. Cain disclaims a social responsibility, and therefore, conscience. Thus the remark of Calvin (*Calvin's Commentaries*, 1:2-6) is apropos: "Cain, in denying that he was the keeper of his brother's life, although, with ferocious rebellion, he attempts violently to repel the judgment of God, yet thinks to escape by this cavil, that he was not required to give an account of his murdered brother, because he had received no express command to take care of him."

² The literature on a general anthropological perspective on man and on his "heart" in particular is considerable. Among these works the following are noteworthy: G. C. Berkouwer, *Man: The Image of God* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962), especially pp. 194-233; Franz Delitzsch, *A System of Biblical Psychology*, trans. Robert Ernest Wallis (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966), especially 292-313; Walther Eichrodt, *Man in the Old Testament*, Studies in Biblical Theology (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1956); Joseph Fichtner, *Man, the Image of God* (New York: Alba House, 1978), especially pp. 61-77; Andrew Bowling, "בְּרֵאשִׁית" *Theological Word-book of the Old Testament*, 2 vols., edited by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), 1:466-67; Ernest Jenni and Claus Westermann, eds., *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, 2 Bande (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1971), 1, cols. 861-67; Aubrey R. Johnson, *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1964), especially pp. 75ff.; Wolfhart Pannenberg, *What Is Man?*, trans. Duane A. Priebe, paperback edition (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), especially 82-95; H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, 3rd edition (Edinburgh: T. & T.

There the issues of life are decided. Kuyper has correctly observed that

. . . a life system shall find its starting-point in a special interpretation of our relation to God. This is not accidental, but imperative. If such an action is to put its stamp upon our entire life, it must start from that point in our consciousness in which our life is still undivided and lies comprehended in its unity--not in the spreading vines but in the root from which the vines spring. This point, of course, lies in the antithesis between all that is finite in our human life and the infinite that lies beyond it. Here alone we find the common source from which the different streams of our human life spring and separate themselves. Personally it is our repeated experience that in the depths of our hearts, at the point where we disclose ourselves to the Eternal One, all the rays of our life converge as in one focus, and there alone regain that harmony which we so often and so painfully lose in the stress of daily duty.¹

What Kuyper observes from more the viewpoint of scientific inquiry is borne out by the interpretation given naive experience in Scripture.² Within the context of this Biblical interpretation of man it is clear that, though he is a unit,³ "by far the most important organ, however, is the heart (בִּלְבָבָא, בְּלִבָּא)."⁴ The preponderance of occurrences of "heart"--according to Wolff 814 instances where the reference is to the human

Clark, 1926), especially pp. 22ff.; W. David Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man* (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1956), especially pp. 194-97; and Hans Walter Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), especially pp. 40-58.

¹ Kuyper, *Lectures*, p. 20.

² So Berkouwer, *Man*, p. 194, aptly remarks: "Bavinck's remark that Scripture 'never intentionally concerns itself With the scientific as such' surely applies also when man is the subject of consideration." The Bible here employs the language of daily life.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 194ff.

⁴ Johnson, *Vitality*, 75.

heart--outnumbers that of even נִפְשׁ (755 times).¹ For this reason the usage of "heart" in the Old Testament must be only summarily stated.

While לֵב and לִב are used in several ways, clearly the general use envisions "far more than the anatomical position and the physiological functions of the heart."² The heart, in fact, finds its reference in the innermost center of man.³ Thus, "dem menschlichen *leb* werden Funktionen für das leibliche, seelische and geistige Wesen des Menschen zugeschrieben. *leb* bedeutet die 'Lebenskraft.'"⁴ In summary, the purpose of localization through use of the word "heart" is to employ it as a reference to the whole man as he stands exposed to God.⁵ In this way the term "heart" (among other terms) is used to describe man's entirety (not certain compositional parts) as that which is exposed to God. This "wholistic" point of reference for "heart" is underscored in the final words of Psalm 22:27: יְהוָה לִבְבָבְכֶם לְעַד. This usage of לֵב, לִב is not unlike the semantic field of the Akkadian

¹ Cf. Wolff, *Anthropology*, p. 40.

² *Ibid.*, p. 44.

³ Delitzsch, *Psychology*, p. 292.

⁴ Jenni and Westermann, *Handwörterbuch*, 1, col. 862.

⁵ Berkouwer, *Man*, p. 202. Of course, נִפְשׁ is also employed as a term to describe man as a whole.

libbu.¹ Within this field is the following usage of *libbu* which is similar to the notion being suggested here for לִבָּ: *beli lu idi ki lib-ba-su ul itti belija su* ("my lord should know that his loyalty is not with my lord").²

The New Testament carries on this same general tradition of meaning from the Old Testament. The word καρδία is used, along with other possibilities, in reference to both mental processes (though more commonly νοῦς is used for לִבָּ in this case) and the whole personality.³ A rather clear indication of this latter use is found in two passages in 2 Corinthians which offer parallel expressions except for the interchange of "us" for "our hearts."

1:22 . . . δοὺς τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ταῖς
5:5 . . . ὁ δοὺς ἡμῖν τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος.

The conclusion to this brief summary on the Biblical use of the word "heart" is that at the innermost center of man's being (appropriately his "heart") is where man's relation to God converges. Here man is laid bare and open before Him.

In relation to others

In the creation narrative there is indication that

¹ Cf. Miguel Civil et al., editorial board, *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1956ff.), 9:164 (hereafter cited as *CAD*). Seven general divisions of semantic range are indicated.

² A Neo-Babylonian example cited in *ibid.*, 9:170.

³ Stacey, *Man*, p. 195. Note also the summary conclusions on New Testament usage given by Robinson, *Man*, p. 106.

man as he lived in God's continuum was also placed by his Creator in yet another relation. Man stood in relation to others. This relation of one to another is a fundamental condition of any life-system. Attention to this relation is necessary since "there is no uniformity among men, but endless multiformity."¹ This multiformity is expressed in the very passage (Gen 2:20-23) which stresses man's individuation from animals. On the human level, in spite of commonality (זאת הפעם עצם מעצמי וְבָשָׂר מִבָּשָׂר),² there is multiformity, man and woman. This multiformity necessitates social ordering.

The distinction between man and woman implies further social orderings. The first of these is found in the words of Genesis 1:28: פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמְלֵאוּ אֶת-הָאָרֶץ. Bearing of offspring would at once place the man and woman in a new social ordering, the family. At first this family would be the only nuclear family (parents and children). In the earliest history of man the nuclear family and the human community were

¹ Kuyper, *Lectures*, p. 26.

² Cf. Walter Bruggemann, "Of the Same Flesh and Bone (Gen 2:23a)," *CBQ* 32 (1970) 534-35: "The two terms in Gn. 2, 23 which we have rendered 'flesh-weakness' and 'bone-power' are not to be regarded as referring to two simple states. . . . Because they are antithetical, it is most likely that they mean to state two extreme possibilities and include everything between them, thus all physical-psychological dimensions of interaction from A to Z. . . In our verse (Gn. 2, 23), the poles of 'flesh-frailty' and 'bone-power' mean to express the entire range of possibilities from the extreme of frailty to power. Thus the relationship affirmed is one which is affirmed for every possible contingency in the relationship . . . It is a formula of constancy, of abiding loyalty which in the first place has nothing to do with biological derivation, as it is often interpreted." Cf. for example 2 Sam 5:1.

identical since there existed only the first family.

But surely the multiplication process envisioned in Genesis 1:28 would eventuate in several nuclear families.

This second implication of social ordering is found in Gene-

sis 2:24 יַעֲזֹב אִישׁ אֶת־אָבִיו וְאֶת־אִמּוֹ וְדָבַק בְּאִשְׁתּוֹ וְהָיוּ לְבֶשֶׁר אֶחָד

Unless these families remained in total isolation, they would have lived according to agreed-upon laws of association. As there was multiformity among individuals, so there was among nuclear families. Eventually, certain of these nuclear families came to have more in common with other families (perhaps commonality of geographic location, vocational pursuit, etc.). This commonality joined nuclear families together to form communities. In this way the individual family was distinguishable from the community. Again, as there was multiformity in individuals and nuclear families, so also in communities.

To summarize then, one may say that Genesis 1:28 and 2:24 imply ever-increasing levels of social complexity: individuals, nuclear families, and communities. The existence of these three, however, introduces a host of societal law-structures of even greater complexity. For each individual finds himself sustaining intra- and inter-relationships at the level of the nuclear family and community. Thus man, by virtue of the very multiplication commanded by the Creator, finds himself to be a social being.¹

These societal relationships are not to be anarchic.

¹ For evidence of this claim see p. 119, n. 1.

The implication of Genesis 4:9 eliminates anarchy as a means of management for society.¹ If not anarchy, then what structuring? In light of all the foregoing material in this chapter this social structuring finds its context in the domain of man's relationship to his Creator. This relationship is normative for social ordering. But does the Bible give a technical scientific accounting of social theory?² No, of course it does not. But it does provide a normative interpretation of naive experience within the societal sphere. This interpretation becomes the context within which normative scientific societal theory is to be developed.

There is no scientific theory developed in Genesis, as for example, concerning marriage. But there is in the pre-fall account a normative expression about marriage from the viewpoint of naive experience. Genesis 2:24 describes a "leaving" and "uniting" (בְּעָזְרוֹ and בְּקִיּוּמוֹ). In Matthew 19:5 these concepts are repeated with καταλείψει and κολληθήσεται. Of

¹ For a brief descriptive analysis of the philosophic options that have been entertained in social philosophy see Robert N. Beck, *Handbook in Social Philosophy* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1979). Beck surveys the philosophic perspectives of classical realism, positivism, philosophic liberalism, utilitarianism, idealism, communism, pragmatism, existentialism, and linguistic philosophy. The general notions about social ordering suggested in this dissertation are understood to be those consistently resulting from the interfacing of scientific inquiry with the normative Biblical interpretation of naive experience.

² Social theory should not be restricted only to the domain of sociology. The expression is related to the ideas of political theory, theory of right, theory of ethics. While some philosophers might want to make distinctions between these expressions, they may generally be taken as all part of social theory or as Thomas Hobbes understood, a general theory of human societal structuring.

these terms the following may be said. The first of these Hebrew words, **עָזַב** (I), especially in the social context, is suggestive of more than mere departure. There surely is the idea of a departure in the sense of reorientation in community.¹ The Greek word *καταλείπω*, translating the Hebrew **עָזַב**, means generally "to leave," though it may carry with it several emphases.² The Greek term, though used only a few times in Matthew, suggests much the same idea as does its counterpart in Hebrew.³ The study of the other pair of terms, **קָרַב**⁴ and *καλλάω*,⁵ indicates their use as describing closeness

¹ According to Lisowsky, *Konkordanz*, p. 1040, the word **עָזַב** (I) is used in these locations within Gen: 2:24; 24:27; 28:15; 39:6, 12, 13, 15, 18; 44:22 (twice); and 50:8. Of these uses all may be construed as marking out the idea of community of man and man (2:24; 44:22, twice) or man and God (24:27; 28:15) or as indicating the disruption of community of man and man by the leaving of goods or persons (39:6, 12, 13, 15, 18; 50:8).

² Cf. Liddell and Scott, *Lexicon*, p. 898.

³ Cf. W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, eds., *A Concordance to the Greek Testament*, 5th edition, revised by H. K. Moulton, with supplement according to the text of the United Bible Society's 3rd edition (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978), p. 535. The passages in Matt are 4:13; 16:4; 19:5; and 21:17. For use of the exact word form as in 19:5 see Mk 10:7; cf. J. Arthur Baird, *A Critical Concordance to the Synoptic Gospels*, The Computer Bible, vol. 1, revised edition, eds. idem. and David Noel Freedman (n. 1: Biblical Research Associates, Inc., 1971), p. 231. Each of the four Matt occurrences indicates change in the idea of community (social relationship) by moving.

⁴ Cf. Lisowsky, *Konkordanz*, p. 336, who cites Gen 2:24; 19:19; and 34:3. For the semantic field of the term see Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, eds., *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, 2 vols. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1951), 1:199.

⁵ Cf. Moulton and Geden, *Concordance*, p. 553, listing only the 19:5 passage in Matt and Liddell and Scott, *Lexicon*, p. 972.

within a community, a strong attachment so that one is given over to another; they become one (Gen 2:24). This brief study indicates the Biblical interpretation of naive experience with respect to marriage. Within this example and many more within the Biblical material a normative interpretation of marriage is established.

What has been said about man in relation to others is that from the outset his Creator cast him in the role of social being. He is in community with others. Distortion here is produced when there is distortion in one's relation to God (Gen 4:1-9). There exists yet another relation in which man finds himself.

In relation to the world

Already in this chapter the view has been argued that man is within the context of a law-structured world and that his very life is dependent upon the functioning of this law-structure. This all implies that a relation to the world exists. When the reader confronts the creation narrative he is struck with two ideas about the world (הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ). One notion is that because man is placed within the context of the world, he is distinguished from his Creator who is above and beyond the world. In a word this Creator is transcendent.¹ But at the same time the Genesis account indicates the close-

¹ This distancing is indicated at the close of Gen 1, a Creator-creation distinction: וַיֵּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת-כָּל-אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה

ness of the divine presence.¹ From within this transcendence-immanence perspective man is viewed in relation to the world; man is *within* the world and his Creator is within and without. The transcendence of the Creator assures man that his Creator is really the true God and his immanence assures man that his Creator may be contacted within this world. Therefore, one begins to understand man's relation to the world when he sees that the world is the habitat of God's contact with man. Here man meets and interacts with his God.

There is no surprise then when one learns that this Creator tells man what he is to do in this habitat. Nor is one surprised to find God structuring this habitat in which he moves in his contact with man. This structuring or ordering by the sovereign, transcendent-immanent Creator is in fact a part of the creation narrative.² One might better characterize this ordering as a structuring-restructuring continuum. The details of this continuum find their watershed in the fall of man. The pre-fall structuring of man's relation to the world is denoted by the nouns "habitation," "commandment," and "guardianship."

The words of the Genesis 2:8 narrative say clearly:

וַיִּטַע יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים גֶּן־בְּעֵדֶן מִקְדָּם וַיִּשְׂם שֵׁם אֶת־הָאָדָם אֲשֶׁר יָצָר

¹ Cf. Henricus Renckens, *Israel's Concept of the Beginning: The Theology of Genesis 1-3* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964), p. 8. Renckens' point is certainly borne out by the remark of Gen 3:8: וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ אֶת־קוֹל יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים מְתַהַלְלִים בְּגֵן.

² Cf. Kuiper, *Lectures*, pp. 28ff., where he discusses the relation of man to the world.

present purposes these few points are worth noting. The words certainly underscore the belief that man was placed here by the conditioning work of God.¹ "The garden was planned only for man and is to be understood as a gift of God's gracious care for the man he created."² The words of verse 8 (and v 15) also indicate that God's purpose could be realized within the garden habitat.³ For this reason the emphasis of the continuing narrative falls on the beneficence of the Creator: לְמַאֲכַל לְמִרְאָה וְטוֹב לְמַאֲכַל (Gen 2:9). But that beneficence contains within it a commandment.

This commandment marks the second feature of man's relation to the world.⁴ The man's relation to the world is conditioned by divine commandment: אָלֶיךָ תֹאכַל ... לֹא תֹאכַל. The infinitive-finite verbal complex certainly emphasizes the freedom with which the eating could be done. But clearly the prohibition is there. Thus the commandment includes both affirmation and negation. There is a call to use and not to use. *Both* are descriptive of man's relation to the world of

¹ A point emphasized by Rust, *Nature and Man in Biblical Thought*, p. 275.

² Rad, *Genesis*, p. 78.

³ For a discussion on the interpretation of יָדָע see W. H. Gispen, *Genesis*, 2 vols., Commentaar op het Oude Testament, eds. W. H. Gispen and N. H. Ridderbos (Kampen: Uitgeverij J. H. Kok, 1974), 1:105-6.

⁴ Thus Rad, *Genesis*, p. 81 is certainly correct in saying that "man in his original state was completely subject to God's command, and the question, 'Who will say to him, What dost thou?' (Job 9:12; Dan 4:35b) was equally out of place in Paradise" (underlined words indicate italics).

his habitation. Added to this commandment aspect of the relation is a third feature.

This feature is understood best as a guardianship.

Whatever else may be said of Genesis 1:28-29 man is clearly placed over the animal kingdom (וּבְשֵׁה וַיְרִדוּ) and over the vegetable kingdom in that it is to be used for food (לְכֶם יְהִיָּה לְאֹכְלָהּ). But this lordship over creation was not cast along the lines of a tyrannical rule. Rather it was a caretaker-ship, ship, a trust to be kept, a beneficence to be given (לְעֵבְדָהּ). Man originally was a servant but a servant in terms of the dominionizing responsibilities he bore (Gen 1:28).

Additionally, however, the realities about the original man's guardianship must be considered in the light of the curse material of 3:17-19. In this passage the ground is cursed because of Adam's knowing act of rebellion: He ate what the Creator had forbidden (וַתֹּאכַל מִן־הָעֵץ אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִיךָ לֵאמֹר (לֹא תֹאכַל מִמֶּנּוּ reach man through whose tillage the ground yielded sustenance. Therefore, "man stands as it were upon enemy soil."¹ Produce will come, but only through painful toil (בְּעֶצְבוֹן תֹּאכַל לֶחֶם). The use of עָבַד here as in 3:19 suggests the means through which productivity will occur, through painful toil and sweat of the brow (בְּעֶצְבוֹן ... בְּזַעַת).² The nature of this struggle to gain

¹ Edward J. Young, *Genesis 3: A Devotional and Expository Study* (London: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1966), p. 132.

² Cf. Ronald J. Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, 2nd ed. reprint (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980), pp. 44-46.

productivity is further emphasized by the thorn-thistle motif (3:18).¹

Furthermore, the portion of the curse narrative in Genesis 3:23 indicates a change of residence for man, but the banishment does not negate the condition of man's original servanthood, work (יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים מִגֵּן־עֵדֶן לְעֵבֶד אֶת־הָאָדָמָה). The terms שָׁלַח and עָבַד are both general,² and too much should not be read into them. But even the expulsion carried with it a task; man was to work (cf. Ps 104:14).

The general nature of man's relation to the world may thus be summarized as a structuring-restructuring. One would be amiss to view the fall as total negation; the work ordinance, though restructured in terms of the curse, is still in effect. Though man's habitation has changed, he still lives within the habitation of God's world, deriving from it his sustenance. And as the remainder of Scripture indicates, the man who sinned in the garden is still under obligation to his Creator. Therefore, the fall of man is the watershed. The curse has now taken its effect. Its reality is so then as now. But the Biblical material clearly indicates that man

¹ On the interpretation that this twofold misery, the sweat of the peasant and bedouin's skimpy livelihood, should be understood as two originally independent passages, see Joachim Begrich, "Die Paradieserzahlung: Eine literargeschichtliche Studie," ZAW 50 (1932): 93-116 and Rad, *Genesis*, pp. 94-95. Such a view is entirely dependent on the supposedly assured results of source criticism.

² Young, *Genesis 3*, pp. 157-59. Even the Pi'el form of שָׁלַח must not be taken to indicate necessarily a supposed "intensification."

still lives in a contextualization given by God, the one to whom man owes obedience and work.¹

Cultus and Culture

Man is in an ordered context which operates by divine law. Placed in this ordered context by virtue of his very creation, man finds himself necessarily sustaining three relationships, those summarized just above. But these few descriptive analyses would be incomplete without considering further man's *living out* these relationships. Ultimately, every man by his very nature practices this threefold relationship in the environs of his divinely ordered habitation. There are two terms which summarize what may be called arenas of human activity, *cultus* and *culture*. These should be thought of as correlatives. To them one must not apply the Kantian scalpel in order to divide and isolate them. They are necessary, continuing functions of man within the world. Cultus and culture of whatever sort are practiced by all humans.

There is a word of caution, though, before these terms are analyzed individually. By assigning two terms to describe the full range of man's activity there is no attempt to hint at a non-reciprocating relation between cultus and culture. These two terms must be viewed as the continuum of a given

¹ Therefore, one must be cautious in accepting fully the judgment of Renckens, *Israel's Concept of the Beginning*, P. 160, that: "the point of Chapter 2, therefore, considered in itself, is not (as in Genesis 1) to describe the origin of *our* world. It depicts, quite deliberately, a world that is to a certain degree unreal, for it is a world which is entirely devoid of any kind of evil."

individual's full range of activity. The necessities in the case are these. Man does practice cultus and culture; these are not options. Cultus and culture reciprocate; the one affects the other and vice-versa.

Cultus

There is no particular advantage for this discussion to dwell at length on cultus. Adequate understanding of it for our purposes can be gathered by consideration of these few remarks. The term "cultus" may initially be defined as that series of acts by which man symbolizes his relationship to God. But clearly these activities are culturally conditioned. One knows that to a given group of worshipers there is a form, a habit of prayer, praise, catechism, liturgy, and music which distinguishes this group from another. These adherents earnestly believe this to be the only true way of acting out one's religious relationship to his Creator. The Bible itself spends a good deal of time on cultus stipulations. Witness in this case the Old Testament law as ceremony and the New Testament passages such as the cultus description of Acts 2:42-47, or the passages which contain what amounts to the wording of early church hymns (1 Tim 3:16; Rom 11:33-36).

And what is true here of the redeemed community is true of the unredeemed. Man worships either in truth or idolatry. And he visibly practices this worship. So Paul argues that worship and service are given either to the Creator or some aspect of creation (Rom 1:25): *καὶ ἐσεβάσθησαν καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα.*

One may say, then, that "cultus" refers to the outward religious expression of the human heart, that deep-seated inner being of man, where relation to God converges.

In the context of the church as the body of Christ the New Testament gives minimal regulatory materials for the practice of the cultus. But these few regulatory matters are mandated. This seems to be the orientation and intention of materials such as those in 1 Timothy 2:lff. For the redeemed community the cultus is a normative outward expression of one's relation to the Creator within the context of the church-institution as mandated by Scripture. In this way the community of Israel also had its institution of law within which to practice its cultus. To summarize then, the definition of cultus for the contemporary redeemed community: Cultus is that symbolic and actual series of activities regulated by Scripture for the practice of the worship of God within the organization of the redeemed community.

Culture

The definition of "culture" was summarily dealt with in the introduction to this work.¹ Discussion here will build on those concepts initially established.² An initial word of

¹ Cf. *supra*, pp. 6-7.

² Typically "culture" is defined as "civilization." The Germans have understood "culture" as standing for intellectual and spiritual spheres and "civilization" as standing for technical and economic spheres. The English "civilization" is typically understood as a broader term than "culture." Cf. Kroner, *Culture and Faith*, p. 22ff. However, the distinctions that are typically understood in German and English are rejected in this work.

caution is appropriate. Culture is no less an expression of man's religious being, his relation to his God, than is cultus.¹ Both arenas of human activity are permeated by relation to God. Therefore, whatever detailed definition is given to culture must include an adequate accounting of this relation.

From the foregoing a further point is obvious. The nature of the relation to God, not the cultus (a religious faith), will be determinative for one's cultural activity. Dooyeweerd has identified this determinative relationship as the *religieuze grondmotieven*, religious ground motives.² These are those deep, driving forces which energize culture. These forces are of two sorts, redeemed or non-redeemed.³ The non-redeemed group may have a variety of idols but there exists a commonality, idolatry. The redeemed group is energized by the work of God's special grace. Thus both groups are

¹ So Van Til, *Culture*, p. 197, says that "the tone of a culture is determined by the spirit that animates the users. As was pointed out before, we have the urge to cultural achievement in common and also the materials and the terrain, but a different spirit animates the children of light than those who are of this world."

² Herman Dooyeweerd, *Roots of Western Culture*, trans. John Kraay (Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1979), pp. 8-9.

³ Therefore, "religion" may be defined as follows: "Religion is not an area or sphere of life, but the whole of it. It is service of God (or an idol) in every domain of human endeavor. As such it is to be sharply distinguished from religious faith, which is but one of the many acts and attitudes of human existence. Religion is an affair of the heart, and so directs all man's functions" (Kalsbeek, *Culture*, p. 352).

energized as servants, not rulers.¹ And this servant nature is what makes this ground motive of culture *communal*.² Thus, culture is not done in isolation but in community. Groups of servants are energized by ground motives. The communal nature of culture simply emphasizes that servanthood is not personal but corporate. Therefore, culture is energized by either of two types of relation to God, and because man is so energized, he is servant together with others.³

A second descriptive analysis of culture concerns its historical expression. Certainly there are various cultural manifestations in the various historical eras. But something other than this is intended here. To begin with, a distinction must be maintained between the historical aspect of reality and history in the concrete sense of what has happened.⁴

¹ Thus Dooyeweerd, *Roots of Western Culture*, p. 9 argues: "A spirit is directly operative in the religious ground motive. It is either the spirit of God or that of an idol. Man looks to it for the origin and unshakable ground of his existence, and he places himself in its service. He does not control the spirit, but the spirit controls him. Therefore specifically religion reveals to us our complete dependence upon a higher power. We confront this power as servants, not as rulers."

² Ibid.

³ When the reference is made to the communal nature of culture, the implication is not that all redeemed people work out a redeemed culture and all non-redeemed work out a non-redeemed culture. All that is meant is that culture is not individual per se but corporate. This is, of course, also true of cultus. Both cultus and culture are done in community. The relation to God is individual but the moment that is expressed in human activity the expression is corporate.

⁴ Ibid., p. 62. Cf. with the earlier analysis of the Dooyeweerdian modality analysis, above, pp. 113-16.

The latter of these should not be understood to mean that those things that *happen*, are *only* historical. Such things also have relationship to aspects of created reality other than the historical. The moment events are absolutized as being the only aspect of reality, one has turned to historicism. When this occurs the historical aspect has been abstracted by scientific historiography and made to be the whole of reality (excluding other aspects).¹ Rather, it is the case that events of the past function in other aspects than history. Then what is the nucleus (center) of the historical aspect? It is culturally formative activity guided by the norms of divine law. In this way one can begin to see the relationship between culture and history.

Cultural activity is thus a human activity of unfolding and shaping the *development* of concrete things. This activity is guided by ground motives which indicate to the shaper what is correct and worthwhile. But it has already been argued that the very law-structure of the historical aspect was placed by God in creation. Some, of course, engage in conflict with the law-structure because of either apostate ground motives or inconsistencies between their ground motives and cultural activity. Since the law-structure (expressed in Scripture in terms of naive experience) is decreed, this means

¹ So *ibid.*, p. 64, reminds that one "needs a criterion for distinguishing the historical aspect of reality from the other aspects. Historicism lacks such a criterion, since in its view the historical aspect and the whole of reality are one and the same."

that the shaping and forming of concrete things is eschatological.

Thus, a third descriptive analysis of culture is that it is eschatological.¹ What is meant is that the law-structured historical aspect of reality will end in the very way the Creator decreed. The historical aspect is not on a trip without destination. It is not in a monotonous cycle. Man is not lord over its end. The Creator is. The only question for man is one of *kind* of cultural activity. What the Scripture assures from its interpretation of naive experience is that the Creator is the sovereign over the movement of the historical aspect.²

A fourth descriptive analysis of culture is by now obvious. Culture is thus done in terms of a value system. By normative values one determines appropriate or inappropriate activities. These values are, of course, energized by the ground motive. Values are in this sense servants to ground motives and are therefore derived. This also explains why groups of servants appeal to differing value systems. And these differing value systems underlie differing formative activities in the historical aspect. Therefore, culture has multiformity; that is, the formative activities differ in

¹ A point emphasized though not for the same reason as here, by Klaas Schilder, *Christ and Culture*, trans. G. Van Rangen and W. Helder (Winnipeg: Premier Press, 1977).

² This means that in every era of history there are those whose ground motive energizes them to perform cultural activity which conflicts with the divine law-structure, the end of which is as God designs.

terms of value systems which differ in terms of ground motives. These formative activities cover the range of relations to others and the world. Then culture is very broad, including that range of formative activities practiced with respect to others and the world.

A fifth descriptive analysis to be made here follows from the above. Culture is both the activity and the context of the human shapers and formers. Man stands within a given set of formative activities to do his formative activities. Thus, there is reciprocation. The series of formative activities impacts the forming and shaping a man does. Therefore Mouw is correct when he says:

The fact is, of course, that we do not relate as Christians to culture as such. We stand in a relationship to one or another historically-embodied culture: to North American culture, South African culture, Scottish culture, Chilean culture. In an important sense, Christians do not relate to "business," they relate to the Canadian economic system; they aren't involved in "art," they participate in the art-world of France. It is true that all cultural manifestations are contained within the one good creation. We must avoid a norm-less situationism. But the creation is presently characterized by cultural pluriformity. More specifically, sin manifests itself in diverse ways, individually and culturally. Thus our responses to the presence of sin will differ from one cultural context to another.¹

This reality about man's place within culture to do culture means that what he does he does not do in isolation; he is part of a community.

Lastly, a descriptive analysis of culture must surely

¹ Richard Mouw, "Reforming Cultural Calvinism," *The Reformed Journal* 31 (3 March 1981): 15-16. The underlined word indicates an italicized word within the quotation.

include the matter of responsibility. Culture is normative, formative activity for which we are responsible. This work is carried out in the presence of the Creator to whom man bears responsibility. One's loyalty is to Him, not the cultural formation in which one stands.

A Proposal

The argument is that the relations which man sustains in the ordered whole in which he is contextualized are expressed in two arenas of activity, cultus and culture. These should not be dichotomized as Kant has done. Scripture gives a normative interpretation of naive experience in both of these arenas. In the case of the Old Testament the arenas are supremely illustrated in the context of corporate theocracy. In the New Testament the arenas are illustrated individually in the context of the Roman Empire. This individuality is indicated by those activities of naive experience described as appropriate for individual members of the *ekklēsia*. The nature of this individual address is to apprise the individual of his duties (cf. Matt 28:18-20; Rom 6:1-14; 12:9ff.; 13:14; 1 Cor 10:23-33; 2 Cor 5:6-21; 1 Pet 2:11-3:17; etc.), those duties in the cultus and culture arenas.¹ Therefore, one of

¹ There are those who challenge with the reason that the address of the New Testament is not only individual but also non-cultural, though this is hardly conceivable in light of the definition of culture offered here. As an example of this non-cultural viewpoint, see the resolution on the cultural mandate adopted by the Bible Presbyterian Synod, recorded in the *Christian Beacon* 35 (29 October 1970): 2, which in part reads: ". . . to express our opposition to the false doctrine, sometimes called the 'cultural mandate.' The mandate

the distinguishing features between the Old and New Testaments is the corporate and individual *address* in terms of the cultus and culture.

Now that the history of dominion materials and the establishment of the philosophic perspective are cared for, the actual dominion materials of the Old and New Testaments must be analyzed to see if in fact the materials themselves are to be understood in terms of a cultural mandate. The history of interpretation indicates that the dominion materials have been interpreted in this way, though certainly not uniformly so. And the philosophic perspective has established that culture must be done, given the definition suggested. But the question is: Do the dominion materials themselves have cultural implications? Answering this question is the task of chapters three and four.

under which Christians obey their Lord is the Great Commission of Matthew 28:19, 20, which requires that we teach and honor all things 'whatsoever I have commanded you.' This so-called 'cultural mandate' erroneously builds its case on Genesis 1:28 before the Fall and the promise of redemption in the seed of the woman. . . . The cultural mandate declares that it is the Christian's duty to pursue these pre-Fall realities, just as it is their duty to preach the Gospel. . . . But the high duty of Christians between the Fall and the return of Christ is to witness to God's righteousness in all things, to live godly lives, and to use every effort to bring individuals to the knowledge of the Saviour, that they may be redeemed through His precious blood and may grow in grace and in the knowledge of His Word." Cf. also Mare, "The Cultural Mandate and the New Testament Gospel Imperative," 139-47.

CHAPTER III

EXAMINATION OF OLD TESTAMENT DOMINION MATERIALS

In order to make this examination more intelligible, several matters must be considered in advance of a look at the Biblical passages. These matters include establishing exactly what the relevant Biblical passages are and developing several hermeneutical realities that will aid as background material.

Already in the introduction of this work a definition of dominion materials has been given.¹ Three passages (Gen 1:26-28; 9:1, 7; Ps 8:6-10) were identified as containing explicit dominion materials. These contain actual dominion terminology, not merely allusions to this terminology. The terminology for which one looks is that identified by the initial passage, Genesis 1:26-28, which is readily acknowledged as a dominion passage. Later passages must be identified within the perimeters established by the first explicit one. Further, not only must there be a match-up of the terminological inventory but also a match-up of what might be called literary intention, in this case an evidently conscious linking of one passage to the other. In the case of

¹ See above, pp. 9-10.

these three there is a match-up of both the inventory and intention. These are the foundational passages.¹ If others are to be added, they must be identified by asking whether they meet the tests of inventory and intention.

Undoubtedly, there are dominion allusions in other passages. But identification of these can be suggested only when an examination of the explicit passages has made clear what elements constitute a dominion allusion. The shape of the object must be known before its own particular shadow can be identified. Therefore, any suggestions about implicit dominion materials must follow examination of the explicit ones.

Hermeneutical Realities

In advance of a direct examination of explicit passages several realities about the ancient Near East must be taken into account. These form a part of the hermeneutical background to the idea of dominion. This fact will become clear as the study of the passages progresses. The realities which in one way or another contribute to this study are royal ideology, apocalyptic imagery, and societal hierarchical structuring.

Royal Ideology

The study begins with royal ideology because the general notion of dominion or exercise of rule is most readily

¹ The Gen 9:1, 7 passage is included because the Septuagint includes καὶ κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς. On the basis of this tradition the passage may be understood to meet the tests of inventory and intention.

associated with the idea of kingship. Because of the complexities of royal ideology, only a survey can be entertained here. And for purposes of this study this will be quite sufficient. As the following surveys indicate, considerable discussion on the subject of kingship has developed in recent years.¹ There is, of course, danger in placing side by side surveys of ancient peoples and then drawing unwarranted conclusions about similarities. Frankfort's caution against this very danger is well taken.²

Contemporary notions about kingship confuse the general picture of kingship coming from the ancient Near East. The reason is that "the ancient Near East considered kingship the very basis of civilization."³ This century is more inclined to view kingship as merely a political institution, to be isolated by itself. To the ancients there was no such abstraction, for they

¹ For a survey of the origins of kingship discussion with respect to Israel see Benjamin Franklin Lowe, *The King, As Mediator of the Cosmic Order* (Ph.D. dissertation, Emory University, 1967; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 68-11963, 1968), pp. 2-16 (hereafter cited as KMCO).

² Henri Frankfort, *The Problem of Similarity in Ancient Near Eastern Religions* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), pp. 3-4: "The point at issue is Frazer's comparative method and the validity of the concepts which he coined and used. They have become so familiar that terms like 'dying god,' 'divine king,' and the like are used nowadays as if they designated well-defined but ubiquitous phenomena--much as we recognize rats and mice all over the world and leave it to zoologists to discuss the finer points of colour and size. This procedure has led to regrettable results, as I shall show in a moment."

³ Henri Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948), p. 3.

. . . experienced human life as part of a widely spreading network of connections which reached beyond the local and the national communities into the hidden depths of nature and the powers that rule nature: The purely secular--in so far as it could be granted to exist at all--was the purely trivial. Whatever was significant was imbedded in the life of the cosmos, and it was precisely the king's function to maintain the harmony of that integration.¹

This is certainly not to argue that a detailed uniformity persisted over the whole of the ancient Near East. Rather, the above is but a generalization whose detailing varied from place to place and age to age.

Egyptian royal ideology

In Egypt this understanding of the cosmos worked itself out in the following manner. An appropriate place at which to begin understanding the king's role within the cosmos is "The Instruction of the Vizier Ptah-hotep." The document is a compilation of *wisdom* sayings intended to lay before a younger man those qualities leading to success as a state official. Among these sayings is the following:

If thou art a leader commanding the affairs of the multitude, seek out for thyself every beneficial deed, until it may be that thy (own) affairs are without wrong. Justice is great, and its appropriateness is lasting; it has not been disturbed since the time of him who made it, (whereas) there is punishment for him who passes over its laws. It is the (right) path before him who knows nothing. Wrongdoing has never brought its undertaking into port. (It may be that) it is fraud that gains riches (but) the strength of justice is that it lasts, and a man may say: "It is the property of my father."²

¹ Ibid.

² James B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3rd ed. with supplement (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), p. 412 (hereafter cited as *ANET*). Words within parentheses are those given by the translator of this passage.

Points to be noted are these. The official ought to be a practitioner of justice because, he is warned, wrongdoing operates so much at cross-purposes with nature that "wrongdoing has never brought its undertaking into port." From this it appears that wrongdoing might be defined as that which is opposite natural justice.¹

Further, one should note the use of the word "justice," *maat*.² Essentially "the goddess Maat was the personification of the basic laws of all existence; she embodied the concepts of law, truth and world order."³ The tomb of Seti I contains a picture of Maat, wearing the symbolic plume, placing the *ankh* to Seti's nostrils to give him the breath of

¹ Cf. Raymond O. Faulkner, *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1969), p. 238, who translates utterance 587 in which the king is urged to be like Re: "May you shine as Re'; repressing wrongdoing, cause Ma'et to stand behind Re', shine every day for him who is in the horizon of the sky. Open the gates which are in the Abyss."

² Of this term Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, pp. 277-78 says: "In Egypt it was unthinkable that nature and society should follow different courses, for both alike were ruled by *maat*--'right, truth, justice, cosmic order.' The gods existed by *maat*, and Pharaoh's speech was 'the shrine of maat'; what was right came to pass, in nature as well as in society."

³ Manfred Lurker, *The Gods and Symbols of Ancient Egypt*, English ed., trans. Barbara Cummings from the German *Götter und Symbole der Alten Ägypter* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980) p. 78. Thus, "without Maat life was impossible for she was Re's food and drink. The seated image of this goddess, who wore an ostrich feather on her head, was held in Pharaoh's hand like a doll and was presented as an offering to the gods. This meant that the king was the representative of divine order. Judges were regarded as priests of Maat."

life.¹ Additionally there is a scene in which Thoth,² the god of wisdom, offers Seti I a statuette of Maat who is holding the *ankh*.³ The term *maat* (*m³'t*) itself, meaning according to Faulkner "right-doing, righteousness, orderly management,"⁴ certainly is suggestive of the responsibility which fell to the king. An encounter of the king and the deity Maat implies the king's accountability for orderly management. This accountability is graphically illustrated in a scene in which Anubis, the god of the dead, leads the deceased toward a balance.⁵ On this balance his heart is weighed against Maat, the latter being represented on the scale by the statuette with the prominent, characteristic plume.

There is further dimension added to the word *maat* by

¹ For a photographic reproduction of this scene see *ibid.* While there exists some debate over the original meaning of the *ankh*, it is best understood as "vital force," in keeping with the hieroglyphic sign (*'nh*), "life" (*ibid.*, p. 27). As a symbol it probably points to divine or eternal existence.

² Even the deity Thoth might be understood in cosmic terms, especially in light of his connections with the moon. This connection makes him "lord of time" and "reckoner of years" (*ibid.*, p. 121).

³ A photographic reproduction of this scene can be found in James B. Pritchard, ed., *The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the old Testament*, 2nd ed. with supplement (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), p. 191, no. 572 (hereafter cited as ANEP).

⁴ Raymond O. Faulkner, *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian* (Oxford: The Griffith Institute, 1962), pp. 101-2.

⁵ For a photographic reproduction of this scene see p. 210, no. 639, and its attendant explanation on p. For a bit better detailing of certain features of the note C. J. Bleeker, *Hathor and Thoth*, *Studies in the History of Religions*, vol. 26 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973), insert facing p. 145.

the fact that the deity Maat seems to have something to do with the determination of orderliness and destiny. This fact is shown by the paralleling of the titles "the Lord of Maat" and "the Lord of the year."¹ Maat is lord of the year because, says Ringgren,

the sun rises and sets according to *maat*. Maat protects the sun-god, she destroys his enemies, she embraces him day and night. Thoth and Maat write down his course for every day. Very often she stands in the ship of Re, leading his journey across the sky and through the nether-world. Thus, the regularity of the sun's rising and setting is guaranteed by Maat, and at the same time it is a manifestation of the cosmic order, of $m^3't$.²

Clearly if Ringgren is correct, *maat* is both cosmic order and a personification of cosmic order, the deity Maat.

This cosmic orderliness (including the destiny at which the orderliness aims) of which Ringgren speaks is attested by the following passages in The Book of the Dead in

O come and acclaim ye RE, the lord of heaven, the Prince (Life, Health, Strength!), the Creator of the gods, and adore ye him in his beautiful form at his rising in the *Atet* boat. They who dwell in the heights and they who dwell in the depths worship thee. The god Thoth and the goddess Maat have written down [thy course] for thee daily and every day.³

These words are followed later by this wish:

¹ Cf. the discussion of Helmer Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom: Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East* (Lund: Hakan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1947), p. 45.

² *Ibid.*, p. 46.

³ This translation is by E. A. Wallis Budge, *The Book of the Dead*, Books on Egypt and Chaldaea series, vol. 6 (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co. Ltd., 1901), p. 5.

May I see Horus acting as steerman, with the god Thoth and the goddess Maat, one on each side of him; may I grasp the bows of the *Sektet* boat, and the stern of the *Atet* boat.¹

Therefore, it is not surprising that Re's course is described as resting on Maat:

Homage to thee, O Amen-Ra, who dost rest upon Maat, and who passest over the heavens, every face seeth thee. Thou dost wax great as thy Majesty doth advance, and thy rays are upon all faces.²

And later in this same passage the author announces that "RE liveth by *Maat* the beautiful."³

But perhaps overshadowing all of these is the remarkable passage in *Ritual of the Divine Cult*, ceremony thirty. Only a portion need be cited to demonstrate the supremacy of Maat's orderliness. These words were part of the liturgy to be performed in the house of Re, the king of the gods.

Maat hath come that she may be with thee. Maat is in every place of thine so that thou mayest rest upon her. The beings of the Circle of the heavens have their hands [stretched] out to praise thee every day. Thou hast given breath to every nostril to vivify that which thou didst make with thy two hands. . . Thou art provided with Maat, Creator of things which are, Maker of things which shall be. . . . Maat uniteth herself to thy Disk, O thou who art great, O thou who art mighty, the Lord of the gods. Maat is among the Company of the gods [when] they are gathered together. Maat cometh to thee and repulseth thy evils, and she maketh the Uerutu Crown to be on thy head. The Majesty of Ra Heru-Khuti riseth, and he maketh Maat to be for thee in thy Two Great Lands. . . . Thou

¹ Ibid., p. 6.

² Ibid., p. 14. Budge here defines Maat as "thou whose existence and whose risings and settings are ordered and defined by fixed, unchanging, and unalterable laws."

³ Ibid., p. 17. The underlined word indicates an italicized word within the quotation.

existeth, for Maat existeth; Maat existeth and thou existet.¹

In analyzing these passages Lowe rightly concludes that the existence of the personification of *maat* indicates the Egyptians' interest in the regularity and orderliness of nature.² Consequently, the Egyptian view of the world is rather static. The regularity, *maat*, precludes radical, lasting changes.³

The relationship of the king to *maat* is most interesting. In recent years there has been considerable debate over the actual divinity of the pharaoh. Earlier assessments had concluded that "from the earliest historic times, therefore, the dominant element in the Egyptian conception of kingship was that the king was a god--not merely godlike, but very god."⁴ In more recent years this view has been questioned, not because it is entirely wrong but because it must be tem-

¹ E. A. Wallis Budge, *The Book of Opening the Mouth*, 2 vols. in 1 (London: n.p., 1909; reprint ed., New York: Arno Press, 1980), pp. 221-23.

² KMCO, p. 29.

³ Bleeker, *Hathor and Thoth*, pp. 12-13. Bleeker also observes (p. 13) that the Egyptian "was convinced that the same order, Ma-a-t, which was established in primeval days would prevail to the end of time. Periods of chaos and social disruption did not count. Once they had passed by, the old order was established again. As ruler it was part of the pharaoh's duty to maintain Ma-a-t and to restore it where necessary. It was said of Amenophis III that his task was 'to make Egypt flourish as in primeval days, through the plans of Ma-a-t. '"

⁴ H. W. Fairman, "The Kingship Rituals of Egypt," in *Myth Ritual and Kingship Essays on the Theory and Practice of Kingship in the Ancient Near East and in Israel*, ed. S. H. Hooke (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960), p. 75. The natural consequence of this understanding "was that theoretically everything in religious and secular life was linked with the king, and every religious ceremony and ritual was in a sense a royal ritual" (*ibid.*, p. 76).

pered. Such tempering is necessary because earlier conceptions of Egyptian kingship were founded on selective text types, those of official theology.¹ A more balanced judgment must be

that divine kingship was limited to a king after he had died, or to a king while he was alive only during the time of his official performances. The rest of the time he was considered to be a human being, surely not an ordinary one, but never a god. Naturally, the kings realized this all too clearly themselves, as is indicated by the endeavors of many of them to persuade the Egyptian citizen to transfer the specific divine character of the institution to the person of the king. The pharaoh tried to convince his subjects of his superhuman nature, to invite his people to venerate him as an intermediary, a saint, and to present himself as something he was not; a personal god.²

This king realized that he was responsible to the order of the cosmos. Therefore, it was appropriate that at a king's accession the expectation of order and harmony (*maat*) that would result from his reign be underscored. This fact is evident in the accession hymn of Merneptah:

The Chief Archivist of the Treasury of Pharaoh--life, prosperity, health:--Amen-em-Onet, addressing the Scribe Pen-ta-Uret, thus: This writing is brought to thee (to) say: Another matter: Be glad of heart, the entire land! The goodly times are come! A lord--life, prosperity, health:--is given in all lands, and *normality* has come down (again) into its place: the King of Upper and Lower Egypt, the lord of millions of years, great of kingship like Horus: Ba-en-Re Meri-Amon--life, prosperity, health! --he who *crushes* Egypt with *festivity*, the Son of Re, (most) serviceable of any king: Mer-ne-Ptah Hotep-hir-Maat--life, prosperity, health! All ye righteous, come that ye may see! Right (*maat*) has banished wrong. Evil-doers have fallen (upon) their faces. All the rapacious

¹ Dietrich Wildung, *Egyptian Saints: Deification in Pharaonic Egypt*, Hagop Kevorkian Series on Near Eastern Art and Civilization (New York: New York University Press, 1977) Pp. 1-3.

² *Ibid.*, p. 3.

are ignored. The water stands and is not dried up; the Nile lifts high. Days are long, nights have hours, and the moon comes nunnally. The gods are satisfied and content of heart. [One] lives in laughter and wonder. Mayest thou know it.¹

The accession of Merneptah (ca. 1234 B.C.) is joyous because the goodly times have come. Such times are those during which *maat* banishes falsehood. The context indicates what are the tangible evidences of *maat*. These are nothing other than the harmonious operations of nature's regularity and order. The presence of *maat* means normalcy of the operations of the cosmos.

The success of Merneptah's rule depends upon whether the orderliness of his state matches the orderliness of the cosmos.² There is no surprise in learning that the deceased is evaluated in terms of *maat*.³ Morenz correctly summarizes that *maat*, therefore, is "not only right order but also the object of human activity. Maat is both the task . . . and

¹ For this translation see *ANET*, p. 378. The only notation supplied in the translation is the inclusion of the word *maat* in parentheses. For an alternate translation of this passage see Adolf Erman, *The Ancient Egyptians*, trans. Aylward M. Blackman, with introduction by William Kelly Simpson, Harper Torchbooks ed. (London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1927; reprinted ed., New York: Harper & Row, 1966), pp. 278-79. Another Egyptian literary piece, "The Instruction for King Meri-Ka-Re," contains this corresponding exhortation: "Do justice (*maat*) whilst thou endurest upon earth. Quiet the weeper; do not oppress the widow; supplant no man in the property of his father . . ." (*ANET*, p. 415).

² *KMCO*, p. 29. Cf. also the discussion of Ivan Engnell, *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967), pp. 12-15.

³ On this point note the helpful discussion of Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, pp. 49-50. Consistent with this understanding is the fact that "as a guardian of moral life, the highest judge calls himself the priest of Maat and wears an image of her on his breast" (*ibid.*, p. 50).

. . . the promise . . .”¹

The essential points which have been raised about Egyptian royal ideology are these. The king himself sought to be treated as god-like and undoubtedly was so treated by many. His primary function was the upholding of *maat* and he himself was evaluated in terms of *maat*.² From these points several others may be deduced. The world was understood in Egypt as orderly and structured. This structure was represented by the king who himself was accountable for order in his affairs of state and land, those areas of life over which he had formative control.

¹ Siegfried Morenz, *Egyptian Religion*, trans. Ann E. Keep (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1973), p. 113.

² As *KMCO*, pp. 36ff., points out, *maat* and kingship are closely related in royal ideology in Egypt. "The function of the god-king was the preservation of the divinely ordained order of society, that there might be harmony between heaven and earth. As such he was pictured as the pastor, or herdsman, of his people. Just as the Pharaoh was responsible for controlling, defending, and disciplining the people of the land, he was also responsible for nourishing, sheltering, and enlarging the people. As he was the herdsman and his people were cattle, he must insure that his herd had green pasturage, even if it meant fighting to gain fresh pastures, and especially must he fight to drive away dangerous wild beasts (foreign invaders) who sought to prey on his herds" (ibid., p. 41). This image is reflected in "The Admonitions of Ipu-Wer," the content of which makes the transition from describing the traits of the ideal king to describing a contemporary situation in which there is an absence of such traits: "Remember how (ritual) regulations are adhered to, how (religious) dates are distributed, how one who has been inducted into priestly service may be removed for *personal* weakness--that is, it was carried out wrongfully. . . . It shall come that he brings coolness upon the heart. Men shall say: 'He is the herdsman of all evil. Evil is not in his heart. Though his herds may be small, still he has spent the day caring for them! . . . Would that he might perceive their character from the (very) first generation! Then he would smite down evil; he would stretch forth the arm against it; he would destroy the *seed* thereof and their inheritance. . . . (But) there is no pilot in their hour. Where

Mesopotamian royal ideology

The differences between the royal ideologies of Egypt and Mesopotamia are well known.¹ And just as evident is the mass of primary source material that helps develop a conception of Mesopotamian kingship.² Some years ago Mowinckel outlined the general features of this kingship:

The king is thus the representative of the gods on earth, the steward of the god or the gods. Through him they exercise their power and sovereignty, and he is the channel through which blessing and happiness and fertility flow from the gods to men. "He rises like the sun over humanity." With the right king, in whom the gods have pleasure, all material and spiritual welfare is secured. Speaking poetically and devotionally, he may be said to create all this for his people. But he is also man's representative before the gods. In him the people is one. According to the corporate view of those times the people was somehow incorporated in him, and the strength and blessing which he receives from the gods were partaken of by the whole country and people. This double position of the king as the link between gods and men is expressed and made effective through the cult.³

Mowinckel's definition highlights an important element in understanding the nature of Mesopotamian kingship: The kingship represents a continuum in which the gods and people move.

is he today? Is he then sleeping? Behold, the glory thereof cannot be seen . . ." (*ANET*, p. 443). The underlining within this quotation indicates italicized words, and the words in parentheses are so given in the material quoted.

¹ For a summary of several of these differences see Frankfort, *The Problem of Similarity in Ancient Near Eastern Religions*, pp. 3-23.

² The following assessment of history could also, however, be applied to the primary source material on kingship. Samuel N. Kramer, *The Sumerians* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1963), p. 33, says that the pertinent source material is "tenuous, elusive, meager, and partial."

³ Sigmund Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, trans. D. R. Ap-Thomas, 2 vols. in 1 (New York: Abingdon Press, 1967), p. 51.

This understanding highlights the difference between Mesopotamia and Egypt. Mesopotamian kingship must be understood as mediatorial, a linking of god and man, a semi-divine office.¹

Divine representation

Kingship, as described in "The Sumerian King List," "was lowered from heaven."² In the piece, "Dispute Between the Tamarisk and the Date Palm," the reader is reminded that "once there was given no kingship in the lands and the rule was given to the gods."³ This rule which existed at first

¹ This more tentative understanding of the king as divine is reflected in the history of the use of the *dingir* and *ilu* prefixes. For use of these prefixes see M. J. Seux, *Epithets Royales Akkadiennes et Sumeriennes* (Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1967) and William W. Hallo, *Early Mesopotamian Royal Titles*, American Oriental Series, vol. 43 (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1957). The general assessment of the use of these prefixes is that they flourish in the Ur III period (2113-2004 B.C.) and then pass out of general use. The very view these ancients had of kingship made it most difficult to maintain use of the prefixes.

² See *ANET*, p. 265, and the entire work of Thorkild Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List*, Assyriological Studies, no. 11 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939). Of course the king list is understood to be an attempt to legitimate a dynastic establishment by means of historiography. For a tangential note see Sidney Smith, "The Practice of Kingship in Early Semitic Kingdoms," in *Myth, Ritual and Kingship: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Kingship in the Ancient Near East and in Israel*, ed. S. H. Hooke (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960), p. 46, who remarks, "The expression 'raised to kingship' might seem a simple metaphor. If it were so, then a goddess bestowed some form of kingship. That is contrary to all that is known. The city god in Babylonia bestowed kingship, his consort may be mentioned with him, but not without him; or 'the great gods,' including certain goddesses, may assent to the appointment of a king, but the goddesses are never mentioned alone. The phrase clearly indicates some recognition of kingship, just as the phrase in the record of NIN.LIL's festivals does. There is evidence that 'raising' was a technical term."

³ For this translation see *ANET*, p. 593; note also W.G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford: The Clarendon

among the gods was posited in the pantheon of gods. A glimpse at the operation of this divine assembly is given in a lamentation occasioned by the destruction of Ur (2004 B.C.):

After they had *pronounced* the utter destruction of Ur,
 After they had directed that its people be killed--
 On that day verily I abandoned not my city;
 My land verily I forsook not.
 To Anu the water of my eye verily I poured;
 To Enlil I in person verily made supplication.
 'Let not my city be destroyed,' verily I said unto them;
 'Let not Ur be destroyed,' verily I said unto them;
 'Let not its people perish,' verily I said unto them.
 Verily Anu changed not this word;
 Verily Enlil with its 'It is good; so be it' soothed not
 my heart.
 For the second time, when the council . . .¹

This lamentation shows clearly that the fate of a given city was determined by the deliberations of the divine assembly, especially by the will of Anu and Enlil.²

These two deities were supreme in the pantheon in terms of *authority* and *executive* power respectively. The "Myth of the Elevation of Inanna" says of Anu:

What thou hast ordered (comes) true!
 The utterance of prince and Lord is (but) what thou hast
 ordered, (that with which) thou art in agreement.
 O Anu: thy great command takes precedence, who could say
 no (to it)?³

Press, 1960), p. 163. Cf. the discussion of W. G. Lambert, "The Seed of Kingship," in *Le Palais et la Royaute*, ed. Paul Garelli, Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, 19 (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1974), pp. 427-40.

¹ *ANET*, p. 458.

² Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 646-51, where "The Curse of Agade" Yields the same picture.

³ As quoted by Henri Frankfort, et al., *Before Philosophy: The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1946), p. 153. The parentheses are given by Frankfort.

And Enlil's executive function is shown in the words of "Hymn to Enlil, the All-Beneficent":

Enlil whose command is far-reaching, lofty his word (and)
holy,
Whose pronouncement is unchangeable, who decrees destinies
unto the distant future,
Whose lifted eye scans the land,
Whose lifted beam searches the heart of all the land.¹

Anu and Enlil along with Ninhursaga and Enki and three others comprised "the seven law-making gods."² These seven presided over the pantheon and the pantheon as a whole served as the prototype of the national state.³ Within the assembly of gods there was a vote to determine who should be king for a given period of time.⁴ In turn the deity chosen as king in the pantheon selected a human figure as his king on earth. However, the deity king could exist without and independently of his human counterpart on earth.⁵

There is no surprise, then, in discovering that earthly kings commonly refer to their kingship as a divine deposit

¹ *ANET*, p. 573.

² Thorkild Jacobsen, "Early Political Development in Mesopotamia," *ZA* 52 (August 1957): 101.

³ Cf. Kramer, *The Sumerians*, pp. 114-16.

⁴ However, the elected cosmic king in the pantheon and his earthly counterpart both functioned under Enlil; Cf. Frankfort, *Before Philosophy*, pp. 207ff.

⁵ Cf. H. W. F. Saggs, *The Greatness That Was Babylon* (New York: The New American Library, 1962), p. 342. A good example of this understanding of the cosmic and national kingship is seen in "The Laws of Ur-Nammu": "After Anu and Enlil had turned over the kingship of Ur to Nanna, son born of (the goddess) Ninsun, for his beloved mother who bore him, in accordance with his (i.e., of the god Nanna) principles of equity and truth . . ." (the translation exactly as given in *ANET*, p. 523).

made to them.¹ In this sense the earthly king is the deity's representative. To argue only from the above analysis would be one-sided since Mesopotamian history is long and the nature of kingship varied. As an example, the understanding of kingship is much more modest in the Old Assyrian period but even then the kings do not resist stating their correlation with deity.²

The artwork coming from the Mesopotamian world corroborates the above evaluation. Only a few of the images are cited to show the divine nature of Mesopotamian kingship. The first is the rather stereotyped "presentation to a god-king."³ Another example emphasizing at least divine assistance for

¹ As an illustration of this see George A. Barton, *The Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad*, Library of Ancient Semitic Inscriptions, vol. 1 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 271-99, where there is clear indication that all five kings of Ur III understood their kingship in this way.

² Cf. the discussion of Mogens Trolle Larsen, *The Old Assyrian City-State and Its Colonies*, Mesopotamia: Copenhagen Studies in Assyriology, vol. 4 (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1976) pp. 109ff. "In his capacity as *issil'ak* Assur the king obviously functioned as intermediary between the god and the community; this appears to be directly expressed in some of the inscriptions, the most striking example being Salim-ahum's remark that the god asked him to build a temple. . . . Building the temples for the gods is a basic duty for all Mesopotamian kings. Another example of this close relationship to the god is found in Ilusuma's long text where he says that Assur opened up two new springs for him, making it possible to mold the bricks on the spot . . ." (ibid., p. 119).

³ For a discussion of this imaging see E. Douglas Van Buren, "Homage to a Deified King," *ZA* 50 (November 1952): 92-120. "The identification of the seated figure has often been discussed; the consensus of opinion, based mainly on seals bearing dedicatory inscriptions, and on certain peculiarities in the seated figure who is always male, is that he was not one of the gods of the pantheon, but was undoubtedly intended to portray a god-king, that is to say, a deified king or the ruler of a city" (ibid., p. 92).

those projects undertaken by the king is found on the stele of Ur-Nammu.¹ There in successive scenes the deity is depicted as “more involved than ever in the affairs of men, and ready to assist them in all sorts of circumstances. First in religious ceremonies; afterwards, in a scene where we see the king with a mason’s tool [sic] on his shoulder. . . .”² A further pictorial illustration of kingship concerns the investiture scene from Zimri-Lim's (1779-1761 B.C.) palace at Mari.³ In the scene prominence is given to the rod and ring symbols,⁴ indicative of the bestowal of divine power and authority. Here is shown undoubtedly a king's interest in giving divine legitimation to his reign.⁵

¹ For a pictorial reproduction of this stele see Andre Parrot, *Sumer*, trans. Stuart Gilbert and James Emmons, in *The Arts of Mankind* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1960), pp. 227-29.

² *Ibid.*, p. 228.

³ For a clear pictorial reproduction of the investiture scene see *ibid.*, pp. 279-80.

⁴ For a discussion of the use and meaning of the symbolic rod and ring see E. Douglas Van Buren, *Symbols of the Gods in Mesopotamian Art*, AnOr, no. 23 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1945), pp. 155ff.

⁵ In "A Letter to a God" there is evidence that Zimri-Lim realized his continuing need for divine favor: "Speak to Ida (the river-god) my lord: Thus Zimri-Lim your servant. I herewith send a gold cup to my lord. At an earlier date I wrote my report to my lord; my lord reveal[ed] a sign. May my lord make the sign which he revealed come true for me. Moreover, may my lord not neglect to protect my li[fe], may my lord not turn [his face elsewhere, besides me may my lord have need of no one el[se]" (*ANET*, p. 627).

Human representation

The king as human representative carries the responsibility for the nation's successful operation.¹ An appropriate example of both aspects of the continuum (divine and human representative), and a transition to a more direct consideration of the human representative aspect, is the content of "Petition to a King":

To my king with varicolored eyes who wears a lapis lazuli
beard,
Speak;
To the golden statue fashioned on a good day,
The . . . raised in a pure sheepfold, called *to* the pure
womb of Inanna,
The lord, hero of Inanna, say:
"Thou (in) thy judgment thou art the son of Anu,
Thy commands, like the word of a god, cannot be *turned*
back,
Thy words like *rain* pouring down from heaven, are without
number,"
Thus says Urshagga, thy servant:
"My king has cared for me, who am a 'son' of Ur.
If now my king is (truly) of Anu,
Let not my father's house be carried off,
Let not the *foundations* of my father's house be torn away.
Let my king know."²

Though the king is unidentified (perhaps he is even a dead, deified king³), the force of the petition is at once clear.

The divine aspect of kingship is underscored in such words as "thy commands, like the word of a god." But the human representative aspect is also emphasized by Urshagga's laudatory

¹ This responsibility of man before God is apparently partially reflected in the correlation of the king with the tree of life, cf. Engnell, *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East*, pp. 24ff.

² *ANET*, p. 382. The ellipsis and underlining to italicized words are part of the quotation itself.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 382, n. 4.

words, "my king has cared for me," and petitionary ones, "let not the *foundations* of my father's house be torn away."

What were the responsibilities of the king as human representative before the gods? Only selective treatment can or need be given here.¹ A royal funeral account (Late Assyrian) indicates partially the responsibility of the king. It does so by relating the mourning of the land upon the passing of the king. Evidently, the king's presence insures the smooth, uninterrupted functioning and fertility of nature:

(In the) tomb, place of mystery,
 on the Royal Esplanade,
 I made him goodly rest. . . .
 I put all this in the tomb,
 with my father who begot me.
 I offered sacrifice
 to the divine rulers, the Anunnaki,
 and to the gods who inhabit the earth.
 The channels complain
 and the watercourses respond.
 Of trees and fruit
 the face is darkened.
 The orchards weep . . .²

While not wishing to violate the highly symbolic nature of this language, it appears to this writer that the author of the document makes a conscious correlation between the functioning of creation's laws and the presence or absence of the king.

But more directly the king is responsible for the economic and social well-being of the people. By exercise of his state function he set about the business of making the

¹ For a more complete treatment see *KMCO*, pp. 87ff.

² As quoted by Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, p. 244. The ellipses are supplied by this writer; the parentheses are not.

people happy, prosperous, and secure.¹ In this way the following words appropriately describe the expectation-function of kingship:

. . . at the throne of the kingship
 strengthen the fundament,
 to seize the reins of the land,
 with a righteous sceptre thoroughly
 the people,
 to build houses, make people settle
 to subjugate the enemies' country . . .²

More complete development is given the expectation of kingship in an Akkadian prophecy. There exists enough uncertainty about this prophecy to say only that it records expectation of a future king whose presence will bring economic and social well-being.

A prince will arise and [exercise sovereignty
 eighteen years.
 The country will live safely, the heart of the
 country will be glad, men will [enjoy abundance,
 The gods will make beneficial decision for the
 country, good rainfalls [will come]. . . .
 The deity of cattle and the deity of grain will
 produce *abundance* in the land.
 Rainfalls and high water will prevail, the
 people of the land will observe, a festival.
 But the ruler will be slain with a weapon
 during an uprising.
 A prince will arise, thirteen years will he
 exercise sovereignty.
 There will be a rebellion of Elam against Akkad.
 Akkad's booty will be plundered.
 (Elam) will destroy the temples of the great
 gods, the downfall of Akkad will be decided.

¹ Samuel N. Kramer, "Kingship in Sumer and Akkad: The Ideal King," in *Le Palais et la Royauté*, ed. Paul Garelli, Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, 19 (Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1974), p. 175-

² This translation is from Engnell, *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East*, pp. 39-40.

Revolution, chaos, and calamity will occur
in the country.¹

What this citation shows is that kingship is responsible, both positively and negatively, for the well-being of land and people. In short, the king was responsible for "justice," *misaru*.

The Akkadian word, as Ringgren notes, "is a wider conception than our 'righteousness.'"² *Misaru* has a fairly wide usage, "redress (as a legislative act to remedy certain economic malfunctions)," "justice (in general)," and even a month name (Old Babylonian Alalakh).³ The use of *misaru* as economic redress is attested in a number of cuneiform sources.⁴ As Finkelstein argues, the *misarum*-acts must not be thought of as permanent reform measures but rather as adjustments to a

¹ This translation together with its brackets, ellipsis, and parentheses is that found in *ANET*, p. 451.

² Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, p. 58.

³ Ignace J. Gelb et al., eds., *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1964ff.), M, part II, p. 116 (hereafter cited as CAD).

⁴ For brief discussions of these see F. R. Kraus, *Ein Edikt des Königs Ammi-Šaduga von Babylon*, *Studia et Documenta ad Jura Orientis Antiqui Pertinentia*, vol. 5 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958), pp. 183-86 and 243-47; N. P. Lemche, "The Manumission of Slaves--the Fallow Year--the Sabbatical Year--the Jubel Year," *VT* 26 (January 1976): 38-59; and J. J. Finkelstein, "Ammi-saduga's Edict and the Babylonian 'Law Codes,'" *JCS* 15 (1961): 91-104, who says, "the *misarum*-act, in the strict sense then, consisted of a series of measures designed to restore 'equilibrium' in the economic life of the society, which, once presumed to have created the necessary effect of a *tabula rasa* for certain types of financial or economic obligations, ceases to have any force. Under this aspect, therefore, it would be misleading to think of *misarum*-acts as 'reforms,' which, strictly speaking, imply corrections of what are deemed to be unjust or improper practices, and which presumably are intended to have permanent effect" (100).

sluggish economy.¹ At any rate, the term *misaru* even in these cases is an act intended for the people's well-being.

The broader understanding of *misaru* as "justice" is important for understanding the function and intention of Mesopotamian kingship. There were throughout Mesopotamian history variations, of course, on the administrative means whereby this justice was enacted.² Generally, however, the judgment of Ringgren, following Widengren, seems acceptable. The term *misaru* "is in fact the right order in the cosmos. When it prevails, the rain falls at the right time and the harvests become abundant. Then the right order reigns in the community .."³ With this right order comes equitable treatment of the oppressed. A sense of harmony exists. As an example, the Code of Hammurabi may be cited to show the correlation of Mesopotamian kingship with this sense of harmony. Only the following excerpts, one from the Prologue and one from the Epilogue, are necessary to illustrate the point.

The Prologue reads:

.. . at that time Anum and Enlil named me to promote
the welfare of the people,
me, Hammurabi, the devout, god-fearing prince,
to cause justice (*misaram*) to prevail in the land,

¹ Ibid.

² J. N. Postgate, "Royal Exercise of Justice Under the Assyrian Empire," in *Le Palais et la Royaute*, ed. Paul Garelli, Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, 19 (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1974), pp. 417-26, has pointed out variations within the administrative means employed to enact "justice, seeing the Assyrian kings as an administrative watershed.

³ Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, p. 58.

to destroy the wicked and the evil,
that the strong might not oppress the weak. . .¹

And the Epilogue reads correspondingly. Of the stele erected
on behalf of the king the Epilogue says,

. . . I set (it) up in order to administer the law of
the land,
to prescribe the ordinances of the land,
to give justice (*misarim*) to the oppressed.
I am the king who is preeminent among kings;
my words are choice; my ability has no equal.
By the order of Shamash, the great judge of
heaven and earth,
may my justice (*misari*) prevail in the land;
by the word of Marduk, my lord,
may my statutes have no one to rescind them . . .
If that man heeded my words which I wrote on my stela,
and did not rescind my law,
has not distorted my words,
did not alter my statutes,
may Shamash make that man reign
as long as I, the king of justice (*misarim*);
may he shepherd his people in justice (*misarim*)!²

The context of these usages indicates a very broad
understanding of justice (*misaru*). Certainly, the material
indicates that Mesopotamian kingship was understood as promul-
gating order and harmony of all types.

Summary

Mesopotamian kingship, being best understood as a

¹ This translation of the Codex is from *ANET*, p. 164.
The word in parentheses is supplied from the transliteration
of G. R. Driver and John C. Miles, eds., *The Babylonian Laws*,
2 vols., Ancient Codes and Laws of the Near East (Oxford: The
Clarendon Press, 1960), 2:6. For the cuneiform text see E.
Bergmann, ed., *Codex Hammurabi*, Scripta Pontificii Instituti
Biblici (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1953), p. 1.

² This translation is that in *ANET*, p. 178. The forms
of *misaru* are supplied by this writer from the transliteration
of Rieckle Borger, *Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesentucke*, 3 Hefte
(Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1963), 2:42-43. For
the cuneiform script see Bergmann, *Codex Hammurabi*, pp. 33, 35.

continuum of the semi-divine, is that position responsible for order and abundance, the general well-being of the land. While there is not an exact parallel here with Egyptian royal ideology, the Mesopotamian ideology does bear one striking similarity with its western counterpart. Both in Egypt and Mesopotamia the kingship bears a responsibility for order and management within the cosmos. Appointment to kingship, by whatever means it may have come about, is an appointment to the cosmic responsibility of management, order, and harmony.¹ The king must carefully attend to the cosmic laws and seek more harmonious operation with them.

*Israelite royal ideology*²

Already the reason for surveying the various royal

¹ Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, p. 310, in this light appropriately cautions: "The Mesopotamian kings interpreted the welfare of their country as proof that they had not disappointed the gods who elected them. Only in this very indirect manner can the king be said to have 'produced a plenteous abundance' or to have created 'the well-being of mankind.' Hence we find him asking for benefactions of which Pharaoh disposed in full sovereignty. Sargon of Assyria prayed: 'O Ea, lord of wisdom, creator of all things, to Sargon, king of the universe, king of Assyria, viceroy of Babylon, king of Sumer and Akkad, builder of thy abode--open thy fountains; let his springs send forth the waters of plenty and abundance; give water in abundance to his fields. Quick understanding and an open mind decree for him; prosper his work; let him attain unto his desire.'"

² One can rightly question why this survey does not also give brief analyses of Hittite and Ugaritic kingship. There are several reasons. (1) The scope of this work could not address all Ancient Near Eastern sacral materials; therefore, those most appropriate for this study were included. There is evidence, at least to this author's mind, that indicates consideration of Egyptian, Mesopotamian, and Israelite royal ideologies calls attention to the three fundamental patterns of kingship in the Ancient Near East. This is not to argue that Hittite and Ugaritic do not contribute. They do,

ideologies has become more clear. The present interest has been to entertain those relationships that existed among deity, kingship, and creation. That same interest will be pursued here. What relationships existed among God, the king, and creation, especially as this reflection on Israel's royal ideology is presented in the Old Testament?

Those who seek an answer to this question are impressed by the immensity of the task on at least two fronts: the vast body of literature (both primary and secondary) awaiting analysis and the tendency to "find" in the Old Testament those *exact* situations discovered in either Egypt or

but apparently not by suggesting an entirely different understanding of kingship. (2) A further reason for not including Hittite and Ugaritic is that neither has enjoyed the benefit of repeated and prolonged studies on kingship. Hopefully that day will come, but undoubtedly by that time Eblaite studies will have called for need of further modification in a number of areas. (3) In keeping with the above reasons a third is understood. The inclusion of Hittite and Ugaritic kingship studies would not perceptibly alter the findings of this work. However, the reader is referred to the following few works as a means of gaining entrance into the study of Hittite and Ugaritic kingship: Engnell, *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East*, pp. 52-177; Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, pp. 74-88; Victor Korosec, "Les Rois Hittites et la Formation du Droit," in *Le Palais et la Royaute*, ed. Paul Garelli, Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, 19 (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1974), pp. 315-21; O. R. Gurney, *The Hittites*, 2nd ed. revised (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1962), pp. 63-79; J. G. Macqueen, *The Hittites and Their Contemporaries in Asia Minor* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1975), pp. 112-38; O. R. Gurney, *Some Aspects of Hittite Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977); John Gray, *The Krt Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra*, 2nd ed., *Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui*, no. 5 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964); and Anson F. Rainey, *The Social Stratification of Ugarit* (Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1962; Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 63-5836, 1963), especially pp. 9ff. (hereafter cited as SSU). Added to these works should be appropriate sources on Hittite and Ugaritic grammar and literature.

Mesopotamia. Being duly cautioned about these difficulties, the following general picture of Israelite royal ideology is drawn. Though the scope of this survey prohibits extensive treatment, analysis of selected Old Testament sources, it is believed, indicates a description of these relationships consistent with the entirety of the Old Testament corpus.

Historiographic literature

One begins to discover something of these relationships among God, the king, and creation through reflection on certain historical texts which treat all three of these together. This study begins with the account of 2 Samuel 21. Here the reader is quickly introduced to famine (the contemporary manifestation of creation),¹ the king (David), and Yahweh. Verse 1 reads:

During the reign of David, there was a famine (רָעָב) for three successive years (שָׁנָה אַחֲרֵי שָׁנָה) ; so David sought (יִבְקֶשׁ) the face of the LORD. The LORD said, "It is on account of Saul and his blood-stained house; it is because he put the Gibeonites to death."²

The verse as it stands emphasizes several points.

One certainly is the duration and severity of the famine. Another is the guilt which is placed upon Saul for his misdeed (cf. Josh 9). But as well, the verse raises

¹ There is a remarkable over-statement in saying the famine represents chaos, the enemies of Yahweh. John Gray, "The Hebrew Conception of the Kingship of God: Its Origin and Development," *VT* 6 (1956): 268-85, seems to overdraw a cosmos-chaos distinction. Rather, there is evidence that God uses the law-structure of the cosmos to bring famine. He manages famine; he does not do battle with it.

² The Hebrew words are supplied from *BHS*.

several interesting questions for our purposes. Why does the natural order (famine) affect the political order (kingship)? Why is David the one "responsible" for resolving the famine crisis? In what sense is David now held "responsible" for a misdeed of his predecessor? Why did not the punishment for sin fall only upon those who actually committed the misdeed against the Gibeonites?

These questions point to an evident reality about the text.¹ The passage evidences a sense of corporateness between the king and his subjects, those subjects on whom the famine's effect had fallen. Therefore, David takes the lead as representative of these subjects, in seeking a resolution to the disaster (famine). One deduces that sins committed in the political sphere do have natural, creational, implications. This is entirely in keeping with the conclusion enunciated by the leaders in Joshua 9:20: "This is what we will do to them. We will let them live, so that wrath (אֲצָרָה) will not fall on us for breaking the oath we swore to them." The term אֲצָרָה does not specify the particular form the wrath would take.² But that famine could be a demonstration of such wrath is beyond question.³ And clearly in the 2 Samuel 21:1 passage the

¹ Cf. the discussion of this passage in *KMCO*, pp. 108-9.

² For occurrences of the various forms of אֲצָרָה see Lisowsky, *Konkordanz*, p. 1268.

³ This point seems evident from the use of אֲצָרָה in 1 Chr 27:24, especially when this passage is compared with its context in 1 Chr 21. The term is certainly employed to describe a divine visitation of judgment, 2 Chr 19:10.

famine is a visitation of wrath. After appropriate action has been taken (21:2-14a), the report is given in 21:14b that they “did everything the king commanded. After that, God answered prayer in behalf of the land.” Clearly God takes action with respect to the land (לֹאֲרִץ . . . וַיַּעֲתֶר).¹ The famine is removed and “the natural order returns to normal.”² This passage, while not at all arguing in any sense that David is divine (Egypt) or semi-divine (Mesopotamia), does nonetheless underscore that kingship is responsible before God on behalf of the land and its people.³ As Saul's evil brings disaster, so David's obedience or righteous act brings relief.⁴

¹ With respect to this passage Hans Wilhelm Hertzberg, *I & II Samuel*, trans. J. S. Bowden from the German *Die Samuel-bucher*, 2nd revised ed., The Old Testament Library (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976), p. 384, appropriately remarks: “Indeed, it is emphatically said that now the grace of the Lord again shines over the people and the land.”

² *KMCO*, p. 109.

³ While this writer cannot agree with the application of sacral principles that Aubrey R. Johnson, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1967) makes, the general sense of his following evaluation is correct: “In the same way the royal family finds its temporary focus in the reigning king, who, like Ahaz, may be referred to or addressed quite simply as ‘House of David’; so that it is altogether in keeping that the nation as a psychical whole should also be seen to have its focus in the royal house and, at any given time, in the reigning monarch. Thus it is that any violent disturbance of the national life, such as that caused by a prolonged drought or an outburst of plague, may be attributed to the fact that the king himself has violated the sanctions of the group and the whole royal-house or the very nation itself may be involved with him in the condemnation which follows upon any such trespass” (pp. 3-4).

⁴ For a discussion of explanations of the convergence of God-king-land in the 2 Sam 21 passage see H. Cazelles, “David's Monarchy in the Gibeonite Claim,” *PEQ* (1955): 165-75; A. Malamat, “Doctrines of Causality in Hittite and Biblical Historiography: A Parallel,” *VT* 5 (1955): 1-12. Note also

Given this reality, one must avoid two pitfalls. One should not extrapolate the imagery from its context in 2 Samuel 21 and hastily apply it to many supposed Old Testament parallels and from this application draw unwarranted conclusions.¹ Moreover, one must avoid so secularizing Israelite royal ideology in order to make it fit the post-2000 B.C. ancient Near Eastern "tendency in the direction of secularization," that any seemingly religious aspect to Israelite kingship must be identified as a mythological carry-over from an earlier period.² The 2 Samuel 21 passage has religious aspects indeed. Obedience to Yahweh is not a mythological carry-over from an earlier age. It is a consistent expectation in each age.

the general discussion on Davidic kingship in Karl-Heinz Bernhard, *Das Problem der altorientalischen Königsideologie im Alten Testament*, *VTSup*, no. 8 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961), especially pp. 85-90.

¹ This is the apparent methodological error of Walter Brueggemann, "Kingship and Chaos," *CBQ* 33 (1971): 317-32, who, using the Davidic model of kingship, attempts to explain the orderliness and regularity referred to in Gen 8:22 as an authorial indicator of this text's background. Rather, the regularity of law operation within creation as described in Gen 8:22 should be understood as testimony concerning the normative operation of God's law structure. There is, of course, the question of whether Gen 8:22 implies uniformity of nature from the beginning, cf. John C. Whitcomb and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood* (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1962), p. 216. However, unless one is willing to concede a new creation of laws by God in Gen 8:22, the passage must be emphasizing a law-structure whose operation is entirely dependent on the living word of the Creator. This all being so, Gen 8:22 could easily be understood as testimony, antecedent to Davidic kingship, of a law-structured cosmos in which all mankind lives.

² This is the very problem into which the explanation of C. R. North, "The Religious Aspects of Hebrew Kingship," *ZAW* 50 (1932): 8-38, falls.

Hymnic literature

Taking 2 Samuel 21 as an informative lead, one may further construct his understanding of Israelite royal ideology from other passages.¹ Among these must surely be the royal psalms such as 2, 18, 45, 72, 89, 110, etc.² Of these Psalm 72 is especially helpful for present purposes. Johnson's remark that "the whole psalm admirably depicts the literally vital role which it was hoped" that the king "might play in the life of the nation" is well taken.³ This particular psalm was thought royal enough that it was even included in Gunkel's select few royal psalms.⁴ The date of Psalm 72 falls within the Monarchic Syncretism period (10th century and later), the view of Freedman and O'Connor.⁵

As an initial generalization one may say that the psalm clearly expresses the king-ideal.⁶ In this respect

¹ Though space prohibits further treatment of the kind of imagery of kingship given in 2 Sam 21, one finds further articulation in such passages as 2 Sam 24:10-25 (noting especially the remark of 24:25) and 1 Kgs 18:1-45 (noting especially the evaluation of Elijah in 18:18).

² For a very helpful, though strained, evaluation of these royal psalms in this context see *KMCO*, pp. 112ff.

³ Johnson, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*, p. 8.

⁴ Cf. the discussion of J. H. Eaton, *Kingship and the Psalms*, Studies in Biblical Theology, 2nd series, no. 32 (Naperville, IL: Alec Allenson, Inc., n.d.), pp. 2-5. Gunkel's category of royal psalms included 2, 18, 20, 21, 45, 72, 101-110, and 132. With these nine he also reckoned 144:1-11 and 89 (in a more remote sense).

⁵ M. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1980), pp. 164-65.

⁶ Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 1:68.

the Psalm becomes a formula of blessing which reminds one strongly of the promises of the prophets as it oscillates between blessing and prediction. The officiating priest who recites the psalm, to begin with speaks on behalf of the congregation and in the form of a petition. But he is also the representative of Yahweh and pronounces strong and effective words with a ring of certainty. Through these he, so to speak, conducts Yahweh's own blessing to the king . . .¹

While one cannot be entirely certain as to the psalm's cultic employment, there is considerable certainty that the oscillation between blessing and prediction is present.² The general picture offered of this king is that, enabled by God, he "is to rule with compassion, bringing prosperity to society and nature and enjoying lasting, world-wide dominion."³ In simple terms the psalm places responsibility for the proper operation of the nation on the kingship. Through him goodness blesses or badness blights the kingdom. The kingship is thus responsible for productivity (3, 6-7, 15-16) and right treatment of the afflicted (2, 4, 12-14). Such a king is a dominionizer (8-11) and hopefully one who has longevity (5, 15, 17).⁴

¹ Ibid., 1:69.

² As Eaton, *Kingship and the Psalms*, p. 120 remarks, after the opening prayer in 72:1, "in the remainder there seems to be oscillation of mood between *prayer* that the king may then rule successfully and *declaration* that he will then do so" (underlining indicates words Eaton italicizes).

³ Ibid. However, as Johnson, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*, pp. 7-8 points out, "the parallelism of the opening line makes it clear that we are here concerned with no simple portrayal of some future eschatological figure (although this is not to say that the psalm is in no way eschatological), but with a prayer for the ruling member of an hereditary line of kings . . . and the whole psalm admirably depicts the literally vital role which it was hoped that he might play in the life of the nation."

⁴ As Shalom M. Paul, "A Traditional Blessing for the

With these few general remarks in hand a closer look at the psalm indicates several intriguing structural features. The psalm divides into five strophes (1-4, 5-8, 9-11, 12-15, and 16-17).¹ Further, the syllabic symmetry is nearly uniform throughout the strophic divisions.² Especially helpful, however, is what has been called "stichochiasm." Kselman has represented this feature in verses 1-4 as follows:³

וצדקתך לבן מלך ידן עמך בצדק	A
ועניך במשפט	B
ישאו הרים שלום לעם	C
וגבעות בצדקה	C'
ישפט עניי עם	B'
יושיע לבני אביון	A'

What is of particular interest here is the parallelism of lines C and C'. As Kselman notes⁴ there are in these lines two common word pairs, **הרים / גבעות** and **שלום / צדקה**, the latter pair being of special interest here. These two terms in a

Long Life of the King," *JNES* 31 (October 1972): 351-55 has pointed out, the prepositions **עם** and **לפני** of v. 5 should both be taken to mean "like, in the manner of." Therefore, reading **יִירָאוּךָ** as **וַיֵּאָרְךָ** (with the Septuagint, cf. NIV), "the king is bestowed a blessing of long life which is expressed in terms of the permanence of the sun and the moon" (*ibid.*, 352). Analogous to this is a blessing for long life in a building inscription of Samsuiluna. The Akkadian reads: *sulmam u balatam sa kima Sin u Samas darium ana qistim liqisusum ana siriktim lisrukusum*, "May (the gods Zababa and Ishtar) grant him as a gift, bestow upon him as a present, good health and life which are as eternal as the moon and the sun" (*ibid.*, 354).

¹ Following the lead of Skehan's analysis, so John S. Kselman, "Psalm 72: Some observations on Structure," *BASOR* 220 (December 1975) : 77.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, 78.

⁴ Cf. *ibid.*

slightly different form are found in verse 7 also (cf. Isa 32:17, 48:18, etc.).

The term קִדְּוֹ is rather broad in meaning, as is quite clearly attested in Ugaritic.¹ Swetman has adduced several helpful citations from Ugaritic literature to demonstrate the rather wide range of meaning *sdq* possesses.² One of those he cites is in the Krt text, lines 12-13 in col. is 'att *sdqh lypq, mtrht ysrh* which Gray translates: "His legitimate wife did he find, yea, his rightful spouse."³ At any rate the Ugaritic cognate means more than "right, uprightness." Gordon has suggested "legitimate" might here even be understood in the sense of "destined."⁴ Concerning קִדְּוֹ the most obvious question is "right" or even "destined" in terms of what? Apparently this *what* (norm) is "a relationship, either between God and man, or man and man. . . . This norm, therefore, is determined by what the relationship demands."⁵ In the case of Psalm 72:3 the meaning of קִדְּוֹ appears to be that a kingship properly endowed by God will result in that productivity which God has destined for his people. Kingship surfaces as pivotal

¹ Cyrus Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*, AnOr, no. 38 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1965), pp. 472-73, no. 2147.

² James Swetman, "Some Observations on the Background of קִדְּוֹ in Jeremiah 23, 5a," *Bib* 46 (1965): 29-40.

³ Gray, *Krt Text*, p. 11. See also his commentary on

⁴ Gordon, *Textbook*, p. 473.

⁵ Lester J. Kuyper, "Righteousness and Salvation," *SJT* 30 (1977): 233.

in this account.¹

This analysis of קִדָּץ is very much in keeping with the other member of the word pair, שְׁלוֹם. Both the Ugaritic² and Akkadian³ cognates indicate much the same meaning as does the Hebrew, "well-being" in the sense of "wholeness."⁴ The parallel of this word with קִדָּץ in 72:3 is instructive. The king, divinely enabled, will cause to come about the wholeness which God desires for his creation. What this psalm has shown more clearly is the correlation of God-king-creation. The king is not divine. But when he is empowered by God, there is said to be a return in creation to a state of wholeness, a divinely ordered and beneficent regularity.

Prophetic literature

This leads naturally to still another type of literature which helps develop more fully this picture of Israelite

¹ Kselman, "Psalm 72: Some observations on Structure," 78 has correctly observed that in the chiasmic structure of Ps 72 "the psalmist makes the point that behind royal rule, the world of nature and the human community stands the same divine, creative power." Therefore, king and creation both ultimately have to do with the Creator-God.

² Gordon, *Textbook*, p. 490-91, no. 2424.

³ Wolfram Von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*, 3 Bande (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1972), pp. 1013-14.

⁴ For a more complete discussion of שְׁלוֹם and its cognates see Walter Eisenbeis, *Die Wurzel שְׁלֵם im Alten Testament*, BZAW, no. 113 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Company, 1969). He remarks that even with respect to apocalyptic literature that "wird das Nomen שְׁלֵם nur als religiöses Wort in Aussagen über die Endzeit verwendet. Ihm liegt dabei die Vorstellung zugrunde, dass eine begonnene Entwicklung zum Abschluss kommt und dadurch ein entgültiger Zustand erreicht wird. Es bedeutet Kraft, Wohlbestelltheit oder Frieden" (p. 221).

royal ideology. Some years ago DeGuglielmo wrote a study on messianic prophecies that have to do with the fertility of the land.¹ Passages which he cited include Isaiah 32:15; 35:1-7; 41:18-20; Amos 9:13-15; and Zechariah 8:12.² While most acknowledge in these passages a general picture of the land's fertility there is some debate over what direction an exact interpretation should take.³ Among the various interpretations offered there is the consistent view that

. . . the material benefits, specifically the fertility of the land, are considered solely on the basis of their relation to the citizens of the future kingdom. Little thought, for example, is given to the possibility that the sacred writers intended to predict the fertility of the land *propter se*, hence only incidentally or perhaps concurrently in relation to man. On this one score, I am convinced, we have failed to obtain the complete picture of the messianic doctrine of the OT. In the light of the insistence of the OT on the fertility of the land in the messianic age, it must follow that it is an essential feature of the messianic program and as such must be placed in its proper soteriological perspective.⁴

There is much in these judgments with which one can agree. However, the messianic prophecies do not separate the

¹ Antonine DeGuglielmo, "The Fertility of the Land in the Messianic Prophecies," *CBQ* 19 (1957): 306-11.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 306-7.

³ A number of years ago Angelo Meli, "I beni temporali nelle profezie messianiche," *Bib* 16 (1935): 314-28, had summarized all interpretations of such passages as fitting into one of three categories:

1. I beni temporali nelle profezie messianiche erano un elemento secondario e di sua natura caduco.
2. I beni temporali nelle profezie messianiche erano un elemento secondario e condizionato.
3. I beni temporali nelle profezie messianiche non erano the figure di beni spirituali.

⁴ DeGuglielmo, "The Fertility of the Land in the Messianic Prophecies," 308.

fertility of the land from the righteous (צדק) and just (משפט) king whose land it is.¹ Thus it is in relation to the king, messiah, not the subjects of the kingdom, that the fertility of the land must be seen. As an example Isaiah 32 may be examined briefly.

There is doubt in the minds of some about whether Isaiah 32:lff. is prophecy, more particularly a messianic prophecy. But even for those who doubt, there is consensus that this passage in Isaiah "came to be interpreted as a specific promise of the upright king of the future for whom they were then hoping."² In this light it is better to translate the opening of 32:1 as, "See a king will reign . . (NIV),³ instead of, "When a king reigns . . ." as does Kaiser.⁴ The force of this wording would then imply that the disposition of this king's reign, righteousness and justice, will issue in a new arrangement for creation. Isaiah 32:15 argues that

¹ These (צדק, משפט) are the two primary characteristics that true kingship ought to possess; cf. Kselman "Psalm 72: Some Observations on Structure," 78.

² This is the conclusion of Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, trans. G. W. Anderson (Nashville: Abingdon Press, n.d.), p. 17. However, just prior to this quoted conclusion he says of Isa 32:1-8 that it "is not primarily a prophecy, still less a Messianic prophecy, but a wisdom poem which describes in general terms the blessing enjoyed in the reign of an upright, of any upright king."

³ Though not giving the same interpretive force, Edward J. Young, *The Book of Isaiah*, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969) 2: 384 appropriately translates, "Behold! for righteousness a king will reign . . ."

⁴ Otto Kaiser, *Isaiah 13-39*, trans. R. A. Wilson from the German *Der Prophet Jesaja / Kap. 13-39*, The Old Testament Library (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974), p. 320.

a part of this new arrangement is fertility of the land, a "teeming fertility," says Mowinckel.¹

But now the question is: Does Isaiah 32 speak of a *messianic* prophecy? In all honesty, one must say not directly so. But "it speaks of a government, however, that can belong only to the Messiah and be ruled by Him, and in that sense may be labelled a Messianic prophecy."² This king will rule in קדצ;³ thus his government personnel will rule in טפּשׁ.⁴ He is God's true ruler.⁵

Summary

Again in this messianic material as in the historical (2 Sam 21) and hymnic (Psa 72) literature there is a conjoining of God, kingship, and creation. From these three literary types one gathers a general impression about Israelite king-

¹ Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, p. 270.

² Young, *The Book of Isaiah*, 2: 386.

³ For additional discussion of קדצ as it is used in Isa 40-66 see John J. Scullion, "Sedeq-Sedaqah in Isaiah cc. 40-66," *UF* 3 (1971): 335-48, especially his conclusion, 348.

⁴ The ל prefixed to each of these two terms is interpreted as a normative ל, expressing mode or manner. Therefore, both ל's might be translated "according to"; cf. Williams, *Hebrew Syntax*, p. 49, no. 274.

⁵ Cf. the extensive remarks of Martin S. Rozenberg, *The Stem spt: An Investigation of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Sources* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1963; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 63-7081, 1980) on the Old Testament use of טפּשׁ. Note especially pp. 149-52 and his conclusion, pp. 253-57. In his judgment "it should be emphasized that *mispāt* in itself has no preference for either the 'sacral' or the 'secular.' It merely expresses the idea of that which is 'normative' and 'right' as determined by society. . . . In summary, this study has shown that the stem *spt* in all of its forms in the Bible is to be traced back to the concept of authority and not of judgment" (pp. 256-57).

ship. The historical kings are never treated as divine or semi-divine. But they are understood to be responsible for the land's welfare. This welfare is related directly to obedience to divine will.¹ If there is obedience, the land prospers; if there is disobedience, the land suffers. At last will appear the king, messiah. When he comes, he will bring the destined wholeness to creation. His rule is one of justice, righteousness, and well-being. This insures a benediction upon creation. From all this it is clear that messiah's rule and dominion over creation will be of a character and with a result unmatched by any of Israel's other kings.

Apocalyptic Imagery

The subject of this discussion is problematic. The journey of one who defines the term "apocalyptic" has been described by Glasson as beginning "in a kind of twilight. From this uncertain beginning one moves forward with leaden feet, clogged by qualifications and reservations; . . . the fog thickens."² While defining the term precisely is difficult,

¹ This principle had been made abundantly clear already in the passages of Lev 26 and Deut 27-30. For detailed discussion of Lev 26 see William D. Barrick, "Leviticus 26: Its Relationship to Covenant Contexts and Concepts," unpublished doctor of theology dissertation, Grace Theological Seminary, 1981.

² T. Francis Glasson, "What is Apocalyptic?" *NTS* 25 (October 1980): 99. Glasson concludes (105) that "in view of the ambiguities connected with the term, I would advocate the abandonment of the word Apocalyptic. I know what an apocalypse is, and I see there is a place for the adjective 'apocalyptic' to denote matters relating to this type of literature. But, as we have seen, Apocalyptic has no agreed and recognizable meaning." This author fails to see that the distinction between noun and adjective helps Glasson. If adjectival usage refers to something, thus not nothing, then it would seem

one must conclude that something is there to which the term refers. The term apocalyptic is used herein to refer to that certain feature of cosmic transformation which is but one of the several characteristics¹ of Jewish apocalypses.² Analysis of this single characteristic of apocalyptic builds upon this definition of "apocalypse":

"Apocalypse" may be defined as a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial, insofar as it involves another supernatural world. In the Jewish literature which can be dated with some plausibility to the period 250 BCE-150 CE, it is possible to identify fifteen apocalypses by this definition.³

there is *something* there. The question is still "what is that something?"

¹ G. I. Davies, "Apocalyptic and Historiography," *JSOT* 5 (1978): 28, has offered an appropriate word of caution: "Jewish apocalyptic was not totally oriented towards the future, although of course its authors did expect radically new events which they sometimes described at great length. Eschatology was not its only concern . . . we need in thinking of it to make a conscious effort to remember the breadth of its concerns."

² For identification of these cf. the master chart in John J. Collins, "The Jewish Apocalypses," *Semeia* 14 (1979): 28. Daniel is excluded from this list for reasons cited in the footnote just below. Mention must be made of course of the correlations between the Qumran community materials and apocalyptic literature. For a brief synopsis of these correlations see D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*, The Old Testament Library (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), pp. 36-48 and John J. Collins, "Patterns of Eschatology at Qumran," in *Traditions in Transformation*, eds. Baruch Halpern and Jon D. Levenson (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1981), pp. 351-75.

³ Collins, "The Jewish Apocalypses," 22. Given Collins' perimeters, the understanding of this work makes two exceptions. By "revelation" is not understood divine revelation as it is used in the Judeo-Christian tradition. Further, the earlier date of Daniel and its divine revelatory character must exclude it from Collins' list of apocalypses.

The feature of cosmic transformation is found in several sources. Two are cited as illustrative of this characteristic of the Jewish apocalypses. In 2 Enoch (A) 65:6-9 the reader is told:

When all creation visible and invisible, as the Lord created it, shall end, then every man goes to the great judgment, and then all time shall perish, and the years, and thence-forward there will be neither months nor days nor hours, they will be stuck together and will not be counted. There will be one aeon, and all the righteous who shall escape the Lord's great judgment, shall be collected in the great aeon, for the righteous the great aeon will begin, and they will live eternally, and then too there will be amongst them neither labour, nor sickness, nor humiliation, nor anxiety, nor need, nor violence, nor night, nor darkness, but great light.¹

Cosmic transformation may be witnessed even more clearly in 2 Baruch 29:3-8:

And it shall come to pass when all is accomplished that was to come to pass in those parts, that the Messiah shall then begin to be revealed. And Behemoth shall be revealed from his place and Leviathan shall ascend from the sea, those two great monsters which I created on the fifth day of creation, and shall have kept until that time; and then they shall be for food for all that are left. The earth also shall yield its fruit ten thousandfold and on each vine there shall be a thousand branches, and each branch shall produce a thousand clusters, and each cluster produce a thousand grapes, and each grape produce a cor of wine. And those who have hungered shall rejoice: moreover, also, they shall behold marvels every day. For winds shall go forth from before me to bring every morning the fragrance of aromatic fruits, and at the close of the day clouds distilling the dew of health. And it shall come to pass at that self-same time that the treasury of manna shall again descend from on high, and they will eat of it in those years, because these are they who have come to the consummation of time.²

¹ Charles, *Apocrypha*, 2:467-68. This passage should be compared with 2 Enoch 9:1ff. (*ibid.*, 2:434-35) which seems to be an initial glimpse of the future. If this is so, the beginning and the end correlate by having one and the same view of cosmic abundance.

² *Ibid.*, 2:497-98.

If these examples may be accepted as normative expressions, then cosmic transformation is clearly a characteristic of the apocalypses. A number of people have attempted to correlate this feature with New Testament literature.¹ But what is of interest here is to look at the origin of this apocalyptic idea. In recent times a good deal of work has been done on apocalyptic origins, especially its relationship to prophecy.² Rowley acknowledged that "the roots of apocalyptic lie far behind the composition of the books which belong to this class."³ What Rowley suggested was that whatever may

¹ Stephen H. Travis, "The Value of Apocalyptic," *Tyn-dale Bulletin* 30 (1979): 76 concludes: "Finally and paradoxically, apocalyptic brings a new sense of responsibility towards the world, because it feeds hope for the transformation of the world. Social action, according to Norman Young, 'becomes pointless without this apocalyptic vision because there are no grounds in past history for expecting a lasting change for the better in human affairs. Only belief in God as one who breaks in against the possibilities resident within history can provide the hope that makes any present reforming action worth the effort.' At the heart of the apocalyptic faith is its movement towards the future. But in Christian apocalyptic that future is dominated by the Son of Man who has already set in motion the process of fulfillment on which the apocalypticist's hope is set." For other discussions on correlations of apocalyptic and the New Testament see: Wayne G. Rollins, "The New Testament and Apocalyptic," *NTS* 17 (1970-71): 454-76, especially his conclusion (476); the excellent article of George Eldon Ladd, "The Place of Apocalyptic in Biblical Religion," *The Evangelical Quarterly* 30 (April-June 1958): 75-85; Leon Morris, *Apocalyptic* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972), especially pp. 72-87; and Paul S. Minear, "Some Archetypal Origins of Apocalyptic Predictions," *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 1 (1979): 105-35.

² Especially noteworthy in this respect is Paul Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979).

³ H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, rev. ed. (London: Lutterworth Press, 1963), p. 15.

have been said in apocalyptic literature in the period from 250 B.C. to A.D. 150 certainly has its origins in much earlier history. Some have attempted to find apocalyptic developing along the lines of Persian influence,¹ but to "resort to Persian influence is not *necessary* to account for the main development in Jewish apocalyptic, for its basic elements belong to Old Testament prophetic religion."² Minear sees an antecedent deposit of apocalyptic terminology coming from the creation account itself.³ A judicious assessment would seem to suggest that while prophetic material undoubtedly does not account for every apocalyptic motif, there surely are correlations between certain characteristics of apocalyptic literature and the content of Old Testament prophecy.

In order to explain the nature of the relationship of apocalyptic to prophecy Hanson has offered an allegory.⁴ In

¹ As an example of this cf. William R. Murdock, "History and Revelation in Jewish Apocalypticism," *Int* 21 (April 1967): 174 who says "that the religion of Israel which had so recently attained the status of a truly monotheistic faith should suddenly shift to dualism is an anomaly in the history of ideas and cannot be understood apart from the simultaneous shift to eschatology. Dualism and eschatology belong together, for they constitute the two foci of a single theological system. Together they formed the core of Zoroastrianism, and they were taken up together by apocalypticism under Iranian influence."

² George Eldon Ladd, "The Origin of Apocalyptic in Biblical Religion," *The Evangelical Quarterly* 30 (July-September 1958): 140.

³ Minear, "Some Archetypal Origins of Apocalyptic Predictions," 117-29.

⁴ Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, pp. 402-13. While there is much to agree with in Hanson's allegory, one would question his chronological perspective on prophetic literature.

summary the allegory is this:

In this allegory apocalyptic was born of native Jewish parents in the late sixth century and by the close of the fifth century was near to maturity. The child's mother was prophecy but the identity of the father is less clear. Hanson thinks he may have been of royal birth or a man influenced by the royal courts of the ancient Near East. The circumstances of the birth are veiled in ambiguity but the collapse of the royal dynasty may have allowed prophecy and royalty to mate and so produce apocalyptic eschatology. Mother taught the growing child that their nation's god Yahweh acted on behalf of the oppressed within the events of history, father believed that history belonged to a fallen order which would be supplanted on the day when Yahweh acted to save his people. The child never abandoned mother's belief but tended to favour father's mythic modes of thought when expressing her beliefs.¹

The present discussion is definitely interested in the mother of apocalyptic. What is of special interest in the mother is this: Is there evidence on the mother's side of the family that such an idea as cosmic restoration was present?

As a matter of fact, cosmic restoration does seem to be present. Isaiah 65:1-25 may be taken as an example. About this passage Hanson has argued that the essential elements of apocalyptic eschatology are present: a present evil era, great judgment separating evil and good (corresponding respectively to the present world and the world to come), and a new world of peace and blessing.² The third of these is of special interest. This new world of peace and blessing is described in verses 17-25, which stand in contrast to the troubles

¹ This excellent summary is that of Robert P. Carroll, "Twilight of Prophecy or Dawn of Apocalyptic," *JSOT* 14 (October 1979) : 5.

² Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*, p. 160. This author cannot agree with Hanson's sharp dichotomizing between the two worlds. Rather they are but outworkings of the one divine plan.

referred to in 16b.¹ The words of verse 17 direct special attention to God as the one about to perform his startling work (בּוֹרָא שְׁמַיִם חֲדָשִׁים וְאָרֶץ חֲדָשָׁה).

The radical nature of the work of God is indicated in 17b. Such work stands in contrast to the *known*. A part of what is not known through means of empirical evidence is the peace and blessing as is described in verses 18b-25. Included for change are Jerusalem, sorrow, longevity, stability, productivity, divine audience, and peace. The use of "new" to describe this restorative work could easily be misunderstood. The imagery and vocabulary have similarity to the account of Genesis 1-4.² This may indicate that the "new" is in fact a return to Edenic qualities.³ There are expansions of the

¹ Cf. the remarks on this matter by Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, trans. David M. G. Stalker from the German *Das Buch Jesaia 40-66*, The Old Testament Library (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969), p. 407. However, his interpretation of 73 in verse 16 is not necessary since as Young, *The Book of Isaiah*, 3:512 says: "That He is the God of truth appears in that the former distresses the people suffered have been forgotten (a strong expression for stating their complete removal). Furthermore, they have been hidden from before God's eyes, so that He no longer sees them. The distresses are more than misfortunes; they are the result of the nation's sins. As there is a removal of the reason for punishing sin, the distresses that sin causes will be removed also."

² E.g. note the imagery of 65:17 (creation of heaven and earth), 20 (longevity), 21-22a (permanency of dwelling), 22b-23a (work perspective and productivity), 23b (disposition of offspring), 24 (immediacy of divine audience). For illustrations of similar vocabulary note: בּוֹרָא, שְׁמַיִם, אָרֶץ, etc.

³ Cf. the remarks of Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, p. 408 on the use of the word "new" (a similar conclusion for a different set of reasons). The remarks here offered on the term "new" as meaning "restoration" negate the question of whether Isa 65:17-25 speaks of the millennium or the eternal state. By conjoining within the same passage Jerusalem and the new heaven and earth it is clear that Isa 65:17-25 is a very gen-

Edenic theme (Jerusalem, 18-19), but the core of 65:17-25 does appear to have an Edenic background.¹

In summary, in terms of the cosmic restoration one cannot say conclusively that the apocalyptic material came *from* the prophetic. All that has been demonstrated here is that apocalyptic *might* have drawn its imagery from a future cosmic restoration promised by the prophetic literature. This restoration in prophetic literature was attached to a hope of deliverance.² Were there space and the need, one could demonstrate that apocalyptic literature, consistent with its view of cosmic restoration, understood the cosmos to be moving toward its targeted destination; therefore, the cosmos is in linear movement. And this movement is associated with divine will. God himself will bring the cosmos to its destination.

eral description, intending to refer neither to *either* one or the other. Cf. Isa 66:22 and Rev 21:1-4. F. F. Bruce, "The Bible and the Environment," unpublished paper, 1981 (soon to be published in a S. J. Schultz Festschrift by Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, IN) argues for much the same conclusion on the use of the word "new."

¹ There has been considerable debate in recent times about the nature of Isaiah's use of creation material. For examples of the various views see: Ph. B. Harner, "Creation Faith in Deutero-Isaiah," *VT* 17 (July 1967): 298-306; Carroll Stuhlmueller, "The Theology of Creation in Second Isaias," *CBQ* 21 (October 1959): 429-67; idem., "'First and Last' and 'Yahweh- -Creator' in Deutero-Isaiah," *CBQ* 29 (July 1967): 189-205 (495-511); idem., "Yahweh--King and Deutero-Isaiah," *BR* 15 (1970): 32-45; and Theodore M. Ludwig, "The Traditions of the Establishing of the Earth in Deutero-Isaiah," *JBL* 92 (September 1973) : 345-57.

² Were there more space, correspondences could be shown between this hope and a mediator of this hope in both the prophetic and apocalyptic literature. However, this additional evidence would not advance the argument given here.

This destination is inextricably tied to the great end-time figure. God, the end-time figure, and the cosmos all converge in this destination.

Societal Hierarchical Structuring

A last evaluation of background ideas relevant to the dominion materials concerns the ancient Near Eastern societal structure. The purpose here is simply to survey several sources and to attempt a synthesis of the picture developed by these sources. Harriet Havice, in her helpful sociological-ethical study of the ancient Near East, concludes

. . . that the cultures of the ancient Near East share a hierarchical world view which is determinative of their ethical systems. In these societies virtually everyone stands in a hierarchical relationship with everyone else. Ethical duties are primarily owed up and down the hierarchical scale and are only rarely owed to one's social equals. In this system the two primary duties are loyalty and obedience owed to one's superior and beneficence owed to one's inferior. These two duties are reciprocal so that being loyal and obedient to one's superior entitles one to beneficence from him, and doing beneficence to one's inferior entitles one to loyalty and obedience from him in return.¹

What is of present interest about Havice's conclusion is her analysis of the social hierarchy with its attendant duties of beneficence and loyalty.² The literature of the ancient Near East does appear to reflect this hierarchical structuring.

¹ Harriet Katherine Havice, *The Concern for the Widow and the Fatherless in the Ancient Near East: A Case Study in Old Testament Ethics* (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1978; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 79-15, 827, 1979), p. 275.

² This writer is not as convinced by her analysis of ethical duty rarely being described as owed to one's equals, especially in the Old Testament. Her analysis warrants further study.

There is no particular value in retracing all of the literary evidences of this analysis, since Havice's study suffices in this respect. What will prove adequate here is a brief survey of selected examples (especially those dealing with kingship) to demonstrate the point at issue and a summary conclusion of the implications of this type of societal structuring.

The order of selected citations begins with Egyptian, then moves to Mesopotamian and Ugaritic literature. The Egyptian sources are three in number. The first is a song of the commoner sung while doing work in the field. This particular song is found "in an agricultural scene in an Eighteenth Dynasty (16th-14th centuries B.C.) tomb at el Kab."¹

A good day--it is cool.
The cattle are pulling,
And the sky does according to our desire--
Let us work for the noble!

The words indicate a degree of loyalty owed to the noble in the form of work. The cosmic forces (sky) have beneficently yielded a day for such loyalty to be exercised.

In "The Protestation of Guiltlessness," one of the few Egyptian sources for social law, the "negative confession" demonstrates through a plea of guiltlessness that the expected mode of living was beneficence toward those on the social scale that are below and loyalty to those that are above.

Behold me--I have come to you without sin,
without guilt, without evil, without a witness
(against me), without one against whom I have taken
action. I live on truth, and I eat on truth.
I have done that which men said and that with which
gods are content. I have satisfied a god with that

¹ *ANET*, p. 469.

which he desires. I have given bread to the hungry, water to the thirsty, clothing to the naked, and a ferry-boat to him who was marooned. I have provided divine offerings for the gods and mortuary offerings for the dead. (So) rescue me, you; protect me, you.¹

Here beneficence and loyalty have direct ethical ties. Beneficence to the hungry, thirsty, naked, and marooned is claimed as the very hope of safe and blessed passage through the next world. A part of this same claim and hope is the loyalty practiced toward the gods.

A third Egyptian piece, which focuses attention on both beneficence and loyalty, is "The Instruction of the Vizier Ptah-Hotep," the chief manuscript being from the Middle Kingdom.

If thou art a leader commanding the affairs of the multitude, seek out for thyself every beneficial deed, until it may be that thy (own) affairs are without wrong. Justice is great, and its appropriateness is lasting; it has not been disturbed since the time of him who made it, (whereas) there is punishment for him who passes over its laws. . . If thou art one of those sitting at the table of one greater than thyself, take what he may give, when it is set before thy nose. Thou shouldst gaze at what is before thee. Do not pierce him with many stares, (for such) an aggression against him is an abomination to the *ka*. Let thy face be cast down until he addresses thee, and thou shouldst speak (only) when he addresses thee. Laugh after he laughs . . . Bow thy back to thy superior, thy overseer from the palace. (Then) thy household will be established in its property, and thy recompense will be as it should be. Opposition to a superior is a painful thing, (for) one lives as long as he is mild.²

¹ The words within parentheses are those furnished in this translation from *ibid.*, p. 36.

² This translation including parentheses and underlining is that of *ibid.*, pp. 412-14. The *ka*, symbolized by two upraised arms, "was a term for the creative and preserving power of life. . . . The *ka* accompanied a person like a kind of double, but when the person died, the *ka* lived on. 'To go to one's *ka*' meant 'to die,' since the *ka* then left its mortal

Again the same pattern of social structuring emerges. Beneficence and loyalty are both obligatory.

A similar pattern is observable in Mesopotamian literature. "A Pessimistic Dialogue Between Master and Servant," though overtly emphasizing abject servitude toward the master, calls attention to the servant's obligation to practice loyalty to a superior through use of the recurring expression, "'Servant obey me.' Yes, my lord, yes."¹ There are also statements in both the prologues and epilogues of law codes which indicate the king's interest in acts of beneficence toward his subjects. Hammurabi in his code had recorded for himself his interest in establishing justice so "that the strong might not oppress the weak."² This remark indicates both the king's beneficence to his subjects (the strong and the weak) by the establishment of justice and the strong's beneficence to the weak by not oppressing them.

A third Mesopotamian evidence of societal hierarchy is the curious proverb: "Man is the shadow of a god, a slave is the shadow of a man; but the king is like the (very) image of a god."³ However, Oppenheim has given this sense to the prov-

house and returned to its divine origin. The *ka* needed sustenance above all for its continued existence which was provided in concrete form as offerings or symbolically in the tomb paintings which the Egyptians regarded as no less effective," Lurker, *The Gods and Symbols of Ancient Egypt*, p. 73.

¹ *ANET*, pp. 437-38.

² *Ibid.*, p. 164. Cf. also the prologue of the "Lipit-Ishtar Lawcode," *ibid.*, p. 159.

³ This is the translation of *ibid.*, p. 426. For the cuneiform text see Robert Francis Harper, *Assyrian and Babylo-*

erb: "The *amelu* (lives in) the shadow of god, and mankind (in the) shadow of the *amelu*' (and) *amelu* means 'king' (in this context) because he (i.e. the king) is (for us human beings) just like a god."¹ The term "shadow" translates *sillu* which can mean "shadow," "covering," "likeness," or "protection."² An example of this latter usage is found in ABL 920. rev. 2:

Among the captives whom we took from the Sealand there are old men of the house of my father who served my father during the regency of the kings of your fathers.³

But there is also evidence that *sillu* in the proverb can be thought of as an "umbrella," a part of the paraphernalia of kingship.⁴ In light of this evidence *sillu* can be understood to mean

. . . , that the shadow of the king, or more exactly the shadow cast by the royal parasol, endowed these officials upon whom it fell with a special status (privileges, etc.), and that the phrase "to be in the shadow of the king" was applied to officials on special missions. Eventually this phrase assumed the connotation "under the auspices of the king, during the rule of the king . . ."⁵

Without pursuing other interesting features of this evidence,

nian Letters, 5 vols., reprint ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1902; n.l.: N. and N. Press, 1977), 3:652 (hereafter cited as *ABL*).

¹ A. Leo Oppenheim, "Assyriological Gleanings IV," *BASOR* 107 (October 1947): 9, n. 6.

² Cf. the citations listed in *CAD*, S, 189ff.

³ The translation given by A. Leo Oppenheim, "Idiomatic Accadian," *JAOS* 61 (1941): 264. The term for "regency" is *sillu*.

⁴ Cf. *CAD*, S, 192-93 and especially the discussion of Oppenheim, "Assyriological Gleanings IV," 7-11.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 10.

one can easily see that the proverb implies a structuring of society (god-*amelu*-servant) and that through the use of *sillu* evidence of a beneficence-loyalty reciprocation is implied in the king's shadow of protection and the subject's responsibility to the king as he (the subject) stands in that shadow.

Brief mention must also be made of Ugaritic sources. According to UT 127:29-34 and 45-50 the work of the government administrator is described as follows:

Repeat to K[rt of T]:
 "Liste[n]
 And be alert [of ear]!
 For dost thou administer *like the strongest of the strong* and *govern* (like) the [moun]tains?
 Thou hast let thy hands fall into *negligence*
 Thou dost not judge the case of the widow
 (*almnt*) nor adjudicate the cause of the broken
 in spirit (*qsr nps*). . . .
 Thou dost not judge the case of the widow (*almnt*)
 nor adjudicate the cause of the broken in spirit
 (*qsr nps*) nor drive away *those who prey* upon
 the poor (*dl*)
 Before thee thou dost not feed the fatherless
 (*ytm*) nor behind thy back the widow (*almnt*).¹

While these are not the only underprivileged persons attested in Ugaritic literature,² UT 127 indicates clearly the beneficence the government official was expected to practice toward his subjects.

In these few documents representing a general picture of the ancient Near Eastern world, there is evidence of both

¹ The translation of this portion of UT 127 is that of Cyrus H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Literature* (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1949), p. 82. The Ugaritic terms are supplied from the transliteration of UT 127 in Gordon, *Textbook*, P. 194. Other underlined words indicate italics in original.

² Cf. *SSU*, pp. 233ff. who mentions also *awilu muskenu-tu(m)* ("plebian men"), *awilu nayyalu* ("disgraced person"), *bel arni* ("convict"), etc.

a structuring of society and an ethic of beneficence and loyalty based upon one's exact location within that structuring. Ethical accountability demanded loyalty to superiors and beneficence to those under one's jurisdiction and care. This pattern emerges most clearly in the god-king-subject complex in the ancient Near East. The king (especially in his vice-regent role) owed loyalty to the god and beneficence toward his subjects. His loyalty would be consciously practiced as he sought divine will in a given matter (especially appropriate to the Mesopotamian understanding of kingship). And his beneficence was consciously practiced as he sought justice and well-being for his subjects, especially defenseless persons. Disloyalty to his god would initiate divine visitations of wrath upon the king's subjects in the form of a disruption of well-being and justice.

Summary Evaluation

From this survey of royal ideology, apocalyptic ideas, and societal hierarchical structuring there emerge three pieces of ancient Near Eastern evidence that will have hermeneutical implications for the study of these Old Testament dominion materials. The first of these is the fact that kingship in the ancient Near East was understood to include a cosmic stewardship. This does not imply that the stewardship was always envisioned in the same way by Israel's neighbors. Each neighboring country possessed its own variation of the theme of stewardship. But the theme was present nonetheless. Egyptians saw the stewardship in terms of *maat*, for the Mesopotamians

there was *misaru*, and for the Israelites **משפט** and **צדק**. The kings stood before the god or as the god (Egypt) when they practiced their stewardship. If, in fact, the dominion materials evidence royal imagery, perhaps man, as the apex of God's creative work, should be understood as the one *between* his Creator and the rest of the cosmos. Standing in this position, his dominion would be seen as a stewardship, a stewardship given by the Creator. Man stands *within* the cosmic law structure to practice his stewardship. Thus he is *under* God and over the cosmos.

This suggestion fits nicely with a second piece of ancient Near Eastern evidence, that suggested by the analysis of the societal hierarchical structuring. From the observations on kingship the king must be understood to bear a relationship to his deity. The practice of this relationship was his activities to insure beneficence upon the subjects of the kingdom. As he pleased the deity by loyal service and obedience, he assured benefits for the subjects of his kingdom. But if the king was disloyal to his deity, the cosmic results were that his subjects were required to live in a world that languished.

What this indicates is that the king ethically was required to practice loyalty toward his deity and beneficence to those over whom he was appointed. Obviously, this loyalty-beneficence complex had a history, i.e., the history of the king's reign would reveal periods of both loyalty (beneficence) and disloyalty (distress). Once the king fell into

disloyalty, and should he not be immediately removed from office, he must do as his deity demanded in order that the cosmic distress might be removed. If in fact the dominion materials suggest this type of structuring, then man's loyalty and cosmic beneficence are correlated by man's creator. As man was faithfully loyal to his creator he practiced beneficence toward the cosmos. In terms of the Biblical material, this beneficence was characteristic of the pre-fall world of harmony. But when man became disloyal to his Creator, distress became the lot of creation. Man himself experienced this distress. Man's relationship to his Creator and the world over which he was given dominion has a history. The history is one of disloyalty and distress.

A third piece of evidence addresses this history of disloyalty and distress. Apocalyptic literature emphasized the distress, and over against this distress a future deliverance, a time when the distress will be disrupted by a cosmic restoration. Then beneficence in the world will return. Briefly put, man's history is one of repeated distress but there is a coming deliverance. If this imagery from apocalyptic literature is applicable to Old Testament dominion material (New Testament as well), then the end of man's history will be the coming of a world of beneficence. Could it also be the case that beneficence will come because one truly loyal to God, who in fact is God himself, will reign as king?

Explicit Dominion Materials

If the passages which explicitly refer to dominion are

to be evaluated properly, careful study of the language of each passage is required. The purpose of this language study is to determine what interpretive possibilities the language encourages and prohibits. Thereby an interpretive field can be established. Within this field an interpretation of each passage must be constructed.

The procedure for doing this work will be to establish what the reading of the text is, to survey the literary context, to study relevant linguistic and terminological features, and to suggest an interpretive field.

Genesis 1:26-28

According to the Hebrew¹ this passage reads:

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כְּדְמוּתֵנוּ	26
וַיְרַדּוּ בְדִגְתַּיִם וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבַבְּהֵמָה	
וּבְכָל־הָאָרֶץ וּבְכָל־הַרְמֵשׁ הָרֹמֵשׁ עַל־הָאָרֶץ	
וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים	27
בָּרָא אֹתוֹ זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם	
וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתָם אֱלֹהִים וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם אֱלֹהִים פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ	28
וּמְלֵאוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ וּכְבִשְׁתֶּהּ וַיְרַדּוּ בְדִגְתַּיִם וּבְעוֹף	
הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבְכָל־חַיַּיָּה הַרְמֵשֶׁת עַל־הָאָרֶץ	

For sake of convenience when discussing textual matters, capital letters have been inserted in appropriate places of the Hebrew text to indicate the location of variants. Because of the foundational nature of this passage and its introduction lengthier

¹ This citation is from K. Elliger and W. Rudolph, eds., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsch Bibeistiftung, 1967/77), hereafter cited as *BHS*.

Textual variants

As indicated by the capital letters above, there are five variants noteworthy for consideration. These textual notes may be listed as follows.

A. While the Hebrew text reads **בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כְּדְמוּתֵנוּ** without the conjunction (ו), two versions (Septuagint and Vulgate) and the Samaritan Pentateuch do include the intervening conjunction. The Septuagint (LXX) in 1:26 reads: **Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν.**¹ And the Vulgate follows suit: *Faciamus hominen ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram.*² The Samaritan Pentateuch reads: **נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם וְכְדְמוּתֵנוּ**.³ While this evidence is fairly weighty, it is counterbalanced by the agreement of Targum Onkelos,⁴ the Palestinian Targum,⁵ and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan⁶ in omitting the conjunction.

¹ This and subsequent citations from the Septuagint are taken from Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, 2 vols., editio nona (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1935), hereafter cited as LXX throughout the remainder of this work.

² Cf. Brian Walton, ed., *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta*, 6 vols. (reprint of 1657 edition; Graz: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1963), 1:4 (hereafter cited as *BSP*).

³ Cf. August Freiherrn von Gall, ed., *Der hebraische Pentateuch der samaritaner* (Giessen: Verlag von, Alfred Topelmann, 1918), p. 2 (hereafter cited as *HPS*).

⁴ Cf. Alexander Sperber, ed., *The Bible in Aramaic* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959); vol. 1: *The Pentateuch according to Targum Onkelos*, by idem., p. 2.

⁵ Cf. the English translation of the Palestinian Targum in Etheridge, *The Tarqums*, p. 160.

⁶ Cf. the English translation of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan in *ibid.*, p. 160.

In several ways this is the most important variant, not because it directly touches on the dominion vocabulary but because it concerns the correlation and interpretation of “image” (צלם) and “likeness” (דמות) to which the dominion bears relationship. Without dwelling on this variant, the suggestion is offered here that the variant may be understood as a harmonizing of coordinates (צלם and דמות), whose prefixed prepositions (ב and כ) and different shades of meaning might otherwise be difficult to understand. Attention will be given this variant in the later discussion on the interpretation of בצלמינו כדמותינו.

B. At this location the Syriac inserts between ובכל and והארץ the word XXXXX (*hywt'*), in Hebrew תַּיִת.¹ The place of this inclusion, along with the lack of any consequent substantive change in meaning and the lateness and singularity of the testimony, all join to make the variant of little consequence for this study.

C. By far the longest variant and also one of the least problematic is the inclusion of the LXX, καὶ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς, between the words והשמים and ובכל in 1:28. Comparison of this inclusion with the similar phraseology of 1:26 (καὶ τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς) indicates that the expansion in 1:28 is undoubtedly an attempt to harmonize with the earlier phraseology in 1:26. By this means the listings in 1:26 and 28 were made the same.

D. Also included in 1:28 between והשמים and ובכל is

¹ Cf. the Syriac Version in BSP, p. 4.

the insertion offered by the Syriac, XXXXX (*wbb'yr'*), in Hebrew וַבְּהֵמָה.¹ Comparison of this insertion with the word וַבְּבִהֵמָה¹ in 1:26 indicates that the insertion of the Syriac is an attempted harmonization between the phraseology of 1:26 and 28.

E. The last variant is so minor in nature that it only merits mention. It in no way addresses an evaluation of the dominion expressed in 1:26-28. The Samaritan Pentateuch reads יהיה for יהי in verse 28.² This reading should also be compared with the Targum Onkelos reading in 1:28, איהתא.³

Of these variants only "A above has significance for the study of dominion language and imagery in Genesis 1:26-28. The variant, it appears, is not adequate to force a change in the Hebrew reading of BHS. Rather the variant reading attests an interpretive problem in the phraseology בְּצִלְמֵנוּ כְּדְמוּתֵנוּ. Interpretation of these words and the construction has significance for understanding the dominion ideas. Thus, in the following discussion only this variant will enter into the interpretation of Genesis 1:26-28.

Literary context

Willis has recently noted a current emphasis in the literary-historical approach to Genesis, namely "the feeling that the student of a piece of literature is bound first to

¹ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 6.

² Cf. HPS, p. 2.

³ Cf. Sperber, *Targum Onkelos*, p. 2.

analyze that material in its present final form, irrespective of any prehistory that its various elements may have undergone."¹ This is not to say that all recent study on Genesis, is of this sort² but it is to say that contemporary analyses must concern themselves eventually with what is in the text's final form.

Reflection on the text of the book of Genesis cannot help but show how large a place is occupied by the covenanted people (Gen 12-50). Further, when surveying the opening eleven chapters one is struck with the editor's rapid movement through the creation account (Gen 1-2). If one weighed the theological watershed of Genesis 1-11 in terms of subsequent Biblical history, he would conclude that the text divides quite evidently into pre- and post-fall periods. The fall is so important because it attests a radical reorientation in man's relation to his sovereign Creator.

Within this pre-fall world there is a literary movement from the beginning of creation (the sequential "day" enumerations)³ to the appearance of man (Gen 1) and a subsequent

¹ John T. Willis, "Some recent Studies on Genesis and the Literary-Historical Approach," *Restoration Quarterly* 23 (1980): 199.

² Cf. as examples David J. A. Clines, "Theme in Genesis 1-11," *CBQ* 38 (October 1976): 483-507, especially 504ff. (though he admits that "we do better, I think, to rest the weight of our study largely upon what we do have--the work itself--however subjective our understanding of it has to be, than upon hypotheses, however much they deal with 'objective' data like dates and sources," 505) and David L. Petersen, "The Yahwist on the Flood," *VT* 26 (October 1976): 438-46.

³ Cf. the conclusion of Edward J. Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, International Library of Philosophy and Theology:

ontological-anthropological dwelling on man as he stands in relation to his Creator (Gen 2).¹

The obvious question to raise about this point is:

For what purpose and intention has the text come down to us in this form? To answer this question is most difficult and requires attention to both the remainder of the Biblical record (to witness the analogy of faith)² and the literature of the ancient Near East (to assess something of its imagery and

Biblical and Theological Studies, ed. J. Marcellus Kik (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1973), p. 103.

¹ Though for other reasons to which this writer does not hold, George W. Coats, "Strife and Reconciliation: Themes of a Biblical Theology in the Book of Genesis," *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 2 (1980): 18, rightly concludes concerning Gen 2:4bff. that "the intention of the pericope is not so much to describe the creation itself, but rather to paint the creation of the man in terms of his relationships with other parts of the world. Thus, vv 8-15 contain an account of the construction of the Garden, with all its magnificent vegetation. And in v 15, God places the man in that paradise."

² For a lengthy treatment of this type cf. David L. Uhl, "A Comparative Study of the Concepts of Creation in Isaiah 40-55 and Genesis 1-2," unpublished doctor of theology dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1966. Cf. also the shorter treatment of Walter R. Roehrs, "The Creation Account of Genesis: Guidelines for an Interpretation," *CTM* 36 (May 1965): 301-21, especially 303ff. For an entirely different perspective but, nonetheless, a comparative study within Scripture see the summary of Gerhard von Rad's article, "Das theologische Problem des alttestamentlichen Schöpfungsglaubens" in B. D. Napier, "On Creation-Faith in the Old Testament," *Int* 16 (January 1962): 21-42. His study leads him to conclude: "Does not the Genesis account rather mean to say that something is now here which in essence was not previously here. And Ploger here declared himself unable to escape the conviction that Israel's own creation shapes the Genesis account of world creation. Israel was, to be sure, but she was *tohu wa bohu*, she was negation, she was nothing. As she was created by a mighty act of God, so Genesis I understands the creation of the world" (*ibid.*, 42).

thought for background). Though answering the question is beyond what is both possible and necessary here, several cursory observations are helpful.

The reason for the creation account as it stands in the text has been variously assigned. In some quarters the answer has been simply that the account itself reflects the record of both divine revelation and human misunderstandings, the latter based upon an "effort to represent God as supreme, just, and holy."¹ As already alluded to above, others have explained the sources behind the present form as though that perspective answers the question of purpose and intention of the early chapters of Genesis.² Still others have understood the intention of the creation account as a re-dressing of Babylonian cosmogony, the intention being to develop a cosmogony re-touched by Yahwistic faith. Speiser without reservation concludes

¹ A. E. Whatham, "Anthropomorphisms of Genesis Chapter I," *Biblical World* 37 (1911): 127.

² Cf. an example of this sort in J. A. Soggin, *Old Testament and Oriental Studies*, *Biblica et Orientalia*, 29 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1975), pp. 88-111, who informs his readers: "*The text of Genesis 3* belongs, as is well-known to the collection of ancient traditions known to biblical criticism as the 'Yahwist source'--Yahweh being the name it uses for God right from the very beginning. With certain extreme Positions discarded which literary criticism held in the past, . . . the theory of Graf, Kuenen and Wellhausen on the sources Of the Pentateuch can be said to be generally accepted today in its major points as a working hypothesis. This is true even in quarters . . . which were at first rather suspicious of, if not actually opposed to, this position, more or less openly preferring the traditional attribution to Moses of the Pentateuch" (p. 89). Additionally note the methodology of Eduard Nielsen, "Creation and the Fall of Man," *HUCA* 43 (1972): 1-22.

. . . that the biblical approach to creation as reflected in P is closely related to traditional Mesopotamian beliefs. It may be safely posited, moreover, that the Babylonians did not take over these views from the Hebrews, since the cuneiform accounts . . . antedate in substance the biblical statements on the subject. . . . Derivation from Mesopotamia in this instance means no more and no less than that on the subject of creation biblical tradition aligned itself with the traditional tenets of Babylonian "science". . . . And since the religion of the Hebrews diverged sharply from Mesopotamian norms, we should expect a corresponding departure in regard to beliefs about creation. This expectation is fully borne out. While we have before us incontestable similarities in detail, the difference in over-all approach is no less prominent.¹

Speiser lays stress on the assured commonality resulting from Israel's borrowing. But Kapelrud has correctly pointed out that importance attaches to emphasizing the ultimate setting into which the used material was incorporated.²

But both Speiser and Kapelrud express views which do not fully account for both similarities and differences. Albertson has pointed out that these similarities and differences are not to be thought of as a re-touching by Yahwistic faith but a polemical radicalizing.³ Hasel has noted that the

¹ Speiser, *Genesis*, pp. 10-11.

² Arvid S. Kapelrud, "The Mythological Features in Genesis Chapter I and the Author's Intentions," *VT* 24 (April 1974): 178.

³ James Albertson, "Genesis 1 and the Babylonian Creation Myth," *Thought* 145 (1962): 226-44. Kapelrud, "The Mythological Features in Genesis Chapter I and the Author's Intentions," 186, does conclude that the creation account was written for the "Judaean community in Babylonia, in order to give them a clear, systematic and right picture of their own traditions, which also gave him an opportunity to emphasize the features he wanted and to strengthen the defence where he found it necessary."

supposed similarities in the *Enuma elish*¹ and the biblical creation accounts (*tehom*-Tiamat, separation of heaven and earth, creation by Word, function of luminaries and man, order of creation) upon closer analysis indicate "that the author of Gn 1 exhibits in a number of critical instances a sharply antimythical polemic."²

That to which Hasel refers is the antimythical polemic of the Hebrew text as it stands.

It proclaims, loudly and unambiguously, the absolute subordination of all creation to the supreme Creator who thus can make use of the forces of nature to fulfill His mighty deeds in history. It asserts unequivocally that the basic truth of all history is that the world is under the undivided and inescapable sovereignty of God.³

But more than this, Genesis 1 is a parting of the spiritual ways with the ancient Near Eastern literature. This "meant an undermining of the prevailing mythological cosmologies."⁴ The danger is in reading the Genesis 1 account apart from the

¹ There is no legitimacy in referring to the *Enuma elish* as a creation account since the document is to offer praise to Marduk. In fact the supposed statement on creation is shorter than the material which comprises the fifty names of Marduk (cf. *ANET*, pp. 60-72).

² Gerhard F. Hasel, "The Significance of the Cosmology in Genesis I in Relation to Ancient Near Eastern Parallels," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 10 (January 1972): 20.

³ Nahum M. Sarna, *Understanding Genesis* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1966), p. 9. So Young, *Studies in Genesis One*, p. 105 concludes: "The purpose of the first section of Genesis (1:1-2:3) is to exalt the eternal God as the alone Creator of heaven and earth, who in infinite wisdom and by the word of his power brought the earth into existence and adorned and prepared it for man's habitancy."

⁴ Hasel, "The Significance of the Cosmology in Genesis I in Relation to Ancient Near Eastern Parallels," 20.

literary corpus in which it functions.¹ To commit this error is to commit the Biblical creation account to little more than a re-touched mythology. This the Genesis 1 account is not.

One indication of this radical polemicizing is in the Genesis treatment of man. Man was perceived among the Mesopotamians as one who served the deities that they might be liberated from work to pursue the desires of their hearts. From the *Enuma elish*, VI, 5ff. there is recorded this perception of the purpose of man's creation:

Blood I will mass and cause bones to be.
I will establish a savage, "man" shall be his name.
Verily, savage-man I will create.
He shall be charged with the service of the gods
that they might be at ease!²

And from VII, 28-29 there is this report: "Who removed the yoke imposed on the gods, his enemies, (and) who, to redeem them, created mankind."³ The record is essentially the same in *Atra-hasis*, I, 1ff.

When the gods like men
Bore the work and suffered the toil--
The toil of the gods was great,
The work was heavy, the distress was much--
The Seven great Anunnaki
Were making the Igigi suffer the work.⁴

¹ Note the warning against this methodological error in Gerhard F. Hasel, "The Polemic Nature of the Genesis Cosmology," *EvQ* 46 (April-June 1974): 81-82.

² *ANET*, p. 68. For the cuneiform text see W. G. Lambert and Simon B. Parker, *Enuma Elis, The Babylonian Epic of Creation: The Cuneiform Text* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1966), p. 34.

³ *ANET*, p. 70. For the cuneiform text see Lambert and Parker, *Enuma Elis, The Babylonian Epic of Creation: The Cuneiform Text*, p. 42.

⁴ W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard, *Atra-hasis: The*

This sad state of affairs was eventually remedied after a complaint was registered. The decision was to effect a remedy (G, II, 9ff.)

Let her create Lullu-[man].
 Let him bear the yoke [. . .]
 Let him bear the yoke [. . .]
 [Let man carry the] toil of the gods.¹

One must not suppose that these are isolated rarities. Rather, this view of man is common in Mesopotamian literature.² How opposite of this is the Biblical view of man's exalted position (Gen 1:26-28 and Ps 8). How fully opposed and as a result polemical the Biblical view is to the Mesopotamian understanding of man is shown by a closer examination of the actual dominion material in Genesis 1:26-28.

Examination of dominion material

In order to effect a clearer understanding of the dominion material in Genesis 1:26-28 several brief studies are necessary.

The expression **בצלמנו כדמותנו**

With the rise of phenomenology in the twentieth century the prolonged study of man was assured, so much so that

Babylonian Story of the Flood, with *The Sumerian Flood Story* by M. Civil (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1969), p. 43. For discussion on who these Igigi were see Wolfram von Soden, "Die Igigu-götter in altbabylonischer Zeit," *Iraq* 28 (Autumn 1966): 140-45.

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 55-57.

² Cf. the additional examples in Alexander Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951), pp. 62-63, 66, and 69-70.

other important themes were passed over in silence.¹ Such being the case, there is seemingly endless writing on the subject.² These Hebrew expressions furnish a number of questions. Only those important for consideration of the imagery will be surveyed here.³

Jobling has correctly estimated that "any light shed on the meaning of dominion depends on how we understand the *imago Dei*."⁴ To come to any certain understanding of *imago Dei* requires study of the two terms "image" (צלם) and "likeness" (דמות). These terms have been variously interpreted.⁵ In fact the use of these terms in Genesis 1:26 has "already been explored so thoroughly by biblical scholars that one may

¹ Cf. the remarks of Charles Lee Feinberg, "The Image of God," *BSac* 129 (July-September 1972) : 235.

² Two examples of studies on the *imago Dei* are Jervell, *Imago Dei*, and the outstanding collection of articles in Leo Scheffczyk, ed., *Der Mensch als Bild Gottes, Wege der Forschung*, Band 124 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969). These only serve to indicate something of the much larger body of literature written on the subject.

³ For studies on the history of *imago Dei* interpretation see James M. Childs, Jr., *The Imago Dei and Eschatology: The Ethical Implications of a Reconsideration of the Image of God in Man Within the Framework of an Eschatological Theology* (S.T.D. dissertation, Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, 1974; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 75-18, 208, 1975), pp. 9-167 and G. D. Peterson, "The Imago Dei: An Historical and Critical Examination," unpublished doctor of philosophy dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 1974.

⁴ *IOTT*, p. 26.

⁵ For a brief summary of ways these terms have been understood see R. G. Crawford, "The Image of God," *ExpTim* 77 (May 1966): 233-36. For a brief survey of the interpretations of the *imago Dei* see D. J. A. Clines, "The Image of God in Man," *Tyndale Bulletin* 19 (1968): 54-61.

question whether any further significant observations can possibly be made."¹ But the necessities of this study demand at least a brief analysis.²

The term **צלם** occurs seventeen times in the old Testament.³ The preponderance of these usages indicates a *physical* representation [Num 33:52; 1 Sam 6:5 (twice), 11; 2 Kgs 11:18; Ezek 7:20; 16:17; Amos 5:26; 2 Chr 23:17]. And on another occasion the term refers to a figure on which is a representation of what is physical (Ezek 23:14). In all these cases referring to the physical, the term is found in construct form, followed either by the object to which it has reference or by a pronominal suffix. In light of these usages it appears that **צלם** may be used without hesitation to refer to the physical representation of a thing or person.

However, the term is used in the psalms to refer to "fantasies" or "phantoms" (Ps 39:7; 73:20). But even in the first passage the term is used in reference to the physical (**אֶרְבֶּה בְּצִלְמִי תְהִלָּתִי אֵישׁ**). Here the man walks about "as a dream-image" (in light of **הַבַּל** being paralleled with **צלם**).⁴ Thus

¹ J. Maxwell Miller, "In the 'Image' and 'Likeness' of God," *JBL* 91 (September 1972): 289.

² In fact, Ludwig Kohler, "Die Grundstelle der Imago-Dei-Lehre, Genesis 1, 26," *TZ* 4 (1948): 17, wrote that "all previous, further interpretation and application of the view of the divine image of man (is) best-forwarded above all with all exactness and inflexible rigor, whatever is asserted (as) actual and original and exclusive . . . to the basic passage of the Imago-Dei teaching." This translation is by the author.

³ Lisowsky, *Konkordanz*, p. 1219.

⁴ Taking the 1 as *beth essentiae* with Clines, "The Image of God in Man," 74, note 103.

the passage might be taken to mean that as man goes about he is essentially "an insubstantial will-o'-the wisp, which has appearance and form, but not much else."¹ The second of these passages, 73:20, might legitimately be interpreted along these lines: Those to be judged will be treated by the Lord as images, as those of little account, as "dream-images."²

In light of these indications that **צלם** may be used in reference to the physical, one is struck that **צלם** is used when referring to one person representing another [Gen 1:26, 27 (twice); 5:3; 9:6]. Does the term have physical implications here? In each of these five uses there is a preposition attached (**ב** in all but 5:3, then **כ**). If one should omit the Genesis 1:26-27 passage, there would be no hesitation in assigning to **צלם** the idea of physical shape and form. Thus Clines is quite correct in saying that "No example remotely matches the meaning **צלם** would have in Genesis 1:26 if it referred there to God's spiritual qualities or character, according to the pattern of which man has been made."³ Thus,

¹ Ibid., 75. This is the same general conclusion of Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalmen*, 2 Teilbände, 4., durchgesehene and mit Literaturnachtragen ergänzte Auflage, Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972), p. 302, who says: "Der Mensch ist 71i1 ('Hauch,' 'Nichtigkeit'; vgl. Ps 62:10; 94:11; 144:4; Koh 1:2). Auch der feststehende, aufrechte Mann is wie ein Nichts, wie ein Traumbild geht er dahin." Man is a "dream-image." For another view see I. H. Eybers, "The Root S-L in Hebrew Words," *JNSL* 2 (1972): 30, who believes that in the case of Ps 39:7 "the Hebrew stem *slm* may conceivably be associated with the root *sl* ('shadow, darkness')."

² Cf. the similar remarks of Miller, "In the 'Image' and 'Likeness' of God," 291, n. 5.

³ Clines, "The Image of God in Man," 75.

unless the use of **עלם** with reference to God be the exception, the term is rather concrete.

The cognates of **עלם** lead one in the same direction.

As examples materials from Aramaic and Akkadian may be considered. Typically the root **עלם** is understood in lexicons "to be derived from a Semitic root **עלם**, attested in Arabic *salama* 'to cut off.'"¹ This view Eybers challenges.² One of the major arguments against the common view is that Arabic *salamu* does not mean "image."³ Years ago (1886) Delitzsch in his *Prolegomena eines neuen Hebraisch-Armaischen* (S. 140) had proposed the Arabic: *z alima* (*z alam*, meaning "become dark, to be dim" as a suitable root.⁴ But the probability of such Arabic correlations has been challenged by Clines.⁵

Aramaic has a root **עלם** meaning "image" or "statue."⁶

¹ D. J. A. Clines, "The Etymology of Hebrew SELEM," *JNSL* 3 (1974): 19.

² Eybers, "The Root S-L in Hebrew Words," 23ff. Cf. also the helpful discussion on this point in Hans Wildberger, "Das Abbild Gottes," *TZ* 21 (1965): 257-58.

³ Eybers, "The Root S-L in Hebrew Words," 31.

⁴ Cf. the remarks of Wildberger, "Das Abbild Gottes," 251. Other interesting Arabic terms in this light are *zalma* () "obscurity, dark," *zulmat* () "darkness, obscurity," *zalil* () "shady," and *zill* () "a shadow"; cf. Joseph Catafago, *An English and Arabic Dictionary* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1858), pp. 154-55 for these brief definitions.

⁵ Clines, "The Etymology of Hebrew SELEM," 21-25.

⁶ See Gustaf H. Dalman, *Aramaisch-Neuhebraisches Handwörterbuch zu Tar um Talmud and Midrasch* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967), p. 364. Cf. also Jacob Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim and Midraschim*, 3 Bände (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963), 3: 193-94 and the interesting occurrence of **עלם** in 29B:16 in Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Daniel J. Harrington, *A Manual of Palestinian*

The word is found

. . . on the stela for Sin-zer-ibni and for Agbar from Herab. Here it does not mean statue, but image, and the representation of the priest is suggested in the flat-relief on the stela itself. However, it means statue in two inscriptions from Hatra, and this same meaning has the feminine *salma* in four additional inscriptions there in the same place of discovery, the feminine form of the substantive being utilized regularly where female persons are depicted. It attracts notice that the Aramaic *s^elem* (in certain respects *salma*) is utilized only in these inscriptions from Herab and Hatra. Otherwise (it) is called stela, statue, monument in Aramaic *nsb* or even *swt*. Clearly the Aramaic *s^elem* means statue in the Aramaic part of the book of Daniel and likewise in Nabataean, Palmyrene, and Old South Arabic.¹

Of course, in Akkadian there is a wide usage of *salmu*.

Meanings for the term are "statue, relief, drawing, constellation, figurine, bodily shape, stature, likeness."² Here only a few citations of pertinent sources are necessary. In a letter sent to Iasmah-Addu³ (ARM 1:74:4) the term is used in reference to the king: *20 MA.NA kaspam <ana> salmika uh-huz[im]* ("twenty minas of silver to plate your statue"⁴). Another use of the term in reference to kings is found in ABL 257, reverse 5:⁵ *salamani sa sarri . . . ina mubbi kigalli*

Aramaic Texts, Biblica et Orientalia, no. 34 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), pp. 104-5.

¹ Wildberger, "Das Abbild Gottes," 252. The translation is by the author.

² *CAD*, s, pp. 78-85.

³ For the cuneiform text of the entire letter see G. Dossin, *Textes Cuneiformes, Archives Royales de Mari*, vol. 1 (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1946), plates 94-96.

⁴ For this translation see *CAD*, S, p. 80.

⁵ For the cuneiform text see ABL, 1:259. *Salamani*, here written XXXXX, is used in a way similar to the "royal

imittu sumeli usaza-azi ("I set up the statues of the king right and left on a pedestal"¹). A different application of the term is found in ABL 6:17f.:² *abusu sa sarri belija salam dEN su u sarru beli salam dEN-ma su* ("the father of the king, my lord, was the very image of Bel, and the king, my lord, is likewise the very image of Bel"³). Clearly, these usages indicate something in the direction of the physical and, as well, a use of *salmu* that is attached to royal signification. Wildberger, following F. M. Th. de Liagre Bohler, frankly admits that in Sargon's age there is a clearly prominent presentation, "that of the king as the image (*salmu*) or even as the outline (*sillu*) of the deity, to be especially precise, as of the Sun-god Samas."⁴ In this light Wildberger explains the problematic proverb of ABL 652, *sil ili amelu usil ameli ameli amelu sarru su ki mussuli sa ili*.⁵ These few examples suffice

statues" (*salam sarrani*), written XXXXX
[text broken], in ABL 36, reverse 3; cf. *ABL*, 1:36.

¹ For this translation see *CAD*, S, p. 81.

² For the cuneiform text see *ABL*, 1:7, *salam dEN* reading XXXXX

³ For this translation see *CAD*, S, p. 85.

⁴ Wildberger, "Das Abbild Gottes," 253. This translation is by the author.

⁵ For the cuneiform text see *ABL*, 3:702. The transcription is that of Wildberger, "Das Abbild Gottes," 253. His explanation (254) of this proverb is that "the writer first of all quotes a proverb: 'The shadow of God is the sovereign (so is *amelu* here rendered), and the shadow of the sovereign are the remaining men.' And now the author acts moreover as a commentator: 'Sovereign means (in this context) the king, which is equal to the image (*mussulu*) of God.' The remainder would read that the common men are images of the sovereigns. The Akkadian *mussulu* corresponds to the sense quite in accord

to indicate the use to which *salmu* is put.¹ Two remarks summarize the direction which צלם with its cognates takes. The term is very concrete (physical) and is associated with royal material and imagery.

A second term, attached to צלם in Genesis 1:26, is דמות, meaning "pattern, shape" and being used twenty-five times throughout the Old Testament.² Of these times, on three occasions it is used with the preposition כ (Gen 1:26; Ps 58:5; Dan 10:16) and twice with the preposition ב (Gen 5:1; 5:3). Of these usages there are two impressions. The first is that because of the numerous usages in Ezekiel's visions the term appears to be less concrete than צלם. But closer analysis indicates that even in those passages one is struck that דמות is used to correlate vision images with the *likeness* of physical objects with which the reader would have been familiar (cf. Ezek 1:22; 8:2; 10:21). And in one passage (23:14-15) דמות is used with צלם to indicate the correspondence between image on a wall and actual Babylonian officers. (However, Ezek 1:28 may indicate a less concrete use in the words

with the Hebrew *d'mut*. The word will modify the conception *sillu* which is undecided and not sufficiently apparent to the writer. The passage is an excellent proof for the mediating position which the king in Assur occupies between God and man. If we have interpreted correctly the latter passage, then *only the sovereign* (as may be the case the king), not the man after all, can be called image of the deity." This translation is by the author.

¹ Cf. the remarks also of Kohler, "Die Grundstelle der Imago-Dei-Lehre, Genesis 1, 26," 18. However, Kohler also insists that the usage of *selem* indicates upright stance.

² Lisowsky, *Konkordanz*, p. 367.

דְּמוּת כְּבוֹד־יְהוָה. Isa 13:4 is also a non-visual reference.)

A second impression about the Old Testament usage of דְּמוּת is that it, like צֶלֶם, is also used in very concrete ways. In 2 Kings 16:10 דְּמוּת is used in the sense of "sketch" to describe what could be sent (נִשְׁלַח) as a plan or pattern for construction. A sketch sent for the construction of an object is physical! 2 Chronicles 4:3 shows no hesitation in using nine in reference to actual figures of bulls.

A general impression of דְּמוּת in the Old Testament is that it, though perhaps a broader term than צֶלֶם, is used in a rather concrete way.² Cognate usage also bears out this general impression. The Aramaic דְּמוּת is used in the Talmud (Y'bamoth) כַּאֲשֶׁר הִדְמִית הַדְּמוּת, meaning "as though he diminished the divine image (by neglecting the propagation of man)."³ A more interesting usage is found in Targum Onkelos in Exodus

¹ However, see the helpful remarks on this passage in Miller, "In the 'Image' and 'Likeness' of God," 291-92.

² Cf. the remark of *ibid.*: "*D^emut* is a more abstract term with a broader range of usage, but it too is normally used in connection with visual similarities." To the same effect John Piper, "The Image of God: An Approach from Biblical and Systematic Theology," *Studia Biblica et Theologica* 1 (March 1971): 16-17 remarks: "The second important word, *d^emut*, apart from the Genesis texts, has a greater flexibility than *selem*. It is used in a concrete sense almost synonymously with *selem*, and in an abstract sense of resemblance. Although the abstract quality is there, *d^emut* is used uniformly in connection with a tangible or visual reproduction of something else. So again, as with *selem*, the usage of *d^emut* urges us very strongly in the direction of a physical likeness."

³ Cited by Marcus Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, 2 vols. in 1 (New York: The Judaica Press, 1975), p. 312.

20:4: **וְלֹא תַעֲבִיד לְךָ צֶלֶם וְכִלְדָּמוֹ**.¹ Here the prohibition is understood not to fashion an idol (**צֶלֶם**) in the form or representation (**דָּמוֹ**) of anything in the heavens, earth, or waters.

Clearly **דָּמוֹת** is used here in a concrete way along with **צֶלֶם**.

The usage of **דָּמוֹת** in Deuteronomy 4:15 in Targum Onkelos should also be compared with the usage in Exodus 20:4.² The Syriac *dmwt'* () is also used in the sense of "form, figure, pattern, image, reflection, likeness."³

In accord with these brief surveys of **צֶלֶם** and **דָּמוֹת** one may say that the terms themselves are rather concrete, the latter term being a bit broader in scope. The usage of these terms in Genesis 1:26-28 would seem to have reference to man being in physical likeness to God.⁴ But before going further

¹ Sperber, *The Pentateuch according to Targum Onkelos*,

² Cf. *ibid.*, p. 297.

³ J. Payne Smith, ed., *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (reprint; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1967), p. 94.

⁴ For further discussion of the concept of *imago Dei* and the use of n'y and nine see the following: James Barr, "The Image of God in Genesis--Some Linguistic and Historical Considerations," *Die Ou Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika* 10 (1967): 5-13; G. C. Berkouwer, *Man the Image of God* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962); David Cairns, *The Image of God in Man*, The Fontana Library Theology and Philosophy Series (London: SCM Press, 1953; rev. ed., London: Collins, 1973); Trevor Craigen, " **צֶלֶם** and **דָּמוֹת**: An Exegetical Interaction," unpublished paper for Anthropology and Hamartiology Seminar, Grace Theological Seminary, 1980; Scheffczyk, ed., *Der Mensch als Bild Gottes*, pp. 77-87; William R. Eichhorst, "Man in the Image of God: Created and Renewed," unpublished doctor of theology dissertation, Grace Theological Seminary, 1973; Joseph Fichtner, *Man the Image of God* (New York: Alba House, 1978); W. Hess, "Imago Dei (Gen 1:26): Der Mensch als Bild Gottes," *Erbe and Auftrag* 29 (1953): 371-400; Meredith G. Kline, *Images of the Spirit*, Baker Biblical Monograph (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House,

in this direction a brief word must be said about the use of the prepositions in **בְּצֵלְמֵנוּ כְּדַמוֹתֵנוּ**. Considerable discussion has taken place over the use of **כ** and **ב** in this instance.¹

The questions are numerous. Is the phrase to be understood epexegetically? Is this a hendiadys? Are the two terms referring to completely different ideas? Are the prepositions merely redundant or do they in fact indicate differing shades of meaning? That there is some difficulty in answering these questions is undoubtedly indicated by the insertion of a conjunction by the LXX, Vulgate, and Samaritan Pentateuch.² This insertion may be understood simply as an epexegetical "even" and need not necessarily reflect an effort to indicate a distinction between **צֵלֶם** and **דְּמוּת**.

Apparently, no essential distinction is intended in the use of **כ** and **ב** for at least these few reasons. (1) The terms to which these prepositions are attached have been shown

1980); A. R. C. Leaney, "Conformed to the Image of His Son (Rom 8:29)," *NTS* 10 (-July 1964): 470-79; Oswald Loretz, "Der Mensch als Ebenbild Gottes," *Anima* 19 (1964): 109-20; idem., *Die Gottebenbildlichkeit des Menschen* (Munich: Kosel-Verlag, 1967); S. V. McCasland, "'The Image of God' According to St. Paul," *JBL* 69 (June 1950): 85-100; T. N. D. Mettinger, "Abbild oder Urbild? 'Imago Dei' in traditionsgeschichtlicher Sicht," *ZAW* 86 (1974): 403-24; K. L. Schmidt, "Homo Imago Dei im Alten and Neuen Testament," *Eranos Jahrbuch* 15 (1947): 149-95; Morton Smith, "The Image of God: Notes on the Hellenization of Judaism," *BJRL* 40 (1958): 473-512; and Claus Westermann, *Creation*, trans. John J. Scullion (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974).

¹ Cf. John F. A. Sawyer, "The Meaning of **בְּצֵלְמֵ אֱלֹהִים** ('In the Image of God') in Genesis I-XI," *JTS* 25 (October 1974): 418-26 and T. N. D. Mettinger, "Abbild oder Urbild? 'Imago Dei' in traditionsgeschichtlicher Sicht," 406-8.

² See above, pp. 198-200.

to admit of no appreciable distinction. (2) The prepositions **ב** and **כ**, because of their broad usage (as standard grammars attest), must be interpreted in light of context in an especially sensitive way.¹ (3) The traditional reading of the Hebrew text with no conjunction included does not indicate in an obvious manner any major distinctions between **ב** and **כ**. (4) As Sperber has pointed out, 1 and 3 demonstrate some interchangeability as is evidenced in the Kethib and Qere readings in Joshua 6:5; Judges 19:25; 1 Samuel 11:9; Jeremiah 36:23; 44:23; and Esther 3:4.2 (5) The possibility of major distinctions in the prepositions as used in Genesis 1:26 (**בְּצִלְמֵנוּ** **כְּדַמוֹתֵנוּ**) is argued against by the opposite arrangement in Genesis 5:3 (**בְּדַמוֹתָו כְּצִלְמוֹ**).³ (6) While **צֶלֶם** and **דְּמוּת** are both used in 1:26, the Biblical author has no hesitation in using either only **בְּצֶלֶם** (1:27 and 9:6) or **בְּדַמוֹת** (5:1) to express the notion of correspondence. (7) The LXX uses **εἰκῶν** to translate both **צֶלֶם** (Gen 1:26, 27) and **דְּמוּת** (Gen 5:1).⁴

From these reasons and the cognate and Old Testament usages of **צֶלֶם** and **דְּמוּת** a general picture emerges. The expression **בְּצִלְמֵנוּ כְּדַמוֹתֵנוּ** is in reality an emphatic assertion of a

¹ Cf. the discussion of Craigen, "צֶלֶם and דְּמוּת: An Exegetical Interaction," 16-19.

² Alexander Sperber, *A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966), p. 28-3.

³ However, there are some manuscripts that have **כְּדַמוֹתָו בְּצִלְמוֹ** at 5:3; cf. the critical apparatus.

⁴ Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*, 2 vols. (Graz: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954), 1:377.

physical correspondence.¹ But how is this to be understood? Does this mean, then, that God is corporeal? Such a view would, of course, be inconsistent with the Old Testament.² God. The imaging is not *simply* a reference to spiritual qualities or decision-making abilities.³ Certainly these are included. But the reference is more inclusive; it refers to *man in his totality*. This conception fits very nicely with the Hebrew understanding of man. Von Rad in summarizing the *imago Dei* has well said:

The interpretations, therefore, are to be rejected which proceed from an anthropology strange to the Old Testament and one-sidedly limit God's image to man's spiritual nature, relating it to man's "dignity," his "personality" or "ability for moral decision," etc. The marvel of man's bodily appearance is not at all to be expected from the realm of God's image. This was the original notion, and we have no reason to suppose that it completely gave way . . . to a spiritualizing and intellectualizing tendency. Therefore, one will do well to split the physical from the spiritual as little as possible: the whole man is created in God's image. . . . Man is like God in the way in which he is called into existence, in the totality of his being.⁴

¹ Cf. the remarks of H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis* (Columbus, OH: The Wartburg Press, 1942), pp. 88-89. However, the physical correspondence should not be understood to mean "upright stature," a view suggested by Kohler, "Die Grundstelle der Imago-Dei-Lehre, Genesis 1:26," 16-22.

² The prohibition of Exod 20:4 suffices to demonstrate this point.

³ As examples of this general perception see Philip F. Taylor, "Man: His Image and Dominion," unpublished doctor of theology dissertation, Grace Theological Seminary, 1974, pp. 85-88; Feinberg, "The Image of God," 235-46; John J. Davis, *Paradise to Prison* (Winona Lake, IN: BMH Books, 1975), p. 81; Clark, "The Image of God in Man," 215-22.

⁴ Von Rad, *Genesis*, pp. 58-59.

This summary will suffice for purposes of analyzing the dominion materials in Genesis 1:26-28.¹ That task now follows. After an evaluation of the dominion vocabulary, an evaluation will be made of the relation of dominion to image.

כבש and רדה.

One is struck by the bold force of these words as they are used in the Old Testament. The term (I) רדה,² meaning generally "to rule" [except in Joel 4:13 (ET 3:13) where it means "to trample"], is used 23 times in the Old Testament.³

¹ Certainly the plural pronominal suffixes attached to צלם and דמות are important, but will be excluded for purposes of this study, since their interpretation only incidentally relates to the present investigation. On this matter compare the helpful discussion of Kline, *Images of the Spirit*, pp. 27-34 and the summary of views in Taylor, "Man: His Image and Dominion," pp. 66-68. However, Taylor has too quickly dismissed the notion of divine council. For further discussion cf. Patrick D. Miller, Jr., *Genesis 1-11*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, no. 8 (Sheffield: Department of Biblical Studies, The University of Sheffield, 1978), pp. 9ff. and A. Cohen, ed., *The Soncino Chumash*, Soncino Books of the Bible (London: The Soncino Press, 1947), pp. 6-7. Perhaps the most helpful summary is that of Gerhard F. Hasel, "The Meaning of 'Let Us' in Gn 1:26," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 13 (Spring 1975): 65 who concludes (a conclusion this writer shares): "The inadequacies of the suggestions already discussed lead us to suggest that the plural in the phrase 'let us' (Gn 1:26) is a plural of fullness. This plural supposes that there is within the divine Being the distinction of personalities, a plurality within the deity, a 'unanimity of intention and plan.' In other words, a distinction in the divine Being with regard to a plurality of persons is here represented as a germinal idea. Thus the phrase 'let us' expresses through its plural of fullness an intra-divine deliberation among 'persons' within the divine Being." This also avoids the error of finding an explicit reference to the Trinity in the words "let us" (*ibid.*, 66).

² Also (II) רדה, meaning "to scrape," is used three times [Judg 14:9 (twice); Jer 5:31].

³ Lisowsky, *Konkordanz*, p. 1318.

However, of these uses two [Ps 68:28 (ET 68:27) and Lam 1:13] are open to question because of variants. There is some indication that **רָדַם** in Psalm 68:28 should be read as coming instead from **רָדַה**. The variants in Lamentations 1:13 are more weighty and indicate that instead of **רָדַה**, the root **רָדַ** should be read.¹ Apart from these two passages there remain 21 Old Testament uses of **רָדַה**. In 20 of these it means "to rule" (excepting Joel 4:13).

Analysis of these uses indicates the following. While the term itself certainly does include the idea of decisive rule, the term does not necessarily picture harshness (cf. the added **בַּפֶּרֶךְ** in Lev 25:43, 46, 53 and **בְּאַף** in Isa 14:6). Attitudinal connotations are supplied by the context (cf. Ezek 34:4 as an example). Therefore **רָדַה** can just as easily be used to describe appropriate *supervisory* work initiated by the central government [cf. 1 Kgs 5:30 (ET 5:16); 9:23; 2 Chron 8:10]. A second conclusion about the use of the term is that its use is widely scattered (occurring in Gen, Lev, Num, 1 Kgs, Isa, Ezek, Joel, Ps, Neh, and 2 Chron).

Furthermore, the context in which the term finds employment is noteworthy. The term is very much at home in regal contexts in which some degree of the absence or presence of restorative justice (cosmic blessing) is emphasized. Especially striking in this case is Psalm 72:8. Verse 1 announces: "Endow the king with your justice (**מִשְׁפָּט**), O God, the royal son

¹ Cf. the brief discussion of Delbert R. Hillers, *Lamentations*, AB (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1972), p. 11.

with your righteousness (הַקְּדוּשָׁה)." Thereafter follows a characterization of what this sort of rule entails (vv 2ff.). The domain of such rule (הַרְבֵּוֹת) is from sea to sea (v 8). In varying degrees the term's use is found in passages emphasizing more the regal aspect [Lev 26:17; Num 24:19; 1 Kgs 5:4 (ET 4:24), 30 (ET 5:16); 9:23; Isa 14:2, 6; 41:2; Ezek 29:15, 34:4; Ps 110:2; Neh 9:28; 2 Chron 8:10].¹ Other times the absence or presence of restorative justice is more prominent in the general context [Lev 25:43, 46, 53; Ps 49:15 (ET 49:14) in light of an attempt to answer a question of injustice].² But

¹ Cf. the similar conclusions of Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, *Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament*, Band 1/1 (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974), p. 218, and James Limburg, "What Does It Mean to have Dominion over the Earth," *Dialogue* 10 (1972): 222.

² Several remarks are noteworthy about Ps 49:15. The first is the analysis of the riddle (v 5); cf. the discussion of Leo G. Perdue, "The Riddles of Psalm 49," *JBL* 93 (December 1974): 533-42. However, his conclusion that the psalmist's hope for escaping death is because he possesses "secret wisdom concerning the mysteries of life and death" is unwarranted in light of the Old Testament's resoluteness on the importance of piety. That the Psalm in general is alluding to injustice seems evident. As Judah Jacob Slotki, "Psalm XLIX 13, 21 (AV 12, 20)," *VT* 28 (July 1978): 361 remarks: "The psalmist is here protesting against man's lack of articulateness in the face of apparent injustices and follows up the thought he expresses at the beginning of the psalm: 'Hear all you people . . . I will speak wisdom and express intelligent thoughts . . . Why should I be afraid?', and he concludes: 'Man is too inarticulate (or too timid) to speak his mind. He has no understanding. He is like the dumb animals.'" With respect to Ps 49:15 even the regal imagery may be present if one follows Calvin, *Calvin's Commentaries*, 5:249: "It may be asked, what that dominion is which the upright shall eventually obtain? I would reply, that as the wicked must all be prostrated before the Lord Jesus Christ, and made his footstool, His members will share in the victory of their Head. It is indeed said, that he 'will deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father,' but he will not do this that he may put an end to his Church, but 'that God may be all in all' (1 Cor XV. 24)."

in keeping with the above findings on Israelite royal ideology one would not expect the one of these emphases (regal and restorative justice) to be far removed from a context in which the other is emphasized.¹

Therefore, in the use of הָרַר in Genesis 1:26-28 there is a term that is readily employed in the Old Testament record in contexts of rule associated with kingship and of justice issuing from that kingship. In general terms, the cognates do not alter this usage. The Aramaic הָרַר is used in the sense of "to rebel, to chastise (a teacher who punishes his pupil, *Mac-coth*, II, 2), to subjugate, rule, govern."² On several occasions, when employed in this latter sense, the term is used to comment on the Genesis 1:26-28 passage.³ If there is any unexpected tendency present in the use of the Aramaic הָרַר , it is that the term is a bit more forceful in usage than its Hebrew counterpart. The Arabic root ك-س-ر , though having a rather wide range of meanings, can mean "to beat, pound (the ground)," even "to dash against."⁴ (There is also the Arabic root ك-س-ر , meaning "repell, turn back, prevail," corresponding to the

¹ Cf. supra, pp. 168-82.

² Cf. Jastrow, *A Dictionary*, p. 1451.

³ Ibid. Cf. this use in M. Rosenbaum and A. M. Silbermann, trans., *Pentateuch with Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Rashi's Commentary: Genesis* (New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, n.d.), p. 7.

⁴ Cf. the illustrations cited by Edward William Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, 8 parts, book 1 (London: Williams and Norgate, 1867; New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1956), 3:1071-73.

Hebrew נָסַח).¹ The Syriac root while meaning "to travel, proceed, continue, derive," can also mean "to instruct, chastise," obviously a less forceful term.²

The other major dominion vocabulary word in Genesis 1:26-28 is כָּבַשׁ. The term is used 14 times,³ and in each instance the idea of force is very much present. Usage of the term in Esther 7:8 ("to molest") indicates the violence which can be implied in the term. But this is a unique usage. Other uses, however, certainly indicate force in subjugating others to slavery [Jer 34:11 (read with Qere as Qal), 16; Neh 5:5 (twice); 2 Chron 28:10], in subduing foreign peoples (Num 32:22, 29; Josh 18:1; 2 Sam 8:11; 1 Chron 22:18), and in God causing his host to overcome (Zech 9:15) or causing sins to be trodden underfoot (Mic 7:19, here paralleled by "hurl," שָׁלַךְ).

In light of these uses several observations are pertinent. The very term itself may indicate violent force (Est 7:8) but this usage is uncommon. In nearly every case the understanding of the nature and degree of the force is supplied by the context. For example, the force required to subjugate foreign peoples is still "force" but the nature and degree of that force is determined by the attendant military-political-economic actualities of a given situation. Furthermore, in a number of cases, as is indicated by the context, the term is employed in a setting of restorative justice, the presence or

¹ Ibid., 3:1061-64.

² Payne, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, pp. 529-30.

³ Lisowsky, *Konkordanz*, pp. 664.

absence of cosmic blessing (cf. Jer 34:11, 16; Mic 7:19; Neh 5:5; 2 Chron 28:10). In three instances (2 Sam 8:11; Zech 9:15; 1 Chron 22:18) the context connotes a royal imagery. Therefore, the term may be summarized as one indicating forceful willing of one over another. But to argue that the term itself implies violence is not necessarily so. The context must determine this.

The cognates of כָּבַשׁ generally indicate a similar usage. Aramaic כָּבַשׁ, while meaning simply "to press, squeeze," may also mean "to suppress, restrain, conquer," this latter usage being found in the Y'rushalmi *Succah*, V, 55: "Instead of conquering (מִכְבֹּשׁ) the barbarians, come and subdue (וּכְבַּשׁ) the Jews."¹ The Arabic root at times meaning "to cover with earth, to squeeze, press," may also be used in reference "to putting one's head into a garment, to throwing oneself upon a thing without consideration," or even "to making a sudden attack with the purpose of surrounding."² However, more forcefulness is demonstrated in the usage of the Syriac root , meaning "to tread down, subdue, bring into subjection, conquer, pilfer, crush, break up."³

From analysis of these cognates one is given the general impression that the Hebrew (and certainly the Syriac) represent that narrower spectrum of the, semantic field of the root *kbs*, while Aramaic and Arabic demonstrate the spectrum

¹ Cf. Jastrow, *A Dictionary*, p. 610.

² Cf. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, 7:2558.

³ Cf. Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, p. 204.

in its fullness. This fact, along with the conclusions reached about Old Testament usage should caution against any view that the mere appearance of **כְּבִשׁ** in Genesis 1:26-28 requires one to understand a violent subjugation. Such a connotation would need to be present in the context. In Genesis 1:26-28 the connotation is lacking. But certainly the idea of forceful (not wanton) willing of one over another is implied.¹

To complete this survey of the dominion material in Genesis 1:26-28 several important questions need to be answered. The first question concerns what relation the dominion has to the *imago Dei*. Some, as Asselin, have argued that Genesis 1:26 teaches that dominion is the explanation of image:

The verse contains two statements. First, *Adham* is somehow a special reflection of *Elohim*. Second, man is given dominion over the rest of creation. In brief, it is our contention that the second is an explanation of the first. . . . man is God's image because he shares God's power and dominion over creation.²

But there is suspicion that this view does not adequately explain the two ideas. Image refers to being, an existence *as* or *in* something (appropriately, this spherical indication is

¹ Cf. the conclusion of George W. Coats, "The God of Death," *Journal of Bible and Theology* 29 (July 1975): 229, who argues that the primary focus of dominion terminology is not rule but *productivity*: "The focus falls on fruitful productivity, not destructive over-production or exploitation; on use of power for particular ends, not unlimited power, on life, not death." For further discussion on **הָרָר** and **כְּבִשׁ** see Norbert Lohfink, "Macht euch die Erde untertan?" *Orientierung* 38 (1974): 138-39. For a general discussion of the dominion imagery of Gen 1:26-28 see Helen Schungel-Straumann, "Macht euch die Erde untertan?" *Katechetische Blätter* 101 (1976): 319-32.

² David Tobin Asselin, "The Notion of Dominion in Genesis 1-3," *CBQ* 16 (July 1954): 282.

given in the use of the prepositions כ and ב). But dominion refers to action (הרה and כבש could hardly be construed otherwise), *doing*, not *being*. Certainly there is a correlation between being and doing but the correlation cannot be that of identification. Apple trees and apples are not identical, though a correlation exists between them.

If image refers to the totality of man's being and dominion refers to man's doing, then the correlation of the two would be that one is the *consequence* of the other. Dominion is a consequence of the *imago Dei*. So Von Rad concludes that "this commission to rule is not considered as belonging to the definition of God's image; but it is its consequence, i.e. that for which man is capable because of it."¹ Years ago Delitzsch had offered the same conclusion.²

Answering a second question is also necessary in concluding this survey of the dominion material in Genesis 1:26-28. Are there any indications about the manner in which the subduing is to occur? It has already been argued above that הרה and כבש are terms of activity, not of state or being. This fact appears to indicate that subduing is precisely a human activity done with respect to that over which man was given rule. Such activity, therefore, would be continuing. As Westermann has correctly noted, the very use of ברך indicates

¹ Von Rad, *Genesis*, p. 59. Cf. the similar conclusion of *IOTT*, p. 26.

² Franz Delitzsch, *A New Commentary on Genesis*, trans. Sophia Taylor (Edinburgh T. & T. Clark, 1888; reprint ed., Minneapolis: Klock & Klock Christian Publishers, 1978), p. 100.

that God is not merely establishing a *status quo*.¹ Rather, the blessing is a force, an energizing activity. A similar focus on dominion as continuing activity is implied in the expression in 1:28: פָּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמְלֵאוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ. "Although you are only two, yet, through your fruitfulness and increase, your descendants will fill the land and subdue it."² Clear implication is given here of "an ongoing historical process," perhaps even a "looking toward the future."³ The context does not allow violence to be the disposition of the rule (רדה and כבש).

A third question now is obvious: Over what is this dominionizing activity done? Without including any variants,⁴ the Hebrew text cites two lists:

<p>בְּדִגַּת הַיָּם וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבַבְּהֵמָה וּבְכָל־הָאָרֶץ וּבְכָל הַרֹמֵשׁ הָרֶמֶשׁ עַל־הָאָרֶץ:</p>	<p>1:26</p>
<p>בְּדִגַּת הַיָּם וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבְכָל־חַיַּה הַרֹמֶשֶׁת עַל־הָאָרֶץ:</p>	<p>1:28</p>

From these two lists there is no doubt that man is to engage in subduing the animal kingdom. But to say as much does not exhaust the two lists. Omitting the Syriac insertion for which there is no other supporting testimony,⁵ the inclusive nature of that over which man rules is indicated by וּבְכָל־הָאָרֶץ (1:26).

The dominion is cosmos wide. This is further suggested by the

¹ Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, p. 222.

² U. Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*, part 1, 1st English ed., trans. Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1961), p. 58.

³ *IOTT*, p. 26.

⁴ Cf. above, pp. 198-201.

⁵ Cf. above, p. 200.

trilogy of 1:28 (sea, air, ground).¹

Interpretive field

In light of the above study an interpretive field within which the dominion material of Genesis 1:26-28 must be viewed begins to emerge. In 1:28 there is clear indication of a summary of the three relations in which man stands.² The declaration that man is made in the "image and likeness" of God addresses the subject of man's relation to God. In his totality (physical, spiritual, etc.) man possesses correspondence to his Creator.³ Further, Genesis 1:28 addresses (at least in an indirect way) man's relation to others in the words "be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth." Man's multiplication requires societal structuring.⁴ Moreover, Genesis 1:28 clearly entertains man's relationship to the cosmos, he is to "subdue" it and to "rule" it.⁵ This subduing has a forward look since it is man's ongoing activity.⁶

Man is thus suspended in relationships. Macrocosmically he is under his Creator and over the cosmos. Microcosmically he is under some person and over others as he multi-

¹ Cf. Loren R. Fisher, eds., *Ras Shamra Parallels*, 2 vols., AnOr, no. 49 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1972), 1:356-57 for discussion of the word pair **יָם** and **שָׁמַיִם**.

² Cf. above, pp. 116-32.

³ Cf. above, pp. 207-21

⁴ Cf. above, pp. 122-27.

⁵ Cf. above, pp. 227-28.

⁶ Cf. *ibid.*

plies and engages in the ongoing historical activity of subduing. Just here the interaction of royal ideology, apocalyptic imagery, and societal hierarchical structuring emerge. Earlier, the royal usage of **הָרַר** and **כִּבַּשׁ** was indicated.¹ These terms clearly show that man was appointed to *rule over* the cosmos. Thus, as Limburg says, "the king/people relationship provides the model for understanding the man/earth-and-its-creatures relationship as portrayed in Gen. 1:26-28."² But as ruler over the earth man is to do it good not harm.³ He forcefully directs it, however, so that he pleases his Creator. In a word, he is to practice beneficence to what is under him and loyalty to the one over him.⁴ The activity of man when done in loyalty to his Creator means continued well-being for creation. When man moves in disobedience to his Creator, there is an absence of well-being in creation (Gen 3:7-24).

The activity of man within creation is restricted only by his relationship to his Creator. Thus Genesis 1:26-28 indicates man's rule is over "all the earth." Exactly what is this activity? Since Genesis 1 does not restrict it, apparently *all* of man's activity with respect to the cosmos is included, the very activity defined earlier as culture.⁵ Man is

¹ Cf. above, pp. 223ff.

² Limburg, "What Does It Mean to 'have Dominion over the Earth'?", 222.

³ Cf. above, pp. 188-94.

⁴ Cf. above, pp. 193-94.

⁵ Cf. above, pp. 134-40.

bound to do culture because he is placed by the Creator in relation to the cosmos and his Creator. Given all of these analyses and definitions Genesis 1:26-28 does deal explicitly with cultural activity. It does so, however, only in the most general way, a way very much in keeping with Scripture's general disposition to give an authoritative interpretation of *naive experience*.¹

With this appraisal of Genesis 1:26-28 in hand, there remains the task of surveying the remaining explicit Old Testament dominion passages, Genesis 9:1, 7 and Psalm 8:6-10.

Genesis 9:1, 7

Upon first reading, these verses do not appear to be an explicit reference to dominion ideas. Rather, they appear to avoid purposely any reference to dominion language. However, two textual matters warrant discussion of these passages. But the nature of these variants is such that only a brief treatment of these two verses is required. The Hebrew text of these two verses reads:

1 וַיְבָרֶךְ אֱלֹהִים אֶת־נֹחַ וְאֶת־בְּנָיו וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמְלֵאוּ
 B אֶת־הָאָרֶץ: A
 7 וְאַתֶּם פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ שִׂרְצוּ בָאָרֶץ וּרְבוּ־בָהּ:

Textual Variants

As already indicated, the variants that concern this discussion are two, marked out above by the inclusion of capital letters "A" and "B" in the Hebrew text.

A. At the end of 9:1 the LXX inserts καὶ κατακυριεύ-

¹ Cf. above, pp. 108-11.

σατε αὐτῆς ("and subdue it"). This is a lone reading since the Targum Onkelos (reading אגס, "to increase," instead of הרב),¹ Samaritan Pentateuch,² Arabic,³ Syriac,⁴ and Vulgate⁵ do not include the insertion. The LXX no doubt included the insertion in order to follow more fully the phraseology of the Hebrew in 1:28: פָּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמְלֵאוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ. But the strength of the testimony of the LXX is weakened by the silence of other corroborating testimony. Perhaps one can say of the LXX reading only that it offers the possibility that the *intended implication* of the Hebrew was not to deny *purposely* Noah and his sons any such dominion.

B. A slight question has been raised about the reading of רב in 9:7. As Westermann acknowledges, many commentators read ורד instead of ורב,⁶ although certainly not all.

The LXX reads ורד, thus translating καὶ κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς. This is the reading followed by several translations, *The New English Bible*, *The New American Bible*, and *The Jerusalem Bible*. However, against this reading stand the same witnesses as stood against the insertion of 9:1, namely Targum Onkelos,⁷

¹ Cf. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, 1:12.

² Cf. HPS, p. 13.

³ Cf. BSP, p. 35.

⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 34.

⁵ Cf. *Ibid.*

⁶ Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, pp. 616-17. His translation of 9:7 reads as ורד (*herrscht*). Cf. also the critical apparatus of BHS.

⁷ Cf. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, 1:13.

Samaritan Pentateuch,¹ Arabic,² Syriac,³ and Vulgate.⁴ Against such witnesses it is difficult to accept the reading ׀ 77. Undoubtedly, textual emendation is not necessary. On the other hand, it is difficult to argue that dominion is totally absent from Genesis 9.⁵

These realities make extensive treatment of the passage unnecessary except to raise one question: Does the silence of Genesis 9:1, 7 in mentioning directly the dominion vocabulary demonstrate that the dominion granted man originally was lost following the fall?

Literary context

The most obvious contextual reality about Genesis 9:1, 7 is that the material is post-fall. That event brought a change in man's relation to his Creator, others, and the cosmos (Gen 3-4). As von Rad says, "What God's address takes simply for granted is a severe disruption and degeneration of very good."⁶

A second reality in the context concerns God's covenant with Noah.⁷ This agreement reassures man that he must

¹ Cf. *HPS*, p. 13.

² Cf. *BSP*, p. 35.

³ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 34.

⁴ Cf. *ibid.*

⁵ Cf. the remarks of *IOTT*, pp. 28-29 and von Rad, *Genesis*, pp. 130-33.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 130-31.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 130ff., argues that Gen 9 is a series of undoubtedly, textual emendation is not necessary.

persist in being fruitful and multiplying (9:1). First, drastic changes did not rescind the blessing of 1:28. Even through agony (3:16) the propagation still must be carried out by the race. Even though man's degradation was extreme and subsequently judged (6:5-7), the command of 1:28 was still to be practiced. Second, 9:2-4 indicates that "man's vocation of power over the animals is renewed."¹ This is stated most graphically by the use of the objective pronominal suffixes attached to "fear" and "dread" (וּמִמֹּרְאָכֶם וְהִתְיַחֵשׁוּ).² Third, 9:5-6 stresses the strong legal tone of the covenant by the citation of the cause which prohibits the taking of life (כִּי בְצַדִּיק אֵלֹהִים (עָשָׂה אֶת־הָאָדָם)).

However, there is a third contextual reality about the passage, namely what Wenham calls "an extended palistrophe, that is a structure that turns back on itself."³ The pali-

answers to theological questions raised by violence and killing in the communal life of the creatures. But to argue that this is purely priestly theological reflection does not do justice to the historical nature of the God-Noah encounter.

¹ Delitzsch, *A New Commentary on Genesis*, p. 282.

² Cf. Williams, *Hebrew Syntax*, p. 23.

³ Gordon J. Wenham, "The Coherence of the Flood Narrative," *VT* 28 (July 1978): 337. Wenham follows the reminder of Francis I. Andersen, *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew* (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1974), p. 40, who says; "But if the text is left as it is, and its grammatical structure is taken seriously as serving artistic purposes, more positive conclusions about the integrity of a passage and the solemnity of its style are possible. Sentences from the Flood Epic used in the present chapter cut across passages generally assigned to the 'J' and 'P' documents. . . . This means that if the documentary hypothesis is valid, some editor has put together scraps of parallel versions of the same story with scissors and paste, and yet has achieved a result which, from the point of view of discourse grammar, looks as if it has been made out of whole cloth."

strophe which shows Genesis 6:10-9:19 to be a highly structured and artistic piece is as follows:

A	Noah (6:10a)
B	Shem, Ham and Japheth (10b)
C	Ark to be built (14-16)
D	Flood announced (17)
E	Covenant with Noah (18-20)
F	Food in the ark (21)
G	Command to enter ark (7:1-3)
H	7 days waiting for flood (4-5)
I	7 days waiting for flood (7-10)
J	Entry to ark (11-15)
K	Yahweh shuts Noah in (16)
L	40 days flood (17a)
M	Waters increase (17b-18)
N	Mountains covered (19-20)
O	150 days waters prevail [(21)-24]
P	GOD REMEMBERS NOAH (8:1)
O'	150 days waters abate (3)
N'	Mountain tops visible (4-5)
M'	Waters abate (5)
L'	40 days (end of) (6a)
K'	Noah opens window of ark (6b)
J'	Raven and dove leave ark (7-9)
I'	7 days waiting for waters to subside (10-11)
H'	7 days waiting for waters to subside (12-13)
G'	Command to leave ark [15-17(22)]
F'	Food outside ark (9:1-4)
E'	Covenant with all flesh (8-10)
D'	No flood in future (11-17)
C'	Ark (18a)
B'	Shem, Ham and Japheth (18b)
A'	Noah (19) ¹

This is a most interesting, if not totally symmetrical, analysis of the text. Two points are cogent for present purposes. The first is that the palistrophe shows the general organizing thought of the structure to be "God remembers Noah." The second, noted by Anderson, who developed a shorter palistrophe than the more elaborate one above, is that the first part of the account "represents a movement toward chaos," whereas "the

¹ Wenham, "The Coherence of the Flood Narrative," 338.

second part represents a movement toward the new creation."¹

If this general literary structuring of the passage (6:10-9:19) be accepted, then the intention of the Biblical material in 9:1, 7 is other than merely to repeat each element of Genesis 1. Rather, it is to show that in God's remembrance provision was made by the sovereign God for the ongoing of his creation after its judgment. Those relations of Genesis 1:26-28 are repeated in Genesis 9:1ff. Man still stands in relation to God ("image," 9:6), to others (9:5-6), and to the cosmos (only animals, 9:2-4, are selected since this inclusion fits the purpose of the overall literary structure of the passage, the animals being preserved with Noah in the ark).

Examination of dominion material and interpretive field

These two may be briefly summarized together since the variant readings have been excluded. Now the question raised

¹ Bernhard W. Anderson, "From Analysis to Synthesis: The Interpretation of Genesis 1-11," *JBL* 97 (March 1978): 38. While Anderson's choice of terms, "chaos" and "creation," are too heavily freighted, his general point is well taken. His shortened palistrophe is as follows (38):

Transitional introduction (6:9-10)

1. Violence in God's creation (6:11-12)
2. First divine address: resolution to destroy (6:13-22)
3. Second divine address: command to enter the ark (7:1-10)
4. Beginning of the flood (7:11-16)
5. The rising flood waters (7:17-24)
- GOD'S REMEMBRANCE OF NOAH
6. The receding flood waters (8:1-5)
7. The drying of the earth (8:6-14)
8. Third divine address: command to leave the ark (8:15-19)
9. God's resolution to preserve order (8:20-22)
10. Fourth divine address: covenant blessing and peace (9:1-17)

Transitional conclusion (9:18-19)

earlier¹ can be entertained: Does the silence of Genesis 9:1, 7 in mentioning directly the dominion vocabulary demonstrate that the dominion granted man originally was lost at the fall? In a word, the answer is "no" and for these reasons. There is some doubt when any given argument is based upon silence. Once Scripture has said man is given the task of dominionizing activity, one assumes its continued existence unless explicitly told otherwise. Additionally, in keeping with the structural purpose of 6:10-9:19, a full development of dominion language and imagery is not necessary. But that portion of the dominion that is necessary for the writer's purpose (9:2-4) is included. And this inclusion assures man that the dominion is intact. Thus, there is a continuity between pre- and post-fall periods. Hence, there is no surprise in discovering that the central structural theme in 6:10-9:19 is that "God remembered."

Moreover, the post-fall material contains a repetition of the idea of image (5:1, 3 and 9:6). The passage in 1:26-28 seems to tie together inextricably image and dominion, the latter being the consequence of the former. If there were alteration in the image, one would expect corresponding alteration in the other. But would he in this case expect obliteration of the dominion? A further consideration makes such obliteration most unlikely. If dominion in 1:26-28 was correctly defined as describing man's essential relationship to creation (formative activity within God's world with respect to concrete things), then surely one could account for alteration

¹ Cf. above, p. 233.

in that relationship following the fall. Indeed, such is the case (3:7ff.). But to speak of the dominion as totally lost is to say man is without relationship to creation. Such a notion is inconceivable.¹

Psalm 8:6-10²

Here there is an explicit reference to man's dominion, as the following Hebrew text indicates.

וַתִּחַסְרָהּ מִעֵט מַאֲלֵהִים וְכְבוֹד וְהָדָר תִּעֲטָרָהּ:	6
תִּמְשִׁילָהּ בְּמַעֲשֵׂי יָדָיָךְ כֹּל שְׁתָּה תַחַת־רַגְלָיו:	7
צִנְהָ וְאֵלֵּפִים כָּלֵם וְגַם בַּהֲמוֹת שָׂדֵי:	8
צִפּוֹר שָׁמַיִם וְדָגֵי הַיָּם עֵבֶר אֲרָחוֹת יַמַּיִם:	9
יְהוָה אֲדַנִּינוּ מִה־אֲדִיר שְׁמֶךָ בְּכֹל־הָאָרֶץ:	10

This remarkable psalm³ with lofty praise has been beset by a number of suggested textual emendations and vying interpretive opinions. Considerable exegetical and theological literature has therefore grown up around the psalm.

Textual Variants

The hope here is not to entertain all the emendations

¹ Thus Calvin, *Calvin's Commentaries*, 1:290 correctly says of Gen 9:2: "He now also promises that the same dominion shall continue."

² As examples of articles on Ps 8 see Vinzenz Hamp, "Ps 8, 2b.3," *BZ* 16 (1972): 115-20; J. du Preeze, "Bible Study on Psalm 8: A Prayer of Praise on the Glory and Greatness of God," *NGTT* 14 (1973): 206-13; Henning Graf Reventlow, "Der psalm 8," *Poet* 1 (1967) : 304-32; Helmer Ringgren, "Psalm 8 och kristo login," *SEA* 36 (1972) : 16-20; J. A. Soggin, "Textkritische Untersuchung von Ps. VIII vv. 2-3 and 6," *VT* 21 (1971): 565-71; and Mary Tanner, "Psalm 8:1-2," *Th* 69 (1966): 492-96. Other treatments of Ps 8 will be noted as the discussion develops.

³ For a discussion of the stichometry of Ps 8 see Oswald Loretz, "Die Psalmen 8 and 67," *UF* 8 (1976) : 117-21.

and readings that have been suggested.¹ The principal concern is to note any variants which might alter the meaning of especially 8:7-9. Happily the text of 8:7-9 is quite stable. The variants are so minor in nature as to exclude any lengthy mention of them. Only two are noteworthy. These are indicated above by the letters "A" and "B" inserted in the Hebrew text.

A. The LXX (καὶ), Vulgate (*et*), Syriac (ܘ), and Arabic () all insert the conjunction at the beginning of 8:7.² Accordingly *BHS* recommends the reading in the critical apparatus. However, the Targum does not include the conjunction.³ Even if the reading were accepted (it is not at all clear that it should be), the meaning of the dominion material in Psalm 8 would be unaltered.

B. Dahood suggests that the initial צִנֹּף ("flock") of verse 8 should be read as coming from צֹאן ("small cattle") plus the archaic accusative ending.⁴ In this way all domestic cattle, both small (צֹאֲנָה) and great (אֵל פִּיִּם), would be included in the general category of animals to which the psalmist refers.⁵ Certainly such a reading is not foreign to the passage

¹ For a survey of a number of those suggested see Charles Augustus Briggs and Emilie Grace Briggs, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, 2 vols., ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914), 1:61-67 and Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms*, 3 vols., AB (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1966), 1:49-52.

² Cf. *BSP*, 3:94-95.

³ Cf. *ibid.*, 3:94.

⁴ Dahood, *Psalms*, 1:51.

⁵ *Ibid.* According to Dahood this usage would be a parallel expression to UT 51:VI 40-43. For an English translation

(cf. 8:7). However, acceptance or rejection of the reading does not alter the essential interpretation of the passage.

Literary context

The correlation of verses 7-9 to Genesis 1:26-28 is evident.¹ As might be expected, verses 7-9 and their setting within the psalm do not celebrate the glory of nature as such. Rather, the focus falls on "the glory and majesty of Israel's God who is the Lord of all that is created."² God's glorification is immediately secured in the psalm (8:2: יְהוָה אֱדַנְיָנוּ יְהוָה אֱדַנְיָנוּ).³ What occasions this praise is most instructive. It is not "the effortless control by which God ruled his

of UT 5:VI see Gordon, *Ugaritic Literature*, p. 35. The translation reads: "He slaughters great [and] small cattle, he fells oxen [and] ram-fatlings." The Ugaritic words translated "great [and] small cattle" are *alpm sin*, an indication of the totality by reference to two contrasting parts (merism). For the transliterated text see Gordon, *Textbook*, p. 172, and his definition of *alpm* and *sin*, pp. 359 (no. 200) and 472 (no. 2137).

¹ Briggs and Briggs, *Psalms*, 1:61. Cf. also the remarks of Bernhard W. Anderson, "Human Dominion Over Nature," in *Biblical Studies in Contemporary Thought*, ed. Miriam Ward (Burlington, VT: Trinity College Biblical Institute, 1975), p. 36; however, he sees at least one major dissimilarity between the Gen 1 and Ps 8 passages: "The clearest evidence of the independence of Psalm 8 is the motif of the coronation of Man: 'with glory and honor you have crowned him.' Here there is no suggestion that Man's dominion is based upon a divine blessing that empowers him to multiply and subdue the earth as in the priestly story (Gen 1:28). Rather, Man's dominion over the earth is the consequence of Yahweh's elevating him to royal position." One wonders, however, if Anderson's distinction between Yahweh's elevation to royalty and Yahweh's blessing is possible or even necessary.

² Huppenbauer, "God and Nature in the Psalms," 20; cf. Kraus, *Psalmen*, 1:67.

³ Cf. the remark of Julian Morgenstern, "Psalms 8 and 19A," *HUCA* 19 (1945-1946): 499-500, that "this glory and dignity of man but emphasize all the more the supremacy and al-

world," nor "the magnitude of the accomplishment of creation," nor "even to describe the harmony of the product."¹ Rather, it is man's position within creation (cf. 8:4ff.) that elicits this praise.²

But how does consideration of man's exalted role yield in praise toward God? The psalmist develops his answer in this way. As man considers the magnitude and splendor of God's creation, man is gripped by his insignificance, his frailty (cf. 8:4-5). The heavens, moon, and stars dwarf man (שָׁנֹא) yet the psalmist recognizes they are all products of God's creative act. What is remarkable to the mind of the psalmist is the vastness of the creation and the amazing role God has given seemingly frail man as lord over this creation. Here is the clash in the psalmist's mind: "that man is lord of the creation and his recognition of the vastness of the creation."³ Such a clash, however, does not result in an expression of skepticism in Psalm 8. Instead, the clash issues in praise because the psalmist's thoughts are encapsulated by the covenant faith (cf. 8:2, the vocative expression יְהוָה אֱדַנְיָנוּ).⁴

most incomprehensible transcendence of God. This is the major theme of this magnificent psalm. The relatively exalted position of man in the universe according to the divine plan, is only a secondary theme."

¹ Brevard S. Childs, "Psalm 8 in the Context of the Christian Canon," *Int* 23 (1969): 21.

² Cf. *ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, 22.

⁴ However, cf. the remarks of Morgenstern, "Psalms 8 and 19A," 495-96, n. 6, concerning יְהוָה אֱדַנְיָנוּ that "in this composite term, יְהוָה is used no longer as the proper name of

personal faith wrought by divine grace causes the clash to issue in praise not skepticism.¹ The Old Testament itself addresses this problem of man as lord over creation and man as sensitized to his frailties by the vicissitudes of life.²

Without recognition of these ideas about the literary context, the dominion material as treated by this psalm cannot be fully appreciated. Nor can the larger canonical context (Heb 2) be accounted for fully. This larger literary context will be treated initially in the following chapter.

Examination of dominion material

Analysis certainly must begin with an evaluation of תַּמְשִׁילֶהוּ (8:7). The term מִשַׁל ("to rule") is used a number of times in the Old Testament, mostly in the standard form + מִשַׁל + ב. More than forty times it is used in this manner. But it may also be used in the forms + ל + מִשַׁל (cf. Exod 2:18; Isa

the national God of Israel, *Yahweh*, but rather with the connotation, 'God,' i.e. the one, universal Deity." His assertion is most debatable, however,

¹ Cf. the similar remarks of Huppenbauer, "God and Nature in the Psalms," 22, and Kraus, *Psalmen*, 1:71f.

² Childs, "Psalm 8 in the Context of the Christian Canon," 28-29, says: "What is the relationship between man as the lord of creation and man as a human being, limited in time and space, formed in communities, striving to maintain his life? The Old Testament is filled with reflections on this problem. The issue is not so much that man is constantly seeking to wrench himself free from God and to become divine himself, but rather that Hebrew man finds himself so overwhelmed by the powers of the world as to threaten any special role in God's creation. The psalms are filled with human struggle to maintain a life of faith among the dangers of everyday existence. The complaint psalms particularly oscillate between the confession that all things are in God's control and a protest against the actual state of affairs in which the psalmist

40:10), + מ + משל (cf. Josh 12:2), + על + משל (cf. Zech 6:13; Neh 9:3, where the preposition comes first), simply + משל (cf. 2 Sam 23:3; Dan 11:3), or משל + (cf. Ezek 19:14).¹

Usages employing the standard form (+ ב + משל) vary.

One is struck by the fact that the Biblical writers readily employ the term with a more mild force [cf. Gen 1:18; 3:16; 24:2; perhaps also the usages in Ps 19:14 (ET 19:13); Prov 16:32; 22:7; Lam 5:81. But just as clearly there is no hesitation to employ the term in ways suggesting great force [cf. as examples Isa 19:4; Ps 89:10 (ET 89:9); 106:41]. A further observation about the word is its frequent usage in royal contexts [cf. as examples Josh 12:5; Judg 8:22, 23; 9:2; 2 Sam 23:3; 1 Kgs 5:1 (ET 4:21); Isa 3:4, 12; 19:4; Jer 22:30; Ps 22:29 (ET 22:28); 106:41; Dan 11:39, 43]. So although the psalmist did not select a word employed in the Genesis 1:26-28 passage, he certainly chose a term very much in keeping with the Old Testament usages of הדר and כבש. These two along with משל all have a relatively wide range of meaning. The exact force of each term must be supplied from the context. All three are very much at home in royal settings. And each of the three focuses attention on the rule granted man as an activity, i.e., a thing to be practiced.²

is slowly being ground to pieces." To illustrate his point Childs appeals to passages such as Job 7 and Eccl 3:11.

¹ Cf. Lisowsky, *Konkordanz*, p. 874.

² Commentators have, frequently pointed out that a dissimilarity exists between משל and the word pair in Gen 1:26-28. This difference is the context of royal imagery (man's being crowned with "glory and honor") which more clearly

The cognates of **משל** point in the same direction. The Aramaic **משל** has a relatively broad range of meaning, such as "to handle, touch, govern, make a ruler (hifil)."¹ Phoenician (*msl*), meaning "to rule, manage," is also attested.²

The form of **משל** in Psalm 8:7 is unusual though. The hifil is employed only here and in Job 25:2 and Daniel 11:39. What Psalm 8:7 calls attention to by the use of the hifil is that through divine causation this role came to man (the point reiterated by the parallel verb **שתה**). The standard form + **נ** + **משל** is employed to emphasize that over which man has been positioned as ruler (reiterated by the parallel expression **תחת**). Daniel 11:39 is the grammatical parallel to this hifil usage with the standard form.

This verb form in Psalm 8:7 does call to mind an apparent distinction between the imagery of Genesis 1:26-28 and Psalm 8:7. Whereas the Genesis passage refers to dominion as something to achieve, Psalm 8 refers to dominion as a stated position. In the latter passage man is viewed as put into this relationship of being under God and over creation. How-

attaches itself to the understanding of **משל** in Ps 8; cf. Anderson, "Human Dominion Over Nature," pp. 36-37; Hans Wildberger, "Das Abbild Gottes," *TZ* 21 (November-Dezember 1967): 481ff.; *IOTT*, pp. 34-35. Certainly the language of the psalm reminds one of the phraseology of Ps 110:1 (cf. 8:7). The only counterpoint to this opinion is that the royal imagery of Gen 1:26-28 is not all that unclear.

¹ Jastrow, *A Dictionary*, p. 855.

² Richard S. Tomback, *A Comparative Semitic Lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic Languages* (Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1974; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 76-10, 247, 1976), pp. 267-68.

ever, the nature of the context of Psalm 8 would account for this distinction since the clash in the psalmist's mind is between this awesome function (position) to which he has been appointed and his frailty.

The only other remarks about the dominion material in Psalm 8, prerequisite to a discussion of its interpretive field, concern that over which man has been placed. The listing of 8:7-9 is not identical to Genesis 1:26-28, nor must it be. In both cases (Ps 8:7 and Gen 1:26-28) the activity of ruling is stressed as being cosmos-wide.

Interpretive field

Only two matters briefly concern the interpretation of the dominion material in Psalm 8.¹ The first of these is whether Psalm 8:7-9 is simply a pre-fall reminiscence. One might read the passage to mean that the psalmist is merely recalling what once (pre-fall) was so (man's dominion). But such a view does not at all fit with the tenets which clash in the psalmist's mind. He is struck by the seeming disparity of his *present* frailty and his *present* God-given position, ruler of those very elements that produce his sense of frailty! Concurrent experience of these realities (rulership and frailty) creates the clash. He lives in a world where the dominionizing

¹ The much-discussed question about how to interpret מְאַלְהֵיִם will be left untouched here since its interpretation does not alter the essential interpretation of Ps 8:7-9 in any appreciable way. For discussion of the interpretation see Gerald Cooke, "The Sons of (the) God(s)," ZAW 76 (1964): 22ff.; Childs, "Psalm 8 in the Context of the Christian Canon," 24-25, etc. The Old Testament usage of אֱלֹהִים is broad enough to make dogmatic assertion untenable.

activity is not rescinded but where his frailty shows his dismal failure to act as the dominionizer.

Thus the paradigm of Genesis 1:26-28 may be applied here. When man moved in loyalty toward God and beneficence toward creation, **על** existed. Disobedience toward God brought lack of **על** (Gen 3:7ff.). Man's kingdom began to struggle against him, it seemed. The struggle intensified man's feeling of frailty. And that is just the problem faced by the psalmist. What man ought to be doing as dominionizer, the world (which is his subject) testifies he is not doing. Only divine grace keeps such a man from skepticism. He is thus able to live with the *present* realities that dominion activity is still his to do and he is incredibly frail.

A second matter which concerns the interpretation of Psalm 8:7-9 is the question of whether the psalm speaks of mankind in general or of a particular individual (an eschatological figure). At least two factors have raised this question. One is the reference to the "son of man" surely a freighted phrase in the New Testament. The other is the very use to which Psalm 8 is put in passages such as Matthew 21:16 and Hebrews 2:5-9. These New Testament employments of the psalm suggest an individualization. But the question is whether this individualization is actually a part of Psalm 8. Analyzing only this psalm within the context of the Old Testament would lead to the conclusion that the psalm is a general reference to mankind, not to a particular man. But when the New Testament is considered there appears to be a move in another

direction. Accounting for this movement is taken up in the discussion of Hebrews 2:5-9 in the following chapter.

Summary

The explicit dominion material within the Old Testament indicates that the dominionizing activity (formative activity with respect to concrete things) has not been rescinded. But this activity may be done in loyalty or disloyalty toward man's sovereign Creator. When done in loyalty אלוהים exists in man's beneficence toward creation and creation's loyal submission to man's formative activities. But when done in disloyalty, the formative activity struggles with the world over which the dominionizer rules. This struggle produces a feeling of frailty within man. But divine grace allows man to cope with his frailty and go on about his ongoing formative activity, hopefully to the glory of the Creator.

In order to complete this examination of Old Testament dominion material a summary word must be said about possible implicit dominion materials.

Implicit Dominion Materials

Only suggestions for further study along two lines can be made here. If the foregoing analysis of Old Testament dominion material be accepted as reasonably accurate, one wonders if there are other dominion materials within the same corpus of literature. This seems an especially appropriate inquiry in light of the seeming disparity between the auspicious announcement of dominion in the first command to man

(Gen 1:26-28) and the scant subsequent reference to explicit dominion materials in the remainder of the Old Testament corpus.

One proposal for further study of implicit dominion material is what has commonly been designated as the theocracy.¹ There can be little doubt that Israel's law cannot be spoken of as only "sacred" or as only "profane" for the reason that "the union of the religious lordship and the national kingship in the one Person of Jehovah involved that among Israel civil and religious life were inextricably interwoven."² Israel's laws addressed the totality of its life (cultic and cultural). These laws pronounced a whole way of living and doing. The Israelite is assured that at life's center is one's relationship to his God.³ Israel's law covenant placed the whole of her existence (individually and therefore collectively) at Yahweh's service.⁴

¹ To conclude that theocracy (following Josephus) was unique to Israel is not so. The wide usage of מַלְאֲכֵי as a deity name witnesses against such a view; cf. the remarks of Gerhardus Vos, *Biblical Theology: Old and New Testaments* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1948), p. 125.

² *Ibid.*, p. 125.

³ So even "the king is very pointedly made subject to the demands of obedience to the written *torah* (Deut 17:18-20)," Ronald E. Clements, *Old Testament Theology* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1978), p. 111. Even prophets (cf. Deut 13 and 18) are subject to its noim.

⁴ Thus the general direction of Walther Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 2 vols., trans. J. A. Baker (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967), 2:243-44, is appropriate: "The hypertrophied cultus of the later monarchy might suppress the sense of personal vocation in popular piety; the monarchy itself might tend to subordinate the moral demands of God to nationalistic egomania, and so substitute the command-

What is evident about the covenant relationship is an entire divine ordering of life.¹ Here was God's expectation for the earthly life of Israel. To obey meant blessing; to disobey cursing. The blessing and cursing were respectively the presence or absence of שלם. Covenant instruction (from the perspective of naive experience) taught how to engage in the formative activity of life (how to treat others, the land, etc.).

As Israel engaged in her formative activity, her disposition toward disloyalty to her sovereign and as a result her confrontation with effects of cursings on her environment became more obvious. Her hopes were cast into the future.² These hopes centered in a person, a king, one whose presence assured a world in which שלם predominated. But hope in this coming deliverer

ment of national solidarity for the personal sense of responsibility; but again and again the hold of the collective was restrained by the spiritual leaders, who stood unrelentingly for the control of the nation by Yahweh's decree, and so summoned the individual to selfless commitment to the cause of the sovereignty of God."

¹ Vos, *Biblical Theology*, p. 126, correctly says, "The fusion between the two spheres of secular and religious life is strikingly expressed by the divine promise that Israel will be made 'a kingdom of priests and a holy nation' (Ex 19:6)."

² Cf. the remarks of Edmond Jacob, *Theology of the Old Testament*, trans. Arthur W. Heathcote and Philip J. Allcock (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958), pp. 326-27: "The hope of the return of Davidic times added to the paradise theme and the Exodus theme an element which, in view of the circumstances surrounding the composition of the biblical books, was destined to enjoy great prominence: a large number of the hopes centre round Jerusalem; the route of the new Exodus does not simply lead to the promised land, but to Jerusalem."

. . . has deep roots which go further back than the institution of kingship, though the latter gave it its dominant orientation. Since the return of the golden age formed part of the most ancient religious patrimony of Israel it is quite natural to suppose that it also included the hope of the return of man as he existed in the beginning. Man had been created to exercise the function of dominator and king within the creation (Gen 1:26; Ps 8:5).¹

A second suggested source of possible implicit dominion material is, therefore, the royal psalms (*Konigspsalmen*). Transition from hope in a king to hope in the king is natural and easy. The royal lament, Psalm 89,² may be cited as an example of this transition (cf. Ps 89:2-5, 28ff. and the New Testament usage of this psalm).³ By the very construction of the covenant with David one sees that kingship has an apocalyptic orientation. The hope for מלך to return is not in David; it is in the coming king who follows in David's line, the Messiah. He will have dominion over the cosmos and thereby demonstrate visibly the rule of one loyal to his God. In a word the loyalty is unique. Messiah is God.

There now remains only a brief analysis of dominion material in the New Testament in order to see the implementation given the dominion materials in the entire canonical corpus.

¹ Ibid., p. 327.

² The conclusion on type reached by D. Wayne Knife, "Psalm 89 and the Ancient Near East," unpublished doctor of theology dissertation, Grace Theological Seminary, 1973, p. 64.

³ Ibid., pp. 217-20.

CHAPTER IV EXAMINATION OF NEW TESTAMENT DOMINION MATERIALS

There is considerable debate over the extent of dominion materials in the New Testament.¹ Here two passages are understood in varying degrees to meet the tests of vocabulary and intention.² Of these two Hebrews 2:5-9 will be given more attention than the other because of the nature of its correlation of Psalm 8 with Christ. Following examination of these explicit references suggestions will be made about other passages within the New Testament that might contain dominion ideology and thus warrant further study. Procedure for analysis here will be much the same as that employed in the previous chapter.

Explicit Dominion Materials

The analysis begins with Hebrews 2:5-9 for a twofold reason. First, this passage is an important connecting link in tying together the entire canon's interpretation of the dominion materials. Second, the passage itself appears to move the dominion toward an individualization, namely Christ.

¹ Cf. above, pp. 9-10.

² Cf. above, pp. 142-43.

Hebrews 2:5-9

The Greek text of this passage according to the United Bible Societies' edition¹ is as follows:

- 5 Οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλοις ὑπέταξεν τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν, περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν.
 6 διεμαρτύρατο δέ πού τις λέγων,
 Τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος ὅτι μιμνήσκη αὐτοῦ ἢ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ὅτι ἐπισκέπτη αὐτόν,
 7 ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους, δόξη καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν,
 8 πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. ἐν τῷ γὰρ ὑποτάξαι [αὐτῷ] τὰ πάντα οὐδὲν ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποτεταγμένα·
 9 τὸν δὲ βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου δόξη καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον, ὅπως χάριτι θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσῃται θανάτου.

These particular verses are most important. Inclusion of Psalm 8 in this passage is strategic, says Reid, indeed these verses are the key to the whole epistle.² Such a potentially important function deserves careful attention.

Textual variants

The study of this passage faces a twofold problem, namely consideration of the variants within the New Testament manuscripts and the nature of the Old Testament passage which

¹ Kurt Aland et al., eds., *The Greek New Testament* (London: United Bible Societies, 1966), hereafter cited as *AGNT*.

² Richard Reid, *The Use of the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Th.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary; New York, 1964; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 64-10, 527, 1964), p. 127 (hereafter cited as *UOTH*). And in general terms H. J. B. Combrink, "Some Thoughts on the Old Testament Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *Neo* 5 (1971): 22 maintains that in order "to understand the message of Hebrews it is necessary to have a good idea of the manner in which (and to what purpose) the writer of Hebrews uses explicit and implicit citations from the OT."

is cited in this text. Happily neither presents any great difficulty for evaluation.

Because of this study's concentration on the dominion materials *per se*, it is necessary to mention but one variant reading in the New Testament text.¹ This concerns the inclusion in 2:7 of καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου following the word αὐτόν. The variant, following the lead of the LXX rendering of Psalm 8:7, has rather strong attestation. Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Ephraemi Rescriptus, and the original hand of Bezae Cantabrigiensis (D*), plus P, Ψ, uncial 0121b, a number of minuscules [33, 81 (except reading ἐκατέστησας for κατέστησας), 88, 104, 181, 330, 436, 451, 629, 1739, 1877, 1881, 1962, 1985, 2127, 24921, part of the Byzantine manuscript tradition, lectionary 597, several manuscripts of the Itala (Old Latin), the Vulgate, the Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, and Ethiopic versions, and several Church Fathers (Euthalius, Theodoret, and Sedulius-Scotus) attest this variant.² On the other hand the variant is omitted in the Chester

¹ In addition to the one considered here, alternate readings include τίς (P46, C*) for τί (supported by ⱼ, A, B, D2, etc.) in v 6 and χωρὶς θεοῦ (little support) for χάριτι θεοῦ (P46, ⱼ, A, B, C, D, etc.) in v 9. For evaluation of this latter variant see Brooke Foss Westcott, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1892), pp. 60-62 and the more recent work of Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977), pp. 94-97. Hughes (p. 97), following the judgment of C. Spicq, *L'Épître aux Hébreux*, 2 vols. (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, Editeurs, 1952-53), 1:419, concludes "that the reading χωρὶς θεοῦ must be 'resolutely rejected,' taking into account both the weight of the textual evidence and also the demands of the context." However, note the contrary remarks of J. C. O'Neill, "Hebrews 11.9," *JTS* 17 (April 1966): 79-82.

² See the critical apparatus of Heb 2:7 in *AGNT*.

Beatty Papyrus, the Vaticanus, the corrector of Bezae Cantabrigiensis, K, several minuscules (326, 614, 630, 1241, 1984, and 2495), part of the Byzantine manuscript tradition, the majority of lectionaries in the Synaxarion ("movable year" beginning with Easter) and the Menologion ("fixed year" beginning with 1 September), the Syriac Harclean version, and several of the Church Fathers (Chrysostom, John-Damascus, Pseudoecumenius, and Theophylact).¹

As is evident, the testimony is rather evenly divided, enough so that the United Bible Society's edition (Aland et al.) gives the text with the omission but assigning a "C" rating, indicating a considerable degree of doubt.² Modern versions indicate a similarly divided opinion over the omission of the reading.³ Among commentators there is also difference of opinion. As examples, Kent⁴ and Lenski⁵ favor the inclu-

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid.

³ Those that omit the reading are the *New International Version*, *Revised Standard Version* (with a note that other manuscripts include the variant), *The Berkeley Version*, *The Jerusalem Bible* (with a note that the variant is included in the Vulgate), *The New American Bible*, and *The New English Bible*. Those that include the variant are the *American Standard Version* (with a marginal note that some authorities omit the variant), *King James Version*, *New American Standard Bible* (with a note that some ancient manuscripts omit the variant), and *The Bible: An American Translation*.

⁴ Homer A. Kent, Jr., *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Winona Lake, IN: BMH Books, 1972), p. 52.

⁵ R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the Epistle of James* (Columbus, OH: Lutheran Book Concern, 1938), p. 74.

sion while Bruce,¹ Buchanan,² Delitzsch,³ Moll,⁴ and Robinson⁵ omit it.

The nature of the variant is quite clear. It actually comprises the first line of the parallelism of Psalm 8:7.⁶ Even if the line should be omitted, the thought is nonetheless sufficiently indicated by the inclusion of the second line in Hebrews 2:8. This fact itself indicates that inclusion or exclusion of the first line of Psalm 8:7 will not alter the interpretation of Hebrews 2:5-9.⁷

¹ F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964), pp. 31-32, n. 13.

² George Wesley Buchanan, *To the Hebrews* AB (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1972), p. 12.

³ Franz Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, 2 vols., trans. Thomas L. Kingsbury (reprint; Minneapolis: Klock & Klock Christian Publishers, 1978), 1:104.

⁴ Carl Bernhard Moll, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, trans. A. C. Kendrick, Lange's Commentaries (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896), pp. 47-48.

⁵ Theodore H. Robinson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, The Moffatt New Testament Commentary (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1933), p. 15.

⁶ As Dahood has pointed out (*Psalms*, 1:51), even the imperfect and perfect are used in quite typical fashion in Ps 8:7 to create a sense of balance.

⁷ Cf. the remarks of Pauline Giles, "The Son of Man in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *ExpTim* 86 (August 1975): 329: "The sentence here omitted from Ps 8:6 is present in a number of manuscripts. Zuntz considers that our author omitted it because it conflicted with his argument. J. H. Davies concludes that it was omitted because it emphasized man's rule over the material world whereas the intention was to apply the Psalm to Jesus' rule over the world to come. This, says Davies, is the reason for the emphasis on the inclusiveness of the phrase τὰ πάντα (everything), even angels. Both reasons for the omission are debatable for the words 'thou hast set him over the works of thy hands' seem to be paralleled by 'thou hast put all things under his feet.'"

And if the writer of Hebrews should be charged with failing to give an exact quotation that should be no surprise.¹ According to Reid, with whom this writer is in essential agreement on this point, only on five occasions does the author of Hebrews intend to give an exact, unaltered quotation (1:5; 1:5; 1:13; 5:6; 11:19).² Certainly the author is able to render exact quotations if this fits his purpose, but should it not, he has no hesitation in making legitimate adaptations to suit his literary goals (cf. the remainder of the Old Testament citations in Heb).³

¹ That rigorous, detailed exactitude may not be his intention is perhaps evident in the very way the author introduces the citations. Typically the introductory formulae are short (forms of λέγω or λαλέω) and do not identify any individual from the Old Testament with whom the citation is associated; cf. *UOTH*, pp. 44ff. for a discussion of these points. The nature of the introductory formula in Heb 2:6 is especially indicative of the author's intention in using the Old Testament citation. The formula is most indefinite: διεμαρτύρατο δέ ποῦ τις λέγων. Of this formula Hughes, *Hebrews*, p. 83, appropriately remarks: "The RSV, *It has been testified somewhere*, fails to reproduce fully the apparent casualness, indeed vagueness, of the formula which introduces this quotation from Psalm 8 (vv 4 to 6). Literally rendered, it reads: 'Somewhere someone has testified, saying.' It is characteristic of our author, however, that he is not concerned to provide a precise identification of the sources from which he quotes. It is sufficient for him that he is quoting from Holy Scripture, whose inspiration and authority he accepts without question. God being its primary author, the identity of the human author is relatively unimportant." Cf. similar remarks by Kent, *Hebrews*, 52.

² *UOTH*, p. 53. However, cf. the recent update on the use of Old Testament citations in Hebrews based upon more complete Septuagintal research in J. C. McCullough, "The Old Testament Quotations in Hebrews," *NTS* 26 (April 1980): 363-79.

³ This conclusion raises the whole question of the attitude with which the author of Hebrews approached the Old Testament. McCullough appropriately summarizes on this point in *ibid.*, 378-79: "Firstly he considered that the Old Testament was a divine oracle which was relevant to the readers of

The text of the Old Testament which the author of Hebrews employed is doubtless the LXX.¹ However, as Howard points out,

since the discovery of the Qumran Literature and the impetus given by it to the study of the pre-Masoretic text, it is now probable that the text used by the author of Hebrews is, on occasion, closer to a Hebrew recension more ancient than the Masoretic text.²

But these realities in no way alter the case of the use of Psalm 8 in Hebrews 2,, since here the relation is closer to the LXX or a Hebrew text very close to the LXX, a case unique among the psalm quotations in Hebrews.³

his day and which, therefore, had to be interpreted and made understandable to them. In performing this task he was ready to make alterations to the text to avoid ambiguity and for the sake of emphasis. On the other hand he showed a reverent and cautious attitude to his text which contrasts starkly with that found among many of his contemporaries. He avoided the pneumatic rewriting of passages which the sectaries of Qumran considered to be part of the work of an interpreter of Scripture. Thirdly the Old Testament which he quoted was that local version which he had to hand when writing. There are at least two possible explanations for this. Either he was unaware of any other version (including the Hebrew), or he may have deliberately used the version known to and used by the local church to which he was writing to avoid confusion, and perhaps even, if congregations then were similar to those of today, opposition." If these were the only two options, certainly the latter (to avoid confusion) is preferable.

¹ *UOTH*, p. 51. Cf. also the cautious remarks of Kenneth J. Thomas, "The Old Testament Citations in Hebrews," *NTS* 11 (July 1965) : 303: "However, in spite of the inconclusive results of past studies, comparison with the LXX text does seem to provide the key to the textual origin of the O.T. citations in Hebrews. These citations are closely related textually to the primary LXX texts LXXA and LXXB."

² George Howard, "Hebrews and the Old Testament Quotations," *NT* 10 (April-July 1968) : 208.

³ Cf. the conclusion in *ibid.*, 211. The closest exceptions would be those uses of psalms where all texts are alike [Ps 2:7-Heb 1:5a; Ps 110:1-Heb 1:13; Ps 110:4a (and 6)-Heb 7:21; Ps 135:14-Heb 10:30b].

Literary context

There can be little doubt that the author is especially concerned in the opening chapters to show the superiority of Christ to angels (cf. 1:5ff.).¹ To serve this purpose he employs a series of Old Testament quotations ending with one from Psalm 110:1 (cf. Heb 1:13). This catena is especially striking for present purposes for two reasons. First, the use of the series in Hebrews 1 is characterized by little exegetical matter being added in order to explicate the author's interpretation of the Old Testament passages.² This stands in rather sharp contrast to the more extended exegetical remarks he makes when citing Psalm 8 in Hebrews 2.³ One would think that the series of Hebrews 1 is presented as *leading up* to the citation from Psalm 8.

Second, it is striking that the catena of Hebrews 1 is prefaced by an allusion to Psalm 110 (cf. Heb 1:3) and ends with a citation from the same psalm. Joined to this is the fact that Psalm 8 and 110 are commonly joined together for

¹ There are, of course, a host of interpretive matters relating to Hebrews that are important but which would also take this discussion on the dominion materials far afield. Besides the standard commentaries on Hebrews see also William G. Johnson, "Issues in the Interpretation of Hebrews," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 15 (Autumn 1977): 169-87.

² Cf. James W. Thompson, "The Structure and Purpose of the Catena in Heb 1:5-13," *CBQ* 38 (July 1967): 352. However, one cannot agree with Thompson's conclusion that the author of Heb handles "his texts with metaphysical assumptions which were very much at home in the Platonic tradition" (363).

³ Cf. the similar remarks of *UOTH*, pp. 103-4.

use in the New Testament¹ (cf. use of this combination of psalms in 1 Cor 15:24-28 and Eph 1:20-22). So here in Hebrews 1 and 2 they are joined, but this time extended attention is given particularly to Psalm 8.

These factors about the extensive treatment given Psalm 8 in Hebrews 2 indicate the reason for which Hebrews 2:5-9 is included here as containing explicit dominion material and other supposed New Testament usages of dominion material are not included. In other instances in the New Testament Psalm 8:6-10 (or Gen 1:26-28 and 9:1, 7) may be used in a catena with other passages (cf. 1 Cor 15:24-28 and Eph 1:20-22) where one passage in the catena has undoubtedly influenced another and no distinctive, lengthy treatment is given any of them.² Or it may be the case that the Old Testament dominion material is used in such a way that one is simply unable to isolate which Old Testament passage it is to which the New Testament makes reference (examples of this usage are Matt 21:23-27; Rom 1:23; 5:17; 8:37-39; 1 Cor 6:2; Phil 3:21; etc.). But in the case of Hebrews 2:5-9 there is an unusual situation. While here Psalm 8 is associated with Psalm 110 as elsewhere, on this occasion the author of Hebrews *purposely* gives an extended treatment to Old Testament material that is clearly

¹ Ibid., p. 103.

² For appropriate remarks on 1 Cor 15:24-28 see F. W. Grosheide, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953), pp. 364-70 and R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians* (Columbus, OH: Wartburg Press, 1937), pp. 671-87.

identifiable. As Reid says, "Instead of just quoting the passage briefly and then moving on, the author actually dwells on it."¹ In fact, the citation of Psalm 8 appears to be a major element in the argument of the book of Hebrews.

But before leaving the matter of the literary context of Hebrews 2:5-9, a broader perspective than has just been entertained is necessary. The usage of Psalm 8 in Hebrews 2 brings one to a most difficult question: What is the *canonical* context of Hebrews 2:5-9?² As Childs says, "The acknowledgement of the role of the canon in interpretation serves in staking out the area of my theological reflection."³ What this means is that the Christian canon (both Old and New Testaments) is a different context than either the Old or the New by itself.

In order for one to understand the literary context within the Christian canon, he must understand what is the context within each of the testaments first. The Old Testament context of Psalm 8 has already been established.⁴ And

¹ *UOTH*, p. 103.

² This question, of course, raises one of the most important and difficult questions for any Biblical scholar: What is the relationship of the New Testament to the Old? For discussion of recent proposals see Gerhard F. Hasel, *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975), pp. 105-27 and idem., *New Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978), pp. 171-203.

³ Childs, "Psalm 8 in the Context of the Christian Canon," 28.

⁴ Cf. above, pp. 241ff.

the New Testament context has been briefly addressed, but not fully. The striking differences in the use to which the material has been put in Psalm 8 and Hebrews 2 has not been addressed. There are three differences, and these can be placed within two categories. The first category concerns differences between the text of the BHS and the LXX. These differences (two of them) are carried over into Hebrews 2:5-9. The first is that אֱלֹהִים (Ps 8:6) has become ἀγγέλους in the LXX. As has been often pointed out, אֱלֹהִים, while meaning "God," can also be used in a broader sense (cf. Ps 82:6). But the LXX chooses to isolate more exactly the meaning of אֱלֹהִים by the term ἀγγέλους. This is, of course, carried over into Hebrews 2:7 because the use of ἀγγέλους so nicely fits the argument of Hebrews 1 and 2 (that Christ is superior to angels).

The second difference in this first category is that the LXX translates מַעַט of Psalm 8:6 by βραχύ in the LXX. The Greek term in the LXX almost always translates מַעַט (note the exception in Exod 18:22 where it translates יָטָק in reference to simpler cases).¹ In these passages βραχύς is used in reference to what is less in number (cf. Deut 26:5; 28:62), distance (cf. 2 Kgs 16:1; 19:36), and amount (cf. 1 Kgs 14:29, 43) or in reference to that which is "almost" or "nearly" so [cf. Ps 93 (94):17; 118 (119):87]. (The use of βραχύ in Isa 57:17 to indicate "a little while" is misleading since the LXX differs from the Hebrew.) In the New Testament (βραχύς is used

¹ Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*, 2 vols. (Graz: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954), 1:230.

less often (only in Luke 22:58; John 6:7; Acts 5:34; 27:28; Heb 2:7, 9; 13:22).¹ With the exception of the use in John 6:7 and Hebrews 13:22 (perhaps even here the point is *duration*) βραχύς is used with reference to time. This is a most interesting turn of events. The Hebrew טעם and LXX βραχύς are more general but the New Testament usage inclines to a shortness of time. Thus Childs appropriately concludes:

The important exegetical move is evident when one sees what the writer of the Hebrews has done with the Septuagint translation of Psalm 8. The translation made possible a new direction of interpretation which had not been available to the reader of the Hebrew text. The Hebrew had stated that man in his exalted position lacked only a little of being a god himself. The Greek now opened the possibility of understanding this lack as a temporal distinction, "to lack for a little time." The writer of Hebrews seizes upon this new avenue as a means of elaborating his understanding of the incarnation of Jesus Christ.

The second category of difference in the implementation of dominion material in Psalm 8 and Hebrews 2 does not concern a difference between the Hebrew text and the LXX but a difference between the Old Testament and the New. The movement from the Old to the New in this case is apparently a movement toward *individualization*. At the center of this movement has been the interpretation of Hebrews 2:6-8. Should these remarks be interpreted Christologically or anthropologically? More specifically, how is αὐτῷ employed in verse 8? Opinion is

¹ W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, eds., *A Concordance to the Greek Testament*, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899), p. 152.

² Childs, "Psalm 8 in the Context of the Christian Canon," 25.

divided. Calvin treats the verse Christologically.¹ Spicq essentially agrees.² However, Delitzsch,³ Kent,⁴ Lenski,⁵ Moll,⁶ and Westcott⁷ understand that the $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$ refers to man. Bruce, on the other hand, takes something of a mediating view: "So, while man is primarily indicated by $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$, the Son of Man cannot be totally excluded from its scope."⁸

In light of the text in Hebrews 2:5-9, the natural reading, giving due prominence to the heightened sense of a new expectancy (2:9) and to the obvious reference to man himself in the psalm, would understand man as the one to whom

¹ Calvin, *Calvin's Commentaries*, 22:59-60.

² See the remarks of Bruce, *Hebrews*, p 37, n. 35 to this effect.

³ Delitzsch, *Hebrews*, 1:106-9.

⁴ Kent, *Hebrews*, pp. 53-54.

⁵ Lenski, *Hebrews*, pp. 74-75.

⁶ Moll, *Hebrews*, pp. 49-50.

⁷ Westcott, *Hebrews*, pp. 44-45.

⁸ Bruce, *Hebrews*, p. 37, n. 35. Bruce appeals to the words of A. E. Garvie, "Shadow and Substance," *ExpTim* 28 (October 1916-September 1917): 461, as suggestive of the view he (Bruce) is offering. However, the larger context of Garvie's words indicates that he finds the remarks of Heb 2:8 to refer to man: "He finds that man has not secured the dominion over the creature that befits his dignity as but a little inferior to the Creator. 'Now we see not yet all things subjected to him' (2:8). Man's unfulfilled promise, however, he sees fulfilled in Christ, and for mankind fulfilled through Christ. "But we behold him who hath been made a little lower than the angels, even Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour, that by the grace of God he should taste death for every man. For it became him, for whom are all things and through whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the author of their salvation perfect through sufferings' (2:9-10)."

αὐτῷ refers. "The burden of proof," says Jobling, "is on those who take the opposite view."¹ However, the interpretation given Psalm 8 in Hebrews 2:9 suggests that the words "son of man" (Ps 8:5, **בְּרֵאשִׁית**; Heb 2:6, **υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου**) might be understood as "Son of Man." Obviously, in Psalm 8:5 "son of man" should be understood as nothing more than in parallel with "man" (**אָדָם**) and thus the expression cannot be a messianic title, at least not directly. The LXX and the New Testament scrupulously follow the parallelism. But, as Childs points out, the expression "son of man" takes on particular significance when read in the light of Jesus.²

What is of present concern is that the words **υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου** furnished *opportunity* to the author of Hebrews to particularize, individualize the Psalm (Heb 2:9). There is no direct indication that the Greek words are used as a title in Hebrews 2:5-9. But, on the other hand, neither do they argue against a movement toward individualization.

The Targum of Psalm 8 may indicate something of this same movement toward particularization. Admittedly, "the Aramaic of the Targum is late, but this does not exclude the possibility that the reinterpretation of the Psalm evidenced by

¹ *IOTT*, p. 208.

² Childs, "Psalm 8 in the Context of the Christian Canon" 25. Giles, "The Son of Man in the Epistle to the Hebrews," 331, after tracing a multitude of varying opinions, concludes: "Nevertheless, in our opinion, there is sufficient evidence to warrant the belief that, in quoting from Ps 8, our author gave the title 'Son of Man' to Jesus."

the Targum is from the first century."¹ Evidences of what *might* be construed as an attempt to particularize the psalm indicated in the Targum by four changes.² These are:

- (1) An attempt to individualize God's enemies (v 3):
 MT: "to silence the foe and the avenger"
 Targum: "to silence the author (בְּעֵיל) of enmity and vengeance" (perhaps an Aramaic circumlocution for "for")
- (2) An attempt to individualize the "man" (v 5a):
 MT: "what is man"
 Targum: "what is the son of man (בְּרַ נְשָׂא)"³
- (3) An attempt to individualize what is remembered (v 5b)
 MT: "you are mindful of him"
 Targum: "you are mindful of his works (עוֹבְדוֹי)"
- (4) An attempt to individualize by expansion of the animal list (v 9):
 MT: "the birds of the air, and the fish of the sea, all that swim the paths of the sea"
 Targum: "The birds of the air, and the fish of the sea, and Leviathan (וְלֵוִיָּתָן) who passes through the paths of the sea"

These changes are most significant, but in drawing conclusions about them one must be cautious.⁴ Gathering all

¹ Francis J. Moloney, "The Targum on Ps 8 and the New Testament," *Sal* 37 (1976): 330. However, the warning (as Moloney acknowledges) of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Book Reviews: Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*," *CBQ* 30 (July 1968): 420 should be heeded.

² For isolation and discussion of these and other matters see the excellent discussion of Moloney, "The Targum on Ps 8 and the New Testament," pp. 331-36. Though the stability of the targumic text on Ps 8 is open to question, "it is generally accepted that Walton's text is superior" (*ibid.*, 330). Cf. *BSP*, 3:94.

³ However, the expression בְּרַ נְשָׂא may be nothing more than an Aramaic idiom, rather than an overt exegetical move; cf. Jastrow, *A Dictionary*, p. 937 and the discussion of Moloney, "Targum on Ps 8 and the New Testament," 332.

⁴ There is exact certainty concerning neither the targumic manuscript tradition nor the intention of the targumic exegesis of Ps 8.

four changes together one is impressed that the Targum apparently particularizes what the Hebrew text generalizes. Two of these changes are most striking (1 and 4). There is the possibility that the enemies of God are particularized into one (בעיל) and Leviathan is introduced, perhaps as a symbol of evil force over which rule has been granted. What is to be made of these changes in light of the Psalm 8-Hebrews 2 continuum? Only this: In the Aramaic translation of Psalm 8 there is evidence for *supposing*

. . . an individual, messianic interpretation which presents "the Son of Man" as some sort of messianic figure. It would be more than imprecise to claim that the Targum gives us a complete picture of the figure sometimes vividly described by the apocalyptists . . . , but perhaps in this reinterpretation we do have traces of the expected king.¹

What is to be made of this apparent move from general to particular (from Old to New Testament) will be taken up in the following discussion on the interpretation of the passage in Hebrews 2.

Examination of dominion material

Quite obviously the principal dominion term in Hebrews 2:5-9 is ὑποτάσσω, meaning generally "to submit," a term used nearly forty times in the New Testament.² A form of it occurs once in 2:5 and three times in 2:8. A survey of its usage

¹ Ibid., 336 who also says: "Although the content of this messianic interpretation is new and wholly determined by the event of Christ, perhaps it is a little hasty to dismiss the Targums when looking for *some* of the *traditions* which may stand behind *some* of the New Testament uses of the term 'the Son of Man.'" The underlined words indicate italicized words.

² Cf. Moulton and Geden, *Concordance*, pp. 981-82.

throughout the New Testament is interesting and yields the following analyses. The term itself may be used of both voluntary (cf. as examples Luke 2:51; Rom 10:3; 1 Cor 16:16; Eph 5:21, 22,¹ 24; Col 3:18; Tit 2:5; 3:1; 1 Pet 2:13) and involuntary activity, i.e., force (cf. Luke 10:17, 20; Rom 8:7, 20;² perhaps 1 Cor 15:27, 28). More often than not the term ranking under another (cf. especially 1 Pet 2:13, 18; 3:1, 5). This varied usage yields a rather broad spectrum of meaning for the word, witnessed by meaning either "submitting" to governmental authority (Tit 3:1) or "obeying" parents (Luke 2:51). The term may indicate a recognition of authority passed in silence (cf. 1 Cor 14:34) or a public forcing of subjugation (cf. Luke 10:17; Phil 3:21). And while the term certainly is suitable for use in describing submission to God (cf. Heb 12:9; Jas 4:7), just as clearly it may refer to sociological ordering (cf. Tit 2:5, 9; 1 Pet 2:18; 5:5).

As suggested by this latter idea of ordering, **ὑποτάσσω** is decidedly employed in passages which emphasize an ordering of relationships. Such ordering implies both acquiescence on

is used of voluntary submission, what may be called a willing

¹ There are, of course, several manuscript variants in Eph 5:22. Although there is some measure of doubt about the exact reading, evidently a form of **ὑποτάσσω** should be included in the text since it is omitted in only P46, B, and several fathers.

² This is a legitimate analysis of Rom 8:7 since **οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται** is added. Cf. the remarks of Gerhard Delling, lap "**ὑποτάσσω**," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 8, ed. Gerhard Friedrich, ed. and trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972), p. 42, n. 17.

the one hand and assertion on the other. 1 Corinthians 15:24-28 clearly pictures this ordering of relationships; as Delling remarks,

The most significant statement in the middle occurs in the play on the active in 1 C. 15:28. The supreme power of the Son is not an end in itself; it is merely granted to Him in order that He may render it back to God after completing His task, v. 24. For with His own visible subjection to God He also subjects to God all the things that have been subjected to him by God. This statement is demanded by Paul's view of God (v. 28c) and especially by his concept of God's absolute power. It is hardly by chance that Paul here uses for the one and only time the absolute "the Son." The Son in the absolute is the One who to the very limit gives God the precedence which is His due.¹

The term is also at home among ordered human relationships (masters-slaves, Tit 2:9; husbands-wives, Col 3:18; Christ-church, Eph 5:24; government-citizen, Tit 3:1).

These ordered relationships are God-ordered relationships. Thus, submission to governmental authority is the expectation for the believers, οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ θεοῦ, αἱ δὲ οὖσαι ὑπὸ θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσὶν (Rom 13:1). The submission of one to another is done ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ (Eph 5:21). So it is in the case of women in the assembly; they should do καθὼς καὶ ὁ νόμος λέγει (1 Cor 14:34). The submission of younger men to older must be seen within the larger sphere of the injunction, Ταπεινώθητε οὖν ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιὰν χεῖρα τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Pet 5:5-6). Wives submitting to husbands is a means whereby αἱ ἅγαι γυναῖκες αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι εἰς θεὸν ἐκόσμου ἑαυτὰς (1 Pet 3:5). Such an act of submission is an adorning only because it corresponds to God's ordered expectation

¹ Ibid., p. 43.

within marriage.

These usages demonstrate that ὑποτάσσω is very much at home in expressing placement or positioning within a divinely ordered arrangement. There is little wonder then that the term is so usefully employed in the general argument developed in Hebrews 1 and 2. The Son's appointment is to a position of superiority over angels. Thus the world was not subjected to angels (2:5). It was instead subjected to man (2:8). Yet one does not see man's subjugation of the world (2:8). But happily one sees the man, Christ, who though "made a little lower than the angels" (2:9) is in fact superior to them (crowned with glory) and is the man who will truly exercise dominion over his world (cf. the Christological remarks to this effect in passages such as Eph 1:19-23 and in the catena in 1 Cor 15:24-28). These factors are but further reasons why the LXX of Psalm 8, which uses ὑποτάσσω, was so useful to the argument in Hebrews 1 and 2. Thus it is entirely appropriate that the LXX of Psalm 8:7 parallels ὑπέταξας with κατέστησας, the latter (καθίστημι) meaning generally "to bring (someone somewhere), appoint, put in charge, ordain."¹

The only other dominion term in Hebrews 2:5-9 that needs comment is ἀνυπότακτον (2:8). The term is used only a few times in the New Testament (here and in 1 Tim 1:9 and Tit

¹ Cf. the lexical meanings suggested in Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 2nd ed., revised and augmented by idem. and Frederick W. Danker (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979), P. 390 (hereafter cited as *BAGD*).

1:6, 10).¹ As the passages indicate, the term can denote activity of considerable force (especially seen in the listing of hostiles in 1 Tim 1:9), or of at least sufficient force to cause one to be termed disobedient (Tit 1:6) and rebellious (Tit 1:10).² The exact degree of force the word conveys in Hebrews 2:8 is not entirely clear, but undoubtedly the word recalls at least a portion of the force indicated in **שׁוֹנֵא** and **הִתְרַבֵּן** in Genesis 1:26-28.

Interpretive field

In order to understand more fully the interpretation of Hebrews 2:5-9 an analysis of the New Testament setting followed by an examination of the canonical setting (both Old and New Testaments) will be helpful. As one begins reading in verse 5, he is struck with the casualness of the author's approach. There is the indefinite introductory formula to the psalm citation: **διεμαρτύρατο δέ πού τις λέγων**. The repeated uses of the aorist (v 5, **ὑπέταξεν**; v 6, **διεμαρτύρατο**; v 8, **ὑποτάξαι**, inf., **ἀφῆκεν**) point in the same direction, since the aorist is simply undetermined or undefined.³ What is instructive about this apparent casualness, as indicated by the preponderance of the aorist verbal, is the notice of where

¹ Cf. Moulton and Geden, *Concordance*, p. 81.

² Cf. the lexical meanings cited in *BAGD*, p. 76.

³ Cf. the remarks to this effect by Ernest DeWitt Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*, reprint of 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1976), pp. 16ff. So one may say with Frank Stagg, "The Abused Aorist," *JBL* 91 (June 1972): 231: "The aorist 'presents' an action, of whatever nature, without respect to its nature. It does notes such reflect the nature of the action itself."

another tense is employed by the author.¹ This is first indicated in *περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν* (v 5) which assures that the catena of Old Testament quotations, especially the Psalm 110 and 8 complex, has current application and use in the author's purpose. The presents in Hebrews 2:6, *μιμνήσκη* and *ἐπισκέπτῃ*, are simply the repeating of the LXX as it reflects the Hebrew imperfects. (Ἔστιν is, of course, repeating the LXX's tracing of the Hebrew verbal *implication* of Ps 8:5.)

But especially in Hebrews 2:8 is the movement away from the aorist interesting. For here the author indicates a shift in the narrative through the employment of *νῦν δὲ*.² The temporal aspect of this narrative shift is indicated by *ὀρώμεν*, emphasizing that it is not now apparent that man rules over his *entire* domain. By this means the author provides the entirely contrastive setting for the perfect participle *ὑποταγμένα*. The contrast is that dominion has been given but it is not now apparent.

The author has placed this sharp contrast at a most interesting place in his argument. In Hebrews 2:7-8a the author draws from Psalm 8:6-7 a trilogy of statements which form a paradigm to be employed in his consideration of Christ

¹ So Stagg, *ibid.*, concludes that "departure from the aorist is exegetically more significant than the presence of the aorist."

² This literary device may be understood as a non-temporal usage of *νῦν δὲ* which follows "a sentence expressing an unfulfilled condition," Margaret E. Thrall, *Greek Particles in the New Testament*, *New Testament Tools and Studies*, vol. 3, ed. Bruce M. Metzger (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1962), p. 31. Similar usage is found in Heb 9:26. Thus *νῦν δὲ* might appropriately be translated "but as the case now stands."

(Heb 2:9).¹ The trilogy is:

- A ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους
 B δόξη καὶ τιμὴ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν
 C πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ

With respect to mankind the apparent quandary is not over lines A and B, but C. All things have been placed under man, but evidence of such appears lacking. That is man's predicament.

The application of this trilogy to Jesus is now apparent (Heb 2:9). Jesus in his incarnation has fulfilled lines A and B, but what of C? The problem may well have been that the readers of Hebrews were uncertain over the actualization of Christ's dominionizing.² The problem may well have been the delay of the Parousia, a delay which might appear to some to heighten suspicion that Jesus was not superior to angels (where was the evidence of line C to counterbalance the evidence of line A?).

However, the catena employed by the author in Hebrews 1 has already guaranteed the reality of line C. This is made clear by the appeal in 1:13 to Psalm 110. Therefore, what was true of mankind (no evidence of rule) is true of Jesus (enemies will become a footstool for his feet). The purpose of

¹ For this writer this is a literary reason why the author of Heb chose to employ only one line from Ps 8:7. The context of Heb 2:5-9 may indicate why the second line of the parallelism in Ps 8:7 was included in Heb 2:8, since that line more readily emphasizes the *totality* of the dominion.

² Cf. the discussion of *UOTH*, pp. 104-6, who calls attention to the trilogy. However, his understanding that αὐτῷ in v 8 refers to Christ leads his interpretation in another direction.

Hebrews 2:9 is to call attention to the first two lines of the trilogy. For in lines A and B is found the solution to the apparent contradiction caused by line C when applied to man. In Christ's incarnation and the evidence (crowning) of his satisfactory atoning work sons will be brought to glory (Heb 2:10). Thus "Jesus is not ashamed to call them brothers" (2:11; Rom 8:29). These now joined to Christ participate in his dominion, even over the last enemy, death (2:14-15; cf. 1 Cor 15:24-28). Mankind's dominion is possible only through the humiliation, exaltation and dominion of Christ (lines A, B, and C). He restores loyalty to God in these sons so that their formative activity is one of beneficence toward, not of struggle with, that over which God made them ruler.¹ By this means the trilogy of Psalm 8 is employed fully in Hebrews 2 to resolve the question raised in Psalm 8 and to show that Christ who so resolves man's predicament is superior to angels (cf. Heb 1:14; 2:14-18). Little wonder, then, that the readers of Hebrews are called upon to fix their thoughts on Jesus (3:1) since he is man's hope in the coming world (2:5).

With these summary exegetical remarks in mind one still needs to summarize an answer to the question about the place of Hebrews 2:5-9 in the context of the Christian canon. This question must be addressed while listening intently to both testaments.² The New Testament contribution to the

¹ Cf. above, pp. 229-32.

² So Childs, "Psalm 8 in the Context of the Christian Canon," p. 27 says: "My own hermeneutical suggestion is that the Christian interpreter, first of all, commit himself only

canonical picture of dominion material is that in Jesus Christ is found the resolution to the tenets which clashed in the mind of the psalmist: Man's incomparable position (ruler) and incredible frailty. Psalm 8:2 had already indicated a redemptive context in which to view the clash. (This very context had provided a basis for the psalmist to turn to praise rather than skepticism.) But it remained for the New Testament to point out with full force that in Christ, who is the dominionizer, the clashing tenets find resolution. And Hebrews 2:5-9 taught this by using the very trilogy of Psalm 8:6-7. So complete is his dominion that even death is subjugated (cf. Heb 2:14-15). The New Testament offers assurance that the dominion (formative, beneficent activity) is not mere wishful thinking.

The Old Testament also contributes to the use of dominion material in the New. The Old Testament reminds that dominionizing is not to be spiritualized away. The dominion is achieved in the real world (cf. Heb 2:5, τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν). As well, it reminds that the dominion is not simply vicariously experienced by another but is to be the actual experience of men (cf. Heb 2:11: δι' ἣν αἰτίαν οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται ἀδελφούς αὐτοὺς καλεῖν). And certainly the royal ideology of the Old Testament world with its societal hier-

to hearing both witnesses as clearly as possible, and then in conjunction with one another. To seek a relation between the Old and the New Testaments is to take seriously the church's confession of a canon of Scripture, and to reject an appeal to a 'canon within the canon.' The acknowledgment of the role of the canon in interpretation serves in staking out the area of my theological reflection."

archical structuring indicates that the king represents the fortunes of men. And certainly Hebrews 2 has centered all the good fortunes of men in Christ. He is the believer's hope. His reign guarantees the Christians' *שלום*. He is man's representative. Thus, the particularizing of Psalm 8, in keeping with an apocalyptic hope, is not inconsistent with the world of the Old Testament. Hence, the Targum of Psalm 8 is not such an oddity in the light of the Christian canon's continuum.

James 3:7

This passage by its nature requires only brief mention since there is no direct quotation here of an Old Testament dominion passage.¹ *However*, verse 7 does indicate undoubtedly a reference to the distinct claims of Genesis 1 and 9 and Psalm 8, this being especially the case in the citation in James 3:9. But as Laws points out, the reference in James 3:7 is assuming more than citing an Old Testament background.² For these reasons, the usual procedure employed in this study will be dispensed with in order that a few summary remarks may be made about James' appeal to this Old Testament background material.³

¹ Cf. a similar view expressed by Robert G. Bratcher, ed., *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament*, rev. ed. (London: The United Bible Societies, 1967), pp. 68-69.

² Sophie Laws, *A Commentary on the Epistle of James*, Harper's New Testament Commentaries (San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1980), p. 153.

³ The text which concerns this present consideration in Jas 3 is fairly stable and includes no variants of particular concern to this study; cf. Joseph B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St.*

The context of 3:7 is not at all difficult to determine in spite of the persistent difficulties encountered in outlining the book.¹ A survey of commentators indicates general agreement that James 3:1-12 concerns "the tongue,"² "the danger of a poisoned tongue,"³ "bridling the tongue,"⁴ "the power of the tongue,"⁵ "use and abuse of speech."⁶ Examples of exceptions to this understanding are Hiebert, who believes that "chapter 3 constitutes a self-contained section, dealing with the power of the tongue and its control"⁷ and Tasker who believes that the unit that deals with "the havoc wrought by

James, Classic Commentary Library (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1954), pp. 12-16.

¹ Cf. the remarks by D. Edmond Hiebert, "The Unifying Theme of the Epistle to James," *BSac* 135 (July-September 1978): 221: "The Epistle of James is notoriously difficult to outline. This is confirmed by the great diversity of the outlines which have been proposed. They range all the way from two to twenty-five major divisions. The epistle itself does not herald any clear structural plan concerning the organization of its contents. Hendriksen well remarks, 'A superficial glance at this epistle may easily leave the impression that every attempt to outline it must fail!'"

² Richard Wolff, *General Epistles of James and Jude*, Contemporary Commentaries (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 1969), pp. 56ff.

³ Bo Reicke, *The Epistles of James, Peter, Jude, AB* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1964), pp. 36ff.

⁴ Alexander Ross, *The Epistles of James and John*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954), pp. 57ff.

⁵ Laws, *James*, pp. 139ff.

⁶ Mayor, *James*, pp. 219ff.

⁷ D. Edmond Hiebert, *The Epistle of James* (Chicago: Press, 1979), p. 203.

the tongue" is found only in 3:5b-12.¹

This section on the use of the tongue is not isolated, however, from the rest of the epistle. The material in the book shows great interest in speech generally (cf. 1:19, 22-24, 26; 2:12; 5:12).² But the material in 3:3-8 is, as Laws points out, a highly rhetorical attack on the use of the tongue.³ Obviously, this material is but one part of the larger argument the author develops on the faith-works complex in the Christian's life.⁴

As a brief survey of the Old Testament citations in James indicates, the employment in 3:7 of the Old Testament dominion background material is not part of a catena.⁵ However, by the very method of indirect appeal to the dominion background material the author indicates his assumption that his readers were familiar with the Old Testament statements

¹ R. V. G. Tasker, *The General Epistle of James*, TNTC (London: The Tyndale Press, 1956), pp. 72-79.

² Cf. the remarks of Laws, *James*, pp. 26-27.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

⁴ For discussion of this complex see W. Nicol, "Faith and Works in the Letter of James," *Neo* 9 (1975): 7-24. Hiebert, "The Unifying Theme of the Epistle of James," 224 argues, in fact, that "the contents of the epistle, further, make it clear that James is not content simply to establish the abstract truth that a saving faith is a dynamic, productive faith. His purpose is practical, to present a series of tests whereby his readers can determine the genuineness of their own faith. 'The testing of your faith' (1:3) seems to be the key which James left hanging at the front door, intended to unlock the contents of the book. This writer proposes that *tests of a living faith* is indeed the unifying theme of the epistle and that it provides ready access to its contents."

⁵ Cf. Bratcher, *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament*, pp. 68-69.

on dominion. These factors are indicative of the service to which the material is put. They are momentarily employed to provide for the development of a contrast. This employment of material is very much opposite that of the usage in Hebrews 2. There the dominion was used to make a major exegetical statement. In James 3 the usage is brief and passing, illustrative in nature.

Indication of this contrast is shown by the $\delta\epsilon$ of 3:8. On either side of this $\delta\epsilon$ are the members of the contrast, tamed animals and the untamed tongue (cf. the illustrative material in 3:3-5). The term translated "to tame," $\delta\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$, is used only here and in Mark 5:4.¹ In the latter place the term describes a demon-possessed man whom no one was strong enough to subdue. Outside the New Testament the great force implied by the word is clearly attested. While the term can be used to describe the taming or breaking in of a horse or the clearing of land, it can also mean "to force, seduce, conquer, overpower."²

That James believed the dominion over animals is so is indicated through use of the present and perfect form of $\delta\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ in 3:7. This strengthening of an assertion by combining a present and a perfect³ is used to mean "that man's dominion over the creatures is no new fact, though fresh

¹ Cf. Moulton and Geden, *Concordance*, p. 183.

² Liddell and Scott, *Lexicon*, p. 368.

³ Cf. the remark of Mayor, *James*, p. ccxxx to this effect.

illustrations of it come to light every day."¹

While the subjugation of animals certainly implies that the rule of man was not completely lost, the very contrast which James presents in 3:7-8 shows how pitifully weak that rule is: Man cannot tame the tongue (τὴν δὲ γλῶσσαν οὐδεὶς δαμάσαι δύναται ἀνθρώπων). In this way James reechoes the general Biblical perspective on the dominion. The dominionizing activity is still viable but its accomplishments are pitifully weak.

But if all James argues be accepted, how then can man control the "untamable" tongue? Is all hope lost? "The answer must be that man alone and unaided cannot control his tongue, but that with Christ's help it is possible."² By this contrast James points again to the faith-works complex. Such a deed as control of the tongue, if ever to be accomplished, must spring from faith. Here, as in Hebrews (and even in the catena in 1 Cor 15:24-28), effective dominionizing is seen in relationship to the redeemer of men.

Summary

The New Testament implementation of explicit dominion material elaborates two essential points. One is that man's history reveals his failure to rule as God intended. The other is that such failure finds resolution in the redemptive application of the Christ event to man's life. Only then is

¹ Ross, *James and John*, p. 63.

² Reicke, *James, Peter, Jude*, p. 39.

control of the tongue or the overcoming of death possible. The redeemer is **שלם** for man and the cosmos. He, who in his incarnation gave strict obedience to the Father, even to the point of death, is the one who treats those under him (man and cosmos) with beneficence.

Implicit Dominion Materials

As was the case in considering implicit Old Testament dominion materials, so it is also the case here. Only suggestions for further study can be made. Along with these suggestions one example of implicit dominion material in the New Testament will be briefly considered.

A Suggestion

From the foregoing analysis there is every probability that implicit dominion materials are likely to be found in New Testament passages which discuss the incarnate Lord and his kingdom rule. From the treatment given the dominion materials in Hebrews 2:5-9 and James 3:7 those passages which describe believers as imaging their Lord must also be entertained. A number of individual passages have already been indicated as having been thought by some to contain dominion ideology.¹

As is shown in the catena employed in 1 Corinthians 15:24-28, there is no hesitation in applying the dominion ideas to the Lord who will reign until all enemies, even death, are put under his feet (even Heb 2:5 speaks of the

¹ Cf. above, pp. 9-10, for a list of New Testament passages.

world to come). Thus, the passages are forward-looking. Christ, as true man, is the true dominionizer now (he has already been crowned with glory and honor, Heb 2:9) and one day will give a visible, empirical demonstration of such. No wonder, then, that 2 Peter 3:13 casts the attention of believers forward: *καινούς δὲ οὐρανοὺς καὶ γῆν καινὴν κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ προσδοκῶμεν, ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ*. Of this remark two points are worth noting. One is the appeal to Isaiah 65:17.¹ The second is the typical dominion notice that in that place *δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ*. In light of the Isaiah context "righteousness" must include something of a restored well-being for the cosmos. This decisive renovation will include the *γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔργα* (2 Pet 3:10). These works are no doubt "the products of nature and, above all, of human culture, civilization, art and technology."² This general notion is undoubtedly echoed in the expression of Hebrews 13:14: *τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπιζητοῦμεν*. In that coming residence the believer will find the well-being and benevolence that has eluded him in his world because of disloyalty to his God. But this in no way implies that one whose look is projected forward should not here and now practice benevolence (Heb 13:16).

¹ Cf. Bratcher, *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament*, p. 73. In order to see the significance of this citation see above, pp. 186-87.

² J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, Harper's New Testament Commentaries (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), p. 365. For discussion on the difficult reading *εὐρεθήσεται*, in 3:10 see *ibid*.

Dominionizing activity done in loyalty toward God and beneficence toward creation may be done only in tandem with Christ. Here and now the Christian seeks to mirror Christ. So the church as cultus pursues the didactic purpose of seeing its adherents brought εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Eph 4:13). Though now believers are indeed children of God, yet when he is manifested they shall be like him (1 John 3:2). There is little surprise then that such children will yet be privileged to reign with him (Rev 5:9-10).

There appears then a paradigm in Christ for the children of God. They are to image him. By his total loyalty to his Father (he glorified the Father through completion of the work given him to do, John 17:4), he may rightfully be enthroned as the ruler crowned with glory (17:5; cf. Heb 2:9). The visual imagery of this great dominionizer is graphically given in Revelation 5:5-14. Remarkably, he is the ruling lamb. There is no surprise in discovering that two dominion allusions from the Old Testament are employed in Revelation 5:5-7 (cf. Isa 11:1 and Dan 7:13-14). The lamb owns the title deed to the world; it is his totally. He alone is worthy of opening the scroll (Rev 5:2 and 5).

Believers also reign but only in association with him. Their reigning comes only through application of the atoning death of Christ (Rev 5:9). By perseverance the saints live out their loyalty to their Maker. These reign as man was intended to reign. Corresponding to this loyalty, is the promise

of a world to come which is characterized by שְׁלוֹם . Those who refuse to submit in loyalty to their Maker are promised an eternal residence where שְׁלוֹם is absent, hell. There is little wonder, then, that the cultus (Matt 28:18-20) is commissioned to speak the redemptive word. Only through reception of that word is it possible for man to be divinely empowered to practice loyalty toward his God and thereby engage microcosmically in a formative activity (dominion) of beneficence which in the coming world the Lord will demonstrate macrocosmically. Those who believe not the redemptive word of the gospel will see the cremation of their formative activity and will find eternal lodging in a place where the cosmic benefits of loyalty are altogether absent.

There remains only the task of briefly analyzing an example of a proposed implicit dominion passage.

An Example

An appropriate terminus for consideration of implicit New Testament dominion materials is Romans 8:18-25, both because the "passage as an entity has remained at the periphery of Christian thought" and because it, is one of the more "compelling declarations of Scripture" on sins' consequences on creation and their removal.¹ Furthermore, as Eareckson re-

¹ Joseph Lee Nelson, Jr., *The Groaning of Creation: An Exegetical Study of Romans 8:18-27* (Th.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, 1969; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 75-15, 171, 1975), p. 1 (hereafter cited as *GCES*). At the close of the 1800s George Philip, "Creation Waiting for Redemption: An Expository Study on Romans 8:19-22," *ExpTim* 5 (October 1893-September 1894): 315,

marks, "ours is an age that has heard the demand for a new *theological understanding of nature as God's creation*."¹ Historically, the church has not often heard that demand in connection with Romans 8:18-25.²

While the text itself is quite stable,³ the meaning of the passage has been debated. Of particular interest is the meaning of the word κτίσεως in verse 19. Lexically κτίσις may have several meanings.⁴ Colossians 1:23 makes use of the term in reference to human beings. Romans 1:20 uses the term in reference to the act of creation, whereas 2 Peter 3:4 in reference to the sum total of created things. And the term may even be used in reference to governmental authority itself (1 Pet 2:13). This breadth of meaning is an occasion for difficulty in interpreting Romans 8:18-25.⁵ Though varying

wrote that Rom 8:19-22 "has long been regarded as one of the obscure passages of the Bible."

¹ Vincent Offley Eareckson, III, *The Glory to be Revealed Hereafter: The Interpretation of Romans 8:18-25 and its Place in Pauline Theology* (Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1977; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 77-21, 191, 1977), p. 6 (hereafter cited as *GRHI*). The underlining is according to Eareckson.

² A fact testified to by an analysis of the history of interpretation on the passage. Cf. *GCES*, pp. 8-102 and *GRHI*, pp. 12-26.

³ On a very few occasions of minor importance πίστewς replaces κτίσεως in v 19 and the present passive ἐλευθέπouται replaces the future passive ἐλευθερωθήσεται in v 21. In v 23 υιοθεσίαν is omitted in several manuscripts (interestingly enough even in P46). For more detailed discussion of these matters see *GCES*, pp. 115-138.

⁴ Cf. *BAGD*, pp. 455-56.

⁵ To resolve this interpretive problem *GCES*, p. 140, rightly concludes: "In order adequately to grasp Paul's in-

interpretations have been given the use of κτίσις in this passage, the following points would argue that the term is used in reference to creation *per se*. Verse 19 distinguishes between τῆς κτίσεως and τῶν υἰῶν τοῦ θεοῦ. Further, the creation of which the apostle speaks is described as being subjected οὐχ ἑκοῦσα (v 20), a statement hardly true of mankind's active disobedience. Verse 21 distinguishes κτίσις and τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. v 19). And in verses 22-23 distinction is made between πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις and αὐτοὶ. These factors exclude mankind (saved and unsaved) but undoubtedly include all else.¹

However, having so defined κτίσις, one must avoid dichotomizing sharply creation and man,² since in Romans 8 the redemption of man and the rest of creation are brought to-

attention and thus suitably to render his meaning, as evidenced by his use of κτίσις in Romans 8, attention must be given to the classical usage of this word, to its employment in the LXX, to the Jewish eschatological tradition, and to the context in Romans 8." Obviously such a study is beyond the limits of this survey. Summary of such a study (especially concerning the correlation of κόσμος and κτίσις) may be found in *ibid.*, pp. 140-173. Cf. also the treatment of Eugene H. Maly, "Creation in the New Testament," in *Biblical Studies in Contemporary Thought*, ed. Miriam Ward (Burlington, VT: Trinity College Biblical Institute, 1975), pp. 104-12.

¹ For further discussion on these points see George Mackenzie, "The Earnest Expectation of the Creature," *ExpTim* 5 (October 1893-September 1894): 333-34; G. W. H. Lampe, "The New Testament Doctrine of *Ktisis*," *SJT* 17 (1964): 449-62; and especially the summary remarks of *GCES*, p. 192. Cf. also the conclusion of John Hartog, II, "Sin, Redemption and the Animal Kingdom," unpublished doctor of theology dissertation, Grace Theological Seminary, 1978, pp. 187-88.

² Cf. the similar remarks of *GCES*, p. 192, and Lampe, "The New Testament Doctrine of *Ktisis*," pp. 453-56.

gether.¹ Taken together, Romans 8:18-39 indicate that redemption has cosmic implications. In the words of verse 19 creation with intensity expectantly awaits (ἀποκαραδοκία ἀπεκδέχεται) the ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ. This event, whenever it may occur, signals the creation's transformation. But the obvious question is: Why is creation so vitally linked to the appearance of God's sons? The clarifying γὰρ (v 20) follows. The creation itself was subjected to frustration (ματαιότητι), as it were, the opposite of τέλειος.² But the apostle is quick to add that such a state of frustration was not aimless. Rather, there was a forward look (ἐφ' ἐλπίδι).³ The frustration took on, as it were, the eschatological hope that (ὅτι, v 21)⁴ αὐτὴ ἢ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς. The liberation seems

¹ See the appropriate remarks to this effect in Edwin Lewis, "A Christian Theodicy: An Exposition of Romans 8:18-39," *Int* 11 (October 1957): 405-20.

² A helpful insight furnished by *GCES*, p. 194. Thus Thomas Fahy, "Exegesis of Romans 8:16-25," *ITQ* 23 (April 1956): 179 offers the translation "a slavery that works havoc" (δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς).

³ Here ἐφ' ἐλπίδι is taken as joined to ὑπετάγη, rather than ὑποτάξαντα. This seems to give a clearer answer concerning the reason for the creation's expectation. Thus, even the frustration does not prohibit a looking forward. For discussion of this point of grammar see especially Heinrich A. W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans*, trans. John C. Moore and Edwin Johnson, rev. and ed. William P. Dickson, with preface and supplementary notes to the American ed. by Timothy Dwight (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1889) pp. 323-24.

⁴ If one were to take here the variant διότι (supported by **K**, **D***, and others), the words that follow would furnish a reason for the subjection of creation; cf. the discussion of John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vols., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1959), 1:304.

total.¹ The movement of creation at its momentous renewal is εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ (v 21). What is clear in these verses is that change for redeemed man brings change for creation. Murray's words indicate understanding of this correlation:

The creation is to share, therefore, in the glory that will be bestowed upon the children of God. It can only participate in that glory, however, in a way that is compatible with its nature as non-rational. Yet the glory of the children of God is one that comprises the creation also and must not be conceived of apart from the cosmic regeneration--the glory of the people of God will be in the context of the restitution of all things (cf. Acts 3:21).²

What Romans 8:18ff. evidences is a solidarity between man and the cosmos. He fell and creation suffered; man is delivered and so is creation (cf. this emphasis in 8:22-23). This solidarity is perfectly explainable in light of the treatment given man's relationship to the rest of creation in the dominion materials, especially as these are understood in light of their ancient Near Eastern setting. Much earlier in this study,³ attention was drawn to the fact that those who rule (ancient Near Eastern royal ideology) owe obedience to their god and a beneficence practiced toward the subjects of their kingdom. When the ruler practiced loyalty toward his deity, there was a reciprocating well-being and wholeness that characterized his kingdom.

When this paradigm is applied to the rulership granted

¹ *GCES*, pp. 206-7.

² Murray, *Romans*, 1:304-5.

³ See above, pp. 188ff.

man, both man's harmonious relationship with the creation (pre-fall) and lack thereof (post-fall) are explainable. Obviously, any restoration of creation implies a loyalty toward the Creator. Man's disposition of disloyalty toward God has left him awe-struck that he should rule such objects as cause him to sense his frailty (cf. Ps 8). Then, however, appears Christ, the true man, who lives in utter loyalty to the heavenly Father, even to the point of the substitutionary, atoning death. This loyal Christ is the appointed dominionizer whose kingdom is one of well-being. He will cause his children to reign with him. In that day, creation will be delivered from its frustration and returned to the wholeness God intends. The hope of creation and redeemed man is to see the establishment of the kingdom over which Christ, who is truly God, rules.

Such a proposal appears to this writer to set Romans 8:18-25 into the proper perspective of the redemptive work of Christ which has cosmic consequences. If this be accepted, there is found in Romans 8:18ff. a framework for developing a theology of creation. Such development demands much further study and certainly a closer analysis of verses 18-25.

These analyses naturally culminate in drawing together the major conclusions of this study and suggesting in a speculative way several concepts for further exploration.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study proposed an interfacing of the so-called cultural mandate and the dominion materials of the Christian canon. More precisely, the analysis has asked whether the dominion materials do in fact explicitly mandate cultural activity for man. Consideration of this inquiry has led to the following major conclusions.

Any dogmatic assertion that the dominion materials explicitly demand of man cultural activity must be forthrightly cautioned by the fact that from ancient times the church has given a *variety* of interpretations to the passages. These differing interpretations were conditioned by the particular cultural setting of the interpreter. That is, the interpreter was informed by his cultural environment. And in turn the conclusions drawn by the interpreter were transmitted to the cultural community of which he was a part. The reality of this reciprocation between culture and interpretation serves as a caution against all dogmatic assertions, because the culture-interpretation continuum is not static but dynamic. Culture is moving and changing and is informed and, to that extent, is altered by each interpretation. Therefore, each age of interpretive work must give its own careful

accounting of that milieu from which its interpretive work is done. This eliminates as being legitimate all exegetical work which operates a-historically (as though the cultural milieu of the interpretation did not matter).

A further conclusion offered by this study is that man is placed by God within the context of three relations, to God, to others, and to the cosmos. He acts out these relations in two arenas of human activity, in public acts of liturgy and worship (*cultus*) and in formative acts toward others and the cosmos (*culture*). Both arenas find their ground motive in the inner being (heart) of man. Man's heart is directed either toward God or away from Him. Accordingly, the formative activity of culture is directed by the ground motive. So defined, culture is not optional for man. It must be done by virtue of the very way God has made man. Because man finds himself within these God-established relations and because God has made man a doer and a former, he of necessity does culture, individually and collectively. The question is only whether man does his formative, shaping work to the glory of his Creator.

Moreover, this study has concluded that if the dominion materials address the subject of culture at all, they will address this formative type of activity of man. Analysis of both the ancient Near Eastern background, and in this light the Old and New Testament dominion materials, points in the direction of formative activity.

But there are at least two important realities about

this pointing. One is that whatever the dominion materials say about cultural activity, they say from the viewpoint of naive experience.¹ It is not the intention of the Bible to address cultural activity scientifically. But the Biblical address does call all scientifically conceived cultural activity to measure itself by the Bible's normative interpretation of naive experience.

The second is that the dominion materials themselves make a most interesting journey within the Christian canon. The dominion given man in Genesis 1:26-28 refers to shaping activity, a duty to be practiced with respect to the cosmos in which man lives. Genesis 9:1, 7 being post-fall, pay attention to the alteration in man's relation to the cosmos, but in no sense is that formative activity which should be done to the glory of the Creator negated. Focus on this aspect of the dominion idea appropriately suits the literary purpose of Genesis 9. However, Psalm 8 building upon the assumption of the existence of dominion, casts light on an evident reality. Though man possesses the authority to engage in dominionizing activity to the glory of his Creator, man nonetheless senses his frailty as he stands viewing the *subjects* (the concrete things of the cosmos) of his rule. These subjects seem to operate at cross-purposes with man. As man has operated in disloyalty toward his God, man struggles with that over which he was made ruler. Well-being simply does not exist between mankind and the cosmos.

¹ Cf. above, pp. 108-9.

From the context of this problematic situation (Ps 8) Hebrews 2 moves to a solution. By using the psalm itself Hebrews 2 shows that Christ as true man is the solution. He moved about in his incarnate form in strict obedience to the Father and thus brought about the possibility of well-being for the cosmos. One day this well-being will be visibly demonstrated in His kingdom, but for now mankind is assured that Christ's dominion is so complete that he has even conquered the last enemy, death. The man is the solution for mankind.

Thus, if man would ever engage in dominionizing activity to the glory of the Father, he must accept that supreme act of Christ's loyalty, his atoning death and resurrection. By this means did He demonstrate his complete dominion; He conquered death. There is little wonder, then, that the New Testament lays great emphasis on the proclamation of the gospel's atoning message (Matt 28:18-20). Christlikeness is the goal of the believer. To become progressively like the Son is man's only hope for doing formative activity to the glory of God. Otherwise man's activity is done in disobedience to his Creator and the result is an absence of well-being in the cosmos.

The above conclusions are very much on the surface of the analysis of this dissertation. What is of special interest here is the question concerning what are the contemporary *implications* of these conclusions. These implications and their applications are, of course, speculative. The implications may be divided as follows.

The Christian and Culture

Questions about the Christian and culture are multitudinous. What is the Christian's cultural obligation? Ought not the Christian work for social change? Should not the Christian avoid social and cultural work and simply proclaim the good news? Ought not the Christian concentrate on the spiritual needs of man? Does not one show his liberal tendencies by participating in cultural and social work and thereby claiming this to be spiritual work? On and on the questions go.

These questions do not admit to any simplistic answers, but this study does provide a general direction. From the foregoing study one matter is clear. The question of whether a Christian has a cultural obligation is inappropriate. If cultural activity be defined as formative, shaping activity done with respect to concrete things in the cosmos, and if it be further acknowledged that God gave this function to man within the context of the very relations in which He sustains man, then it follows that cultural activity cannot be avoided. It must of necessity be done by virtue of being human. To cease cultural activity is to declare that one has ceased both to be human and to have a relation to the cosmos. These are hardly possibilities!

One might better formulate the question this way: What cultural activity ought the Christian to be doing? On the surface of things one must say that the Christian is under obligation to measure all of his cultural doing by the nor-

mative interpretation of *naive experience* given in the Bible. This normative, divine interpretation is to guide his scientific work. But exactly what does this all mean? Well, it must be admitted that while the Bible (the dominion passages in particular) says mankind does formative activity, never can one claim that the Bible says Christians must join with this or that particular, scientifically conceived way of doing a cultural activity. For example no group can claim that the Bible *mandates* their *particular* cultural activity. At best they can only say that they believe their scientifically conceived way of doing things approximates the normative interpretation of naive experience given in the Bible. Nor can one ever vindicate a given set of cultural activities (North American culture for example) as being *the* divine way. And no one group can claim that its cultural habits, conceived through analytical reflection (scientific inquiry) are *the* divine way. Such claims fly in the very face of the type of interpretation Scripture gives. At best such groups only approximate the Bible's normative interpretation.

These realities are especially sobering since Christian orthodoxy traditionally has conceived its commission to be the world-wide dissemination of the gospel. But as one goes from one culture to another, he is not fully able to divest himself of the cultural accoutrements through which he has scientifically perceived the Biblical message of the gospel. This spokesman fully runs the risk of believing his culturally influenced perceptions are in fact *Biblical demands*

for the message he speaks. The history of Christian missions attests such ill-informed conceptions of cultural influence. And modern-day mission enterprises are susceptible to the same mistaken identification of their culturally influenced perception of the gospel with the gospel itself. Just here, then, is a call for the whole of mission enterprises to re-think what they send across the sea. If such rethinking is avoided, the mission enterprise has failed to consider fully the implications of the reciprocation between culture and the interpretation of the gospel message. And to a certain extent such failure indicates an ignorance of the formative activity God gave man originally.

There is another reason for cautioning against any given formative activity as being divine. No person or group of persons is able to claim full, unfailing loyalty to God. Only the Son can make such a legitimate claim. All others must struggle with degrees of disloyalty. Disloyalty of whatever degree will keep one from fully performing his cultural activity to God's glory. And to this extent each person or group struggles with his environment, this struggle being supremely manifested in the event of one's death.

What these several applications of this study suggest is that the Christian person lives within a very difficult situation. By his very nature he must do formative activity. This is to be done to God's glory. But disloyalty (man's sinful rebellion) has rendered such a complete glorification impossible. This fact is attested by a continuing struggle

with the cosmos. The counterpart of disloyalty is a lack of beneficence (well-being). Man's only hope, therefore, is the true dominionizer, Christ. But even His followers possess varying degrees of disloyalty and thus a lack of well-being. Apparently man is to be what he cannot fully become.

This predicament has led some to claim that here is one of the very reasons why the Christian should avoid cultural activity. Why be burdened with seeking the impossible? Rather, ought not one to invest his time in helping with the *spiritual* needs of man? However, even here one is faced with a similar predicament. The saints are to live holy lives, but those who claim sinlessness are at best liars! But no one who stands in the line of historic Christian orthodoxy takes this to mean that Christians should give up the goal of living without sin. Happily, the resolution for both predicaments is Christ. One day Christians will reign with Him (true dominionizing) and be like Him (holiness).

Furthermore, what one does culturally (because it is formative) is added to his own cultural setting. His perspectives and activities, whether individual or corporate are absorbed by his culture. This will produce modifications of one type or another and he is accountable for these modifications. Are they to God's glory? Only an analysis of Scripture's divine interpretation can provide an answer. Thus, even a supposed avoidance of cultural activity by the Christian will produce formative modifications in his culture. Such an avoidance can hardly lead to a good accounting before God.

Failure to grasp the reality of this continuing modification of culture by the Christian is unfortunate. The failure leads to something of a Christian monasticism, a failure to intersect consciously the Christian faith with its cultural environment. Certainly the Christian person is faced with the ever present possibility of *supposedly* fleeing from his culture. He may join a group whose stance is anti-cultural. He may inform his children not to participate in worldly activities, by his definition of culture. But even in this person's flight from culture he cannot but do culture, albeit negatively so.

If the findings of this study point in any direction, they indicate that the truly Christian person is one who consciously practices the full range of his shaping, formative activity to the glory of his God. This man must live in the ambiguity of always needing to compare his activity with the Bible's normative interpretation of naive experience. This person will find no verses that identify the expected cultural activity cast in the language of his century. But out of loyalty to his Lord he must not fail to interface constantly the Bible's message with the full range of formative activity open to a citizen of this century.

Then does the Bible give us a cultural *mandate*? The answer is twofold. The answer is "yes" if one means that through divine determination man is given formative work to do with respect to concrete things within the cosmos. But the answer is "no" if one means that God has told the Chris-

tian man to practice this exact activity or participate in that precise social program or join with a particular political group. Man is a modifier, a former (in keeping with the limitations of the divine law-structures) of what is here but the *exact means* for modification is undetermined. That exact means will vary from age to age and will itself be the product of man's formative work.

The Christian and Education

The findings of this study also have several implications for the Christian educational enterprise. If the redeemed man is to do formative activity to God's glory, it would seem the Christian educational enterprise must lead in this direction. The enterprise must expose the student to the breadth of the cosmos wherein the formative work is done. And it must help the student develop interpretive, scientific skills for analyzing the Biblical text so the student may intelligently determine what direction his formative activity should take. Any other enterprise could not, it seems, do justice to the cultural-activity marked out by the dominion materials.

To answer what direct application can be made of these implications, the example of Christian undergraduate education may be cited. Any undergraduate Christian program which consciously or unconsciously avoids exposure to the spectrum of created reality can hardly be said to be doing *Christian* education. Nor can any enterprise be Christian which neglects a conscious attempt to help develop in students skills of

scientific Biblical interpretation. On the surface of things the Christian liberal arts educational enterprise would seem best to match these realities.

Admittedly, many liberal arts colleges do little to educate their students in Biblical studies. And many such colleges which do are sometimes weak in the area of Biblical studies education. Apparently in certain cases Bible education is added in order to Christianize what is being done elsewhere in the college. The study of Scripture is not in such cases an integral part of the total scientific endeavor of the educational community. Such study must be more than that which increases the numbers of Christian donors and endowments or that which adds a touch of campus morality to an otherwise touchy issue for the college's public image. Indeed, if the Christian liberal arts college is to have educational integrity, then there will need to be overt administrative and monetary commitments to an integrated exposure to the full spectrum of created reality. Only an integrative commitment will do. For only this will encourage Christian, integrative skills in the student.

Just here an educational approach such as the Bible college program falters. Admittedly, such a program seeks to give the student an overview of a host of liberal arts subjects. But these are often viewed as service subjects, not as part of the integrative whole of which Biblical study is also a part. Concentration on Biblical studies as the only major tends to monasticize the Bible from its integrative

function within the total spectrum of created reality.

Certainly a Bible college program can stress this integrative function and ought to do so. To the degree this stress is emphasized, to that extent the educational program of the Bible college is not distorting the integration necessary to appropriate formative activity with respect to concrete things.

What has been said of undergraduate programs can also be applied to graduate programs. If graduate studies are to be integrative in function, then the curricular emphases must reflect this fact. Tendencies in American graduate studies are toward non-integration, a movement against the integration with which the Creator fashioned created reality. Too often graduate study specializes, atomistically studying creation. To a degree trained specialists, whose disciplines are seldom interfaced with each other, are developed. Too often these disciplines are overtly protected from integration. This is the inherent danger of seminary studies; they tend toward a non-integrative awareness of created reality. Such a program could easily train specialists in Biblical studies and the ministry but in the process blind them to the integration of all scientific work. And they might view their specialization as having no cosmos-wide function. Such stilted specialization has little integration with the formative activity God gave man at the beginning.

All of the above is not to imply that all graduate schools that specialize in a given discipline are inappro-

priate. For example, seminaries are legitimate educational forms. But the caution for such a program is that it must consciously seek to integrate itself with the totality of creation, with the full range of formative activity that has been man's since the beginning. Administrative and monetary means must secure this end. There must be overt movement in this direction by the faculty members who formulate and implement the curriculum. If these things are not so, some graduate programs of study are in great need of immediate re-evaluation.

But is this enough for Christian undergraduate and graduate study? Hardly. Such study must encourage the student to work freely as a Christian within the totality of the cosmos. Prohibitions such as avoiding merely secular pursuits will not do. Dichotomy is out and integration is in. For the Christian his work is cosmos wide. He must understand that in Christ is found the mediator of the true life of loyalty toward God. In Him is the starting point of doing formative work. In this way the Christian man finds integration with the environment. All he does, he is to do in loyalty to God in the entire habitation God has given. The Christian man does not flee from God's world; he works within it. His only fear is that his formative work might dishonor God, the one who gave him the work to do. And as the believer works, he looks forward in hope to reigning with Christ, the true dominionizer.

Thus, Christian education must set free, liberate.

It must make the student conscious that all in God's world is there to be shaped, and all is to be shaped to God's glory. Monasteries and Christian education do not mix. The Christian man does not flee from this world to another. Because redemption is his, he is able through loyalty to God to embrace the environment in which he lives. Along with his Maker he seeks the well-being of his environment. In a word, only the redeemed man can be truly worldly interested. Without redemption man's formative work leads to chaotic effects in the cosmos, so much so that creation groans. Well-being really is God's design for creation. And above all others the redeemed man must know this supremely. Christian education must consciously be permeated with this spirit of liberation in order to raise in the student the possibility, the interest in doing the shaping work in the cosmos to God's glory.

By virtue of the way God created man and the world, this shaping work makes its impact, its modification on one's own culture and moves that culture in some direction or other. As each fresh impact is made, the culture is changed and moved. Because this is so, each generation of Christian thinkers must make a fresh appraisal of that culture which affects him. And more than this, each cultural impact alters, though perhaps almost imperceptibly, the cultural milieu which permeates the interpreter of the Biblical record. The reciprocation between one's cultural setting and his Biblical scientific interpretation, therefore, implies that both culture and Biblical interpretation have a dynamic movement, either toward God or away

from God. The Christian educational enterprise must constantly hold before its students the reality of this reciprocation and this dynamic. The redeemed student must know that as past interpretations were affected by the cultural milieu, so are present interpretations affected. And past and present interpretations are in a dynamic continuum. Christian tradition itself therefore, has a dynamic. Thus every formative activity impacts the culture which in turn affects one's Biblical interpretation. And each fresh Biblical perception will in some way alter one's perception of what his shaping activity should be which in turn will impact the interpreter's cultural setting. The reciprocation and the dynamic exist, and the redeemed person must work in light of this knowledge.

The Christian and Theology

By now it is clear that the conclusions of this study have several implications for the doing of the discipline of theology. Only a few will be suggested here.

The first is that theological constructions must clearly, humbly, and steadfastly refuse to declare that they are *equal* to the divine, normative interpretation of *naive experience*. Such theological constructions can only be viewed as attempts to approximate that divine interpretation. In this respect the theologian's work is very much like the biologist's or the behavioral scientist's work. In all three cases the scientific work is to more and more closely approximate the Bible's interpretation of naive experience. In some ecclesiastical circles theologians have been unwilling to

acknowledge this. They have insisted that theology is the monarch over other sciences. Certainly, theology informs biology and behavioral science but the opposite is also true. This is only bothersome to the theologians who understand that the informing of theology by biology and behavioral science means that science is informing the Bible. Those who so understand declare their own error. They have equated their theological construction with the Bible, no doubt an equation born out of arrogance. Theology, biology, and behavioral science are in reality only human sciences. Each of them must acknowledge submission to the divine, normative interpretation of naive experience in Scripture. Scientific work, therefore, is always a step removed from the Biblical norm.

A second implication which closely follows the first is that the discipline of theology must acknowledge that its various formulations are developed within a given cultural environment. Often theological perspectives claim to have accounted for the cultural setting of a given passage of Scripture or even the cultural background of a given ancient interpretation of Scripture. But just as often, they are negligent in asserting that their given theological formulation has been impacted by culture. All human scientific endeavor (even theology) must readily acknowledge this reality and whatever subsequent limitations it may produce.

In reality any theological formulation is not only one step removed from the normative interpretation of naive experience in Scripture but is also a formulation that has

been impacted by its cultural context. In this respect a given theology partly expresses this cultural environment. The argument has already been made throughout this dissertation that culture is dynamic, not static. It is continually impacted by man in his formative activity. All this implies that man, the interpreter of Scripture, makes his interpretation from *within* a cultural context that is changing and moving. As this context influences the interpreter, the formulations of the interpreter will be altered, even if the alteration is very subtle. Therefore, the discipline of theology is a developing and changing endeavor.

Does all this imply that the discipline of theology is on an evolutionary journey that leads nowhere? Not necessarily. But the reality of this dynamic nature of theological formulation means that any given theology that imagines it operates a-culturally is arrogantly mistaken. What, then, furnishes the discipline of theology with its moorings? There is, of course, the continuing record of the Christian Canon which each theology studies. But additionally, the discipline ought to make use of the guidance furnished by historical theology. By this means a modern day interpreter can know partially at least what past generations of Christian theologians have thought was essential to an orthodox perspective in their era. The modern day interpreter should see a line of orthodox theological formulations developing. He must know that he is part of this tradition and is contributing to it. He joins with those of like faith in the enterprise of formative ac-

tivity done with respect to the discipline of theology.

In too many circles of theology the interpreter errs. He may imagine that his theology is supra-cultural, i.e., it is not influenced by the culture contemporary with the formulation. Therefore, he lords *his* theology over others as *the* theology. He readily employs *his* formulation to detect heresy. He isolates himself and with him, that small circle of adherents who hold views like *his*. Given this situation, he further errs because he isolates himself from the helpful, guiding, staying influence of historical theology. In fact, he may reject the value of such study outrightly. To help avoid such arrogance, the one who formulates theology must forthrightly acknowledge what has influenced *his* theology and acknowledge the importance and value of historical theology. The discipline of theology can prosper best in circumstances such as these.

A third implication for the discipline of theology is that as a science it must pay more attention to the specific scientific concern about a theology of creation. Much attention has been paid to a theology of man or a theology of last things. But unfortunately little scientific attention within the discipline of theology has been given to the cosmos. As a result theologians have either ignored or resisted giving attention to the environment or ecology. They have proved lame and halting when others have taken strides to address creation. They have spoken slowly and with impediment while others have announced crusades about this or that aspect of

creation. Surely those who study God must say something intelligible about His creation and His intentions and designs for it.

A fourth implication is that the discipline of theology *must* speak to the issue of culture. Culture cannot be ignored or denounced only as a secular concern. It cannot be assigned as being the task of only the unredeemed man. One cannot denounce a given cultural manifestation as evil and thereupon extrapolate by arguing that all culture is evil. One must be more perceptive, thinking, and Biblical than this. Theologians cannot be content to practice what they sing, "This world is not my home, I'm just a-passin' through." The theologian must recognize that heavenly citizenship requires attention to the formative, shaping work within the cosmos to the glory of God. The conclusions of this study are offered as a prolegomena to a theology of culture. The science of theology still has work to do and explorations to make.

Each generation of Christians must study anew the matters raised in this dissertation. Several far-reaching implications demand further intensive study. Redeemed men must be quick to respond to these challenges in order to fulfill more faithfully their redemptive obligations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akita, M. "A Study on Greek and Hebrew Thinkings About Man." *Christianity and Culture* 1 (1964):7-26.
- Albertson, James. "Genesis 1 and the Babylonian Creation Myth." *Thought* 145 (1962):226-44.
- Albrektson, Bertil. *History and the Gods: An Essay on the Idea of Historical Events As Divine Manifestations in the Ancient Near East and in Israel*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1967.
- Allen, Leslie C. "The Old Testament in Romans I-VIII." *Vox Evangelica* 3 (1964):6-41.
- Alster, Bendt. *Dumuzi's Dream*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1972.
- Althaus, Paul. *The Ethics of Martin Luther*. Translated by Robert C. Schultz. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.
- Andersen, Francis I. *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1974.
- Anderson, Bernhard W. "Human Dominion Over Nature." In *Biblical Studies in Contemporary Thought*. Edited by Miriam Ward. Burlington, VT: Trinity College, Biblical Institute, 1975. Pp. 27-45.
- _____. "The Earth Is the Lord's." *Interpretation* 9 (January 1955):3-20.
- Anderson, Bernhard and Harrelson, Walter, eds. *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- Arbuthnot, C. C. "Did Jesus Teach Christian Socialism?" *Biblical World* 41 (1913):147-61.
- Arndt, William and Gingrich, F. Wilbur. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Asselin, David Tobin. "The Notion of Dominion in Genesis 1-3." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 16 (July 1954): 277-94.

- Augustine. *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim*. Translated into French with notes by Paul Agahesse and A. Solignac. 2 vols. Paris: Decibee de Brouwer, 1972.
- Auld, A. G. "Israel's Social Origins." *The Expository Times* 92 (February 1981):146-47.
- Baab, O. J. *The Theology of the Old Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1949.
- Baillie, John, McNeill, John T. and Van Dusen, Henry P., gen. eds. *The Library of Christian Classics*. 26 vols. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960. Vols. 20 and 21: *Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion*, by John Calvin. Translated by Ford Lewis Battles.
- Baird, J. Arthur. *A Critical Concordance to the Synoptic Gospels*. The Computer Bible, vol. 1. Revised edition. Edited by idem and David Noel Freedman. N.I.: Biblical Research Associates, Inc., 1971.
- Barbour, Ian G., ed. *Earth Might Be Fair: Reflection on Ethics, Religion and Ecology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Barnette, Henlee H. *The Church and the Ecological Crisis*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972.
- Barr, James. "The Image of God in Genesis--Some Linguistic and Historical Considerations." *Die Ou Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika* 10 (1967):5-13.
- _____. "Tradition and Expectation in Ancient Israel." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 10 (March 1957):24-34.
- Barrick, William D. "Leviticus 26: Its Relationship to Covenant Contexts and Concepts." Unpublished doctor of theology dissertation. Grace Theological Seminary, 1981.
- Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics*. Vol. 3: *The Doctrine of Creation*, Part 1. Edited by G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. Translated by J. W. Edwards et al. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1958-69.
- Barth, M. "Speaking of Sin: Some Interpretative Notes on Romans 1:18-3:20." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 8 (September 1955):288-96.

- Barton, George A. *The Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad*. Library of Ancient Semitic Inscriptions, vol. 1. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929.
- Baruch, J. Z. "The Relation Between Sin and Disease in the OT." *Janus* 51 (1964):295-302.
- Bauer, Walter, Arndt, William F., and Gingrich, F. Wilbur. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 2nd edition. Revised and augmented by idem and Frederick W. Danker. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Bauman, Clarence. "The Theology of 'the Two Kingdoms': A Comparison of Luther and the Anabaptists." *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 38 (January 1965):37-49 and 60.
- Beauchamp, Evode. *The Bible and the Universe: Israel and the Theology of History*. Translated by David Bol-hatchet. Montreal: Palm Publishers, 1963.
- Begrich, Joachim. "Die Paradieserzahlung: Eine literar-geschichtliche Studie." *Zeitschrift fur die Alt-testamentliche Wissenschaft* 50 (1932):93-116.
- Bentzen, Aage. *King and Messiah*. Lutterworth Studies in Church and State. London: Lutterworth Press, 1955.
- Bergmann, Ed., ed. *Codex Hammurabi*. Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici. Roma: Pontificium Institutum, 1953.
- Berkeley, George. *The Principles of Human Knowledge and Three Dialogues Between Hylas and Philonous*. Introduction by G. J. Warnock. Meridian Books. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1967.
- Berkhof, Hendrickus. *Christ the Meaning of History*. Translated by Lambertus Buuiuan. Twin Brook Series. Reprinted. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979.
- Berkouwer, G. C. *Man: The Image of God*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962.
- Berkovits, Eliezer. *Man and God: Studies in Biblical Theology*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1969.
- Bernhardt, Karl-Heinz. *Das Problem der altorientalischen Konigsideologie im Alten Testament*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, no. 8. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.

- Bethge, Eberhard. *Dietrich Bonhoeffer*. Translated by Eric Mosbacher et al. Edited by Edwin Robertson. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- Birch, L. C. "Creation and Creator." *Journal of Religion* 37 (April 1957): 85-98.
- Black, Matthew. "The Development of Judaism in the Greek and Roman Periods," pp. 693-98. In *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*. Edited by idem and H. H. Rowley. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1963.
- Bleeker, C. J. *Hathor and Thoth*. Studies in the History of Religions, vol. XXVI. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
- Bloch, Joshua. *On the Apocalyptic in Judaism*. The Jewish Quarterly Review Monograph Series, no. II. Edited by Abraham A. Neuman and Solomon Zeitlin. Philadelphia: The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1952; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 1971.
- Bloesch, Donald G. "Soteriology in Contemporary Christian Thought." *Interpretation* 35 (April 1981):132-44.
- Bokser, Ben Zion. *The Wisdom of the Talmud*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951.
- Boman, Thorlief. *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek*. Translated by J. L. Moreau. The Library of History and Doctrine. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Creation and Fall; Temptation*. Translated by John C. Fletcher and Kathleen Downham. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959.
- Borger, Riekele. *Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke*. 3 Hefte. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1963.
- Bornkamm, Heinrich. *Luther and the Old Testament*. Translated by Eric W. and Ruth C. Gritsch. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.
- Bottero, Jean, Cassin, Elena, and Vercoutter, Jean, eds. *The Near East: The Early Civilizations*. New York: Delacorte Press, 1967.
- Bowen, C. R. "Jesus and Social Revolution." *Biblical World* 42 (1913):26-29.
- Bowker, J. W. "Psalm CX." *Vetus Testamentum* 17 (1967):31-41.

- Brandon, S. G. F. *Creation Legends of the Ancient Near East*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1963.
- Bratcher, Robert G., ed. *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament*. Revised edition. London: The United Bible Societies, 1967.
- Brehier, Emile. *The History of Philosophy*. Vol. 2: *The Hellenistic and Roman Age*. Translated by Wade Baskin. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Briggs, Charles Augustus and Briggs, Emilie Grace. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*. 2 vols. The International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914.
- Brown, Francis, Driver, S. R., and Briggs, Charles. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Reprinted. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Brownlee, William H. "Psalms 1-2 as a Coronation Liturgy." *Biblica* 52 (1971):321-36.
- Bruce, F. F. "The Bible and the Environment." Unpublished paper, n. 1., 1981.
- _____. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964.
- Brueggemann, Walter. "Kingship and Chaos." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 33 (1971):317-32.
- _____. "Of the Same Flesh and Bone (Gen 2:23a)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32 (1970):532-42.
- Brunner, Emil. *Christianity and Civilization*. Part 2. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949.
- _____. *Man in Revolt: A Christian Anthropology*. Translated by Olive Wyon. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1947.
- _____. *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption. Dogmatics*, vol. 2. Translated by Olive Wyon. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1952.
- _____. *The Divine Imperative*. Translated by Olive Wyon. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1947.
- Buber, Martin. "Prophecy, Apocalyptic, and the Historical Hour." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 12 (March 1957):9-21.

- Buccellati, Giorgio. *Cities and Nations of Ancient Syria*. Studi Semitici, vol. 26. Roma: Istituto Di Studi Del Vicino Oriente, 1967.
- _____. *The Amorites of the Ur III Period*. Naples: Istituto Orientale, 1966.
- Buchanan, Briggs. "An Extraordinary Seal Impression of the Third Dynasty of Ur." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 31 (April 1972):96-101.
- Buchanan, George Wesley. *To the Hebrews*. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1972.
- Budge, E. A. Wallis. *The Book of Opening the Mouth*. 2 vols. in 1. London: n.p., 1909; reprint ed., New York: Arno Press, 1980.
- _____. *The Book of the Dead*. Books on Egypt and Chaldaea series, vol. VI. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., Ltd., 1901.
- Burney, C. F. "Christ as the APXH of Creation." *Journal of Theological Studies* 27 (1926):160-77.
- Burrows, Eric. "Some Cosmological Patterns in Babylonian Religion." In *The Labyrinth*. Edited by S. H. Hooke. London: S.P.C.K., 1935. Pp. 43-70.
- Bury, R. G., trans. *Sextus Empiricus*. 4 vols. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1934.
- Butler, William W. *A Comparison of the Ethics of Emil Brunner and Dietrich Bonhoeffer With Special Attention to the Orders of Creation and the Mandates*. Ph.D. dissertation, Emory University, 1970; Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 71-15, 591, 1971.
- Cairns, David. *The Image of God in Man*. The Fontana Library Theology and Philosophy Series. London: SCM Press, 1953; revised ed., London: Collins, 1973.
- Caldwell, Thomas A., Oswalt, John N. and Sheehan, John F., trans. *An Akkadian Grammar: Parts I and II*. A translation of Riemschneider's Lehrbuch des Akkadischen. Second edition. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1976.
- Calvin, John. *Calvin's Commentaries*. 22 vols. Translated by John King et al. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1843; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979.

- _____. *Calvin's Tracts and Treatises*. 3 vols. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1851; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1958.
- _____. "The Word Our Only Rule." In *The Mystery of Godliness and Other Selected Sermons*. New York: S. & D. A. Forbes, 1830; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1950. Pp. 67-80.
- Carrington, Richard. *Ancient Sumer*. The Dawn of History Series, no. 4. London: Chatto & Windus, 1959.
- Carroll, Robert P. "Twilight of Prophecy or Dawn of Apocalyptic." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 14 (October 1979):3-35.
- Cassidy, Richard J. *The Social and Political Stance of Jesus in Luke's Gospel.*, Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, 1976; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 77-2581, 1977.
- Cassuto, U. *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*. Part 1, 1st English edition. Translated by Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1961.
- Castellino, G. "Urnammu, three Religious Texts." *Zeitschrift fur Assyriologie*, Neue Folge 52 (August 1957):1-57.
- Catafago, Joseph. *An English and Arabic Dictionary*. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1858.
- Cazelles, H. "David's Monarchy and the Gibeonite Claim." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* (1955):165-75.
- Charles, R. H., ed. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913.
- _____. "The Rise and Development in Israel of the Belief in a Future Life." *The Expositor*, ser. 6, 7 (1903): 49-64.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament*. Studies in Biblical Theology, no. 27. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- _____. "Psalm 8 in the Context of the Christian Canon." *Interpretation* 23 (1969):20-31.
- Childs, James M., Jr. *The Imago Dei and Eschatology: The Ethical Implications of a Reconsideration of the Image of God in Man Within the Framework of an*

- Eschatological Theology*. S.T.D. dissertation, Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, 1974; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 75-18, 208, 1975.
- Clark, Gordon H. "The Image of God in Man." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 12 (1969):215-22.
- Clines, D. J. A. "Psalm Research Since 1955: 1. The Psalms and the Cult." *Tyndale Bulletin* 18 (1967):103-26.
- _____. "The Etymology of Hebrew SELEM." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 3 (1974):19-25.
- _____. "The Image of God in Man." *Tyndale Bulletin* 19 (1968) :53-103.
- _____. "Theme in Genesis 1-11." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38 (October 1976):483-507.
- Coats, G. W., ed. *Canon and Authority: Old Testament Essays*. Berne: Paul Haupt, 1973.
- _____. "Strife and Reconciliation: Themes of a Biblical Theology in the Book of Genesis." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 2 (1980):15-37.
- _____. "The God of Death." *Journal of Bible and Theology* 29 (July 1975):227-39.
- Cohen, A., ed. *The Soncino Chumash*. Soncino Books of the Bible. London: The Soncino Press, 1947.
- Collins, John J. "Patterns of Eschatology at Qumran." In *Traditions in Transformation*. Edited by Baruch Halpern and Jon D. Levenson. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1981. Pp. 351-75.
- _____. "Rabbinic Exegesis and Pauline Exegesis." Pt. 2: "A Pauline Exegesis." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 3 (April 1941):145-58.
- _____. "The Jewish Apocalypses." *Semeia* 14 (1979):21-59.
- Combrink, H. J. B. "Some Thoughts on the Old Testament Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Neotestamentica* 5 (1971):22-36.
- Cooke, Gerald. "The Sons of (the) God(s)." *Zeitschrift fur die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 76 (1964):22-47.

- Copleston, Frederick. *A History of Philosophy*. Vol. I: *Greece and Rome*. The Bella.Lmine Series, no. IX. London: Burns and Oates Limited, 1966.
- Cornford, Francis MacDonald, trans. *The Republic of Plato*. 1st American edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Costello, C. J. "The Old Testament in St. Paul's Epistles." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 4 (1942):141-45.
- Countryman, L. W. *The Rich Christian in the Church of the Early Empire: Contradictions and Accommodations*. New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1980.
- Craigien, Trevor. "צַלֵּם and דְּמוּת: An Exegetical Interaction." Unpublished paper for Anthropology and Hamartiology Seminar. Grace Theological Seminary, 1980.
- Crawford, R. G. "The Image of God." *The Expository Times* 77 (May 1966):233-36.
- Crim, Keith R. *The Royal Psalms*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1962.
- Cross, Frank M. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *Salvation in History*. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- Curtis, John R. and Hallo, William W. "Money and Merchants in Ur III." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 30 (1959): 103-39.
- Dahi, George. "The Messianic Expectation in the Psalter." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 57 (March 1938):1-12.
- Dahl, Nils, "Eschatology and History in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Future of our Religious Past*. Edited by James M. Robinson. New York: Harper and Row, 1971. Pp. 9-28.
- Dahood, Mitchell. *Psalms*. 3 vols. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1966.

- Dalman, Gustaf H. *Aramaisch-Neuhebraisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud, and Midrasch*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967.
- Danielou, Jean. *A History of Early Christian Doctrine Before the Council of Nicaea*. 3 vols. Translated and edited by John A. Baker. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964-77.
- _____. *In the Beginning: Genesis I-III*. Baltimore: Helicon Press, Inc., 1965.
- D'Arcy, M. C. et al. *Saint Augustine*. Reprinted. New York: Meridian Books, Inc., 1958.
- Davies, G. I. "Apocalyptic and Historiography." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 5 (1978):15-28.
- De Catanzaro, Carmino J. "Man in Revolt: A Study in the Primaeval History of the Book of Genesis." *Canadian Journal of Theology* 4 (1958):285-92.
- DeGuglielmo, Antonine. "The Fertility of the Land in the Messianic Prophecies." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 19 (1957):306-11.
- Delitzsch, Franz. *A System of Biblical Psychology*. Translated by Robert Ernest Wallis. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966.
- _____. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. 2 vols. Translated by Thomas L. Kingsbury. Reprint. Minneapolis: Klock & Klock Christian Publishers, 1978.
- Delling, Gerhard. "ὑποτάσσω." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 8. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich, edited and translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972. Pp. 39-46.
- De Vos, Peter et al. *Earth-Keeping: Christian Stewardship of Natural Resources*. Edited by Loren Wilkinson. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980.
- Dewey, John. *Experience and Nature*. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1958.
- Diepenhorst, I. A. "Humanism Versus Christian Faith." *Free University Quarterly* 1 (December 1951):204-13.

- _____. "Science, Its Nature, Its Possibilities, and Its Limitations." *Free University Quarterly* 4 (November 1955):11-37.
- _____. "The Problem of War." *Free University Quarterly* 2 (December 1952):69-105.
- Ditmanson, Harold H. "The Call for a Theology of Creation." *Dialog* 3 (Autumn 1964):264-73.
- Dockx, S. "Man's Eschatological Condition." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 27 (February 1974):20-34.
- Dooyeweerd, Herman. *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought*. 4 vols. Translated by David H. Freeman and William S. Young. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1969.
- _____. "Cornelius Van Til and the Transcendental Critique of Theoretical Thought." In *Jerusalem and Athens*. Edited by E. R. Geehan. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974.
- _____. *Roots of Western Culture*. Translated by John Kraay. Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1979.
- Dossin, G. *Textes Cuneiformes, Archives Royales de Mari*. Vol. 1. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1946.
- Doukhan, Jacques B. "The Literary Structure of the Genesis Creation Story." Doctor of theology dissertation, Andrews University Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1978.
- Driver, G. R. and Miles, John C., eds. *The Babylonian Laws*. 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960.
- Dubarle, Andre Marie. *The Doctrine of Original Sin*. Translated by E. M. Stewart. New York: Herder & Herder, 1964.
- Duddington, John W. "First Fruits of a Cosmic Redemption." *Christianity Today* 3 (September 29, 1959):6-8.
- Eareckson, Vincent Offley, III. *The Glory to be Revealed Hereafter: The Interpretation of Romans 8:18-25 and its Place in Pauline Theology*. Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1977; Ann

- Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 77-21, 191, 1977.
- Eaton, J. H. *Kingship and the Psalms*. Studies in Biblical Theology, 2nd series, no. 32. Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., n.d.
- Ebeling, Gerhard. *Luther: An Introduction to His Thought*. Translated by R. A. Wilson. London: William Collins Sons & Co., 1970; Fontana Library Theology and Philosophy Series, 1972.
- Edwards, G. R. *Jesus and the Politics of Violence*. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.
- Edwards, I. E. S. et al., eds. *The Cambridge Ancient History*. 3rd edition. Vols. I and II. Cambridge: The University Press, 1970-75.
- Eichhorst, William R. "Man in the Image of God: Created and Renewed." Unpublished doctor of theology dissertation. Grace Theological Seminary, 1973.
- Eichrodt, Walther. *Man in the Old Testament*. Studies in Biblical Theology. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1956.
- _____. *Theology of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Translated by J. A. Baker. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967.
- Eisenbeis, Walter. *Die Wurzel ׀ל in Alten Testament*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, no. 113. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Company, 1969.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Eliade, Mircea. *Cosmos and History: The Myth of the Eternal Return*. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.
- Elliger, K. and Rudolph, W., eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1967/77.
- Ellis, Maria DeJ. *Agriculture and the State in Ancient Mesopotamia*. Philadelphia: Occasional Publications of the Babylonian Fund, 1, 1976.

- Emmet, C. W. "The Fourth Book of Esdras and St. Paul." *The Expository Times* 27 (1916):551-56.
- Engnell, Ivan. *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967.
- Erivwo, Sam U. "Traditional Culture and Christianity: Rivals or Partners." *African Ecclesial Review* 21 (August 1979):216-22.
- Erman, Adolf. *The Ancient Egyptians*. Translated by Aylward M. Blackman. With introduction by William Kelly Simpson. Harper Torchbooks edition. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1927; reprint ed., New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
- Estep, W. R. *The Reformation: Luther, the Anabaptists*. Christian Classics series. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1979.
- Etheridge, J. W. *The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch*. New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1968.
- Evans, Geoffrey. "Ancient, Mesopotamian Assemblies." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 78 (January-March 1958):1-11.
- _____. "Ancient Mesopotamian Assemblies--An Addendum." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 78 (April-June 1958):114-15.
- Eybers, I. H. "The Root S-L in Hebrew Words." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 2 (1972):23-36.
- Fahy, Thomas. "Exegesis of Romans 8:16-25." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 23 (April 1956):178-81.
- Fairman, H. W. "The Kingship Rituals of Egypt." In *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Kingship in the Ancient Near East and in Israel*. Edited by S. H. Hooke. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960. Pp. 74-104.
- Farmer, W. R. "The Revolutionary Character of Jesus and the Christian Revolutionary Role in American Society." *Perkins School of Theology Journal* 22 (1969):22-31.
- Faulkner, Raymond O. *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*. Oxford: The Griffith Institute, 1962.

- _____. *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1969.
- Feinberg, Charles Lee. "The Image of God." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 129 (July-September 1972):235-46.
- Fichtner, Joseph. *Man, the Image of God*. New York: Alba House, 1978.
- Filson, Floyd V. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament." *McCormick Quarterly* 21 (March 1968):307-17.
- Finkelstein, J. J. "Ammisaduqa's Edict and the Babylonian 'Law Codes.'" *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 15 (1961) :91-104.
- _____. "The Laws of Ur-Nammu." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 22 (1968-69):66-82.
- Finkelstein, Louis. "The Book of Jubilees and the Rabbinic Halaka." *Harvard Theological Review* 16 (January 1923):29-61.
- Finley, F. I., gen. ed. *Ancient Culture and Society*. 11 vols. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1975. Vol. 11: The Stoics, by F. H. Sandbach.
- Fisher, Loren, ed. *Ras Shamra Parallels*. 2 vols. *Analecta Orientalia*, no. 49. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1972.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Book Reviews: Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 30 (July 1968):417-28.
- _____. *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971.
- _____. *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I*. *Biblica et Orientalia*, vol. XVIII. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. and Harrington, Daniel J. *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts*. *Biblica et Orientalia*, no. 34. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.
- Flack, E. E. "The Apostle Paul and the Old Testament." *Lutheran Quarterly* 53 (1923):330-56.
- Fohrer, Georg, ed. *Hebrew and Aramaic Dictionary of the Old Testament*. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1973.

- Foster, Benjamin R. "Wisdom and the Gods in Ancient Mesopotamia." *Orientalia* 43 (1974):344-54.
- Foster, M. "Greek and Christian Ideas of Nature." *Free University Quarterly* 6 (May 1959):122-27.
- Frame, John M. "The Quiet Crisis." *The Presbyterian Guardian* 41 (April 1972):56-57.
- _____. "The Word of God in the Cosmologic Philosophy." *The Presbyterian Guardian* 41 (October 1972):123-25.
- Frankfort, Henri. *Kingship and the Gods*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- _____. *The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient*. 2nd revised impression. London: Penguin Books, 1958.
- _____. *The Birth of Civilization in the Near East*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1951.
- _____. *The Problem of Similarity in Ancient Near Eastern Religions*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951.
- Frankfort, Henri et al. *Before Philosophy: The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man*. Reprinted from 1946. Baltimore: Penguin Books.
- Freedman, D. N. "The Biblical Idea of History." *Interpretation* 22 (1967):32-49.
- Gall, August Freiherrn von, ed. *Der hebraische Pentateuch der Samaritaner*. Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Topelmann, 1918.
- Garvis, A. E. "Shadow and Substance." *The Expository Times* 28 (October 1916-September 1917):461-64.
- Gaster, Theodore H. *Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1969.
- _____. *Thespis*. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1961.
- Gelb, Ignace J. et al., eds. *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1964ff.
- Gerber, Uwe. "Mm. VIII 18ff als exegetisches Problem der Dogmatik." *Novum Testamentum* 8 (January 1966):58-81.

- Gibbs, John. *Creation and Redemption: A Study in Pauline Theology*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 26. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.
- _____. "Pauline Cosmic Christology and the Ecological Crisis." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 (December 1971):466-79.
- Giblin, C. H. "'The Things of God' in the Question Concerning Tribute to Caesar (Lk 20:25, Mk 12:17, Mt 22:21)" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 33 (1971):510-27.
- Gibson, John C. L. *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*. 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Giles, Pauline. "The Son of Man in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *The Expository Times* 86 (August 1975):328-32.
- Gilkey, Langdon. *Maker of Heaven and Earth*. Christian Faith Series. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1959.
- Ginzberg, Louis. "Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue Toward the Apocalyptic Eschatological Writings." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 41 (1922): 115-36.
- _____. *The Legends of the Jews*. 7 vols. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1968.
- Glasson, T. Francis. *Greek Influences in Jewish Eschatology With Special Reference to the Apocalypses and Pseudepigraphas*. London: S.P.C.K., 1961.
- _____. "What is Apocalyptic?" *New Testament Studies* 27 (October 1980):98-105.
- Goetz, Albrecht. "Mesopotamian Laws and the Historian." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 69 (1949): 115-20.
- _____. "Sakkanakkus of the Ur III Empire." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 17 (1963):1-31.
- _____. "Two Ur-Dynasty Tablets Dealing With Labor." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 16 (1962):13-16.
- Goodenough, Erwin R. "Kingship in Early Israel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 48 (1929):169-205.

- _____. "The Ethical Teaching of Jesus." In *The Jewish Quarterly Review, 75th Anniversary Volume*. Edited by A. A. Neuman and S. Zeitlin. Philadelphia: Jewish Quarterly Review, 1967. Pp. 243-66.
- Gordon, Cyrus H. *Ugaritic Literature*. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1949.
- _____. *Ugaritic Textbook*. Analecta Orientalia, no. 38. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1965.
- Gowan, Donald E. *When Man Becomes God: Humanism and Hybris in the Old Testament*. Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series, no. 6. Pittsburgh: The Pickwick Press, 1975.
- Gray, John. "Kingship of God in Prophets and in Psalms." *Vetus Testamentum* 11 (January 1961):1-29.
- _____. "The Hebrew Conception of the Kingship of God: Its Origin and Development." *Vetus Testamentum* 6 (1956):268-85.
- _____. *The Krt Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra*. 2nd ed. Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui, no. 5. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964.
- Grayson, A. Kirk. "Assyria and Babylonia." *Orientalia* 49 (1980):140-94.
- Green, Clifford J. *The Sociality of Christ and Humanity: Dietrich Bonhoeffer's Early Theology, 1927-1933*. American Academy of Religion Dissertation Series, no. 6. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1972.
- Griffith, G. O. "The Apocalyptic Note in Romans." *Expository Times* 16 (1945):153-55.
- Grogan, G. W. "The Experience of Salvation in the Old and New Testament." *Vox Evangelica* 5 (1967):4-26.
- Grosheide, F. W. *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953.
- Gurney, O. R. *Some Aspects of Hittite Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- _____. *The Hittites*. 2nd ed. revised. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1962.

- Guthrie, W. K. C. *A History of Greek Philosophy*. 5 vols. London: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Hagen, Kenneth. *A Theology of Testament in the Young Luther: The Lectures on Hebrews*. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, vol. XII. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974.
- Haldane, Elizabeth S. and Ross, G. R. T., trans. *The Philosophical Works of DesCartes*. 2 vols. Unabridged republication of the last corrected edition of 1931. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1955.
- Hallo, William W. "A Sumerian Amphictyony." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 14 (1960):88-114.
- _____. *Early Mesopotamian Royal Titles*. American Oriental Series, vol. 43. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1957.
- _____. "Royal Hymns and Mesopotamian Unity." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 17 (1963):112-18.
- _____. "The Coronation of Ur-Nammu." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 20 (1966):133-41.
- _____. "The Royal Inscriptions of Ur: A Typology." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 33 (1962):1-43.
- Halper, Benzion. *Post-Biblical Hebrew Literature, An Anthology*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1921.
- Hamp, Vinzenz. "Ps 8:2b-3 [Pi הנה = 'besingen']." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 16 (1972):115-20.
- Hanson, P. D. "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Near Eastern Environment." *Revue Biblique* 78 (January 1971):31-58.
- _____. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*. Revised edition. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Harmon, Allan M. "Aspects of Paul's Use of the Psalms." *Westminster Theological Journal* 32 (November 1969):1-21.
- Harner, Ph. B. "Creation Faith in Deutero-Isaiah." *Vetus Testamentum* 17 (July 1967):298-306.
- Harper, Robert Francis. *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters*. 5 vols. Reprinted edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1902; n. 1.: N. and N. Press, 1977.
- Harrelson, Walter. *From Fertility Cult to Worship: A Re-*

- assessment of the worship of Ancient Israel*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1970.
- Harris, R. Laird. *Man--God's Eternal Creation*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1971.
- Harris, R. Laird, Archer, Gleason L., Jr., and Waltke, Bruce K., eds. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980.
- Harrison, Roland K. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1969.
- Hartog, John, II. "Sin, Redemption and the Animal Kingdom." Unpublished doctor of theology dissertation. Grace Theological Seminary, 1978.
- Hasel, Gerhard F. *New Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978.
- _____. *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*. Revised edition. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975.
- _____. "The Meaning of 'Let Us' in Gn 1:26." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 13 (Spring 1975):58-66.
- _____. "The Polemic Nature of the Genesis Cosmology." *The Evangelical Quarterly* 46 (April-June 1974):81-102.
- _____. "The Problem of History in OT Theology." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 8 (1970):23-50.
- _____. "The Significance of the Cosmology in Genesis I in Relation to Ancient Near Eastern Parallels." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 10 (1972):1-20.
- Hatch, Edwin and Redpath, Henry A. *A Concordance to the Septuagint*. 2 vols. Graz: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.
- Havice, Harriet Katherine. *The Concern for the Widow and the Fatherless in the Ancient Near East: A Case Study in Old Testament Ethics*. Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1978; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 79-15, 827, 1979.
- Hazard, Paul. *The European Mind*. Reprinted. Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1963.
- Heidel, Alexander. *The Babylonian Genesis*. 2nd edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951.

- _____. *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels*.
Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1949.
- Heinisch, Paul. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Translated
by William G. Heidt. St. Paul: The Liturgical
Press, 1950.
- Hengel, M. *Property and Riches in the Early Church*. Trans-
lated by J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press,
1974.
- _____. "Was ist der Mensch?" *Theologisches Jahrbuch* 18
(1975) :105-21.
- Heppe, Heinrich. *Reformed Dogmatics*. Reprinted. Grand
Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978.
- Herrmann, Siegfried. *A History of Israel in Old Testament
Times*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Hershberger, Guy F., ed. *The Rediscovery of the Anabaptist
Vision*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1957.
- Hershon, Paul. I. *Genesis: With a Talmudic Commentary*.
Translated by M. Walkenberg. London: Samuel Bagster
and Sons, 1883.
- Hertzberg, Hans Wilhelm. *I & II Samuel*. Translated by J. S.
Bowden from the German *Die Samuelbücher*, 2nd revised
edition. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia:
The Westminster Press, 1976.
- Hess, W. "Imago Dei (Gen. 1:26): Der Mensch als Bild Gottes."
Erbe and Auftrag 27 (1953):371-400.
- Hester, James. *Paul's Concept of Inheritance*. Scottish
Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, no. 14.
Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1968.
- Hiebert, D. Edmond. *The Epistle of James*. Chicago: Moody
Press, 1979.
- _____. "The Unifying Theme of the Epistle to James."
Bibliotheca Sacra 135 (July-September 1978):221-31.
- Hillers, Delbert R. *Lamentations*. The Anchor Bible. Garden
City, NY: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1972.
- Hoffman A., "Die Gottebenbildlichkeit des Menschen (Gen. 1,
26) in der neueren Exegese and bei Thomas von Aquin."
In *Urbild and Abglanz*. Regensburg: Habel, 1972.
Pp. 345-58.

- Holladay, William L., ed. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971.
- Honigmann, John J. *Understanding Culture*. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.
- Hooke, S. H. *The Siege Perilous*. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1956.
- Hooykaas, R. "Science, Materialism and Christianity." *Free University Quarterly* 1 (November 1950):49-62.
- Houghton, Thomas. "The Testimony of the Epistle to the Romans to the Old Testament." *Evangelical Quarterly* 7 (1935) :419-26.
- Howard, George. "Hebrews and the Old Testament Quotations." *Novum Testamentum* 10 (April-July 1968):208-216.
- Hughes, Philip E. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977.
- _____. "The Doctrine of Creation in Hebrews 11:3." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 2 (1972):64-77.
- Hunken, J. W. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Journal of Theological Studies* 16 (October 1914): 80-97.
- Huppenbauer, H. W. "God and Nature in the Psalms" *Ghana Bulletin of Theology* 3 (1969):19-32.
- Imschoot, Paul van. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Translated by Kathryn Sullivan and Fidelis Buck. New York: Desclee Co., 1965.
- Jacob, Edmond. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Translated by Arthur W. Heathcote and Philip J. Allcock. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.
- Jacobsen, Thorkild. "Early Political Developments in Mesopotamia." *Zeitschrift fur Assyriologie* 52 (August 1957):91-140.
- _____. "Primitive Democracy In Ancient Mesopotamia." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 2 (July 1943):159-72.

- _____. *The Sumerian King List*. Assyriological Studies, no. 11. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.
- Jaeger, Werner. *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers*. London: The Clarendon Press, 1947; Oxford Paperbacks, 1967.
- Jastrow, Marcus. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. 2 vols. in 1. New York: The Judaica Press, 1975.
- Jenni, Ernst and Westermann, Claus, eds. *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament*. 2 Bände. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1971.
- Jervell, J. *Imago Dei*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.
- Jobling, David. "And Have Dominion . . ." *The Interpretation of Old Testament Texts Concerning Man's Rule Over the Creation (Genesis 1:26, 28, 9:1-2, Psalm 8:7-9) from 200 B.C. to the Time of the Council of Nicea*. Th.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York, 1972; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 72-22, 911, 1972.
- Johnson, Aubrey R. *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1967.
- _____. "The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus." In *The Labyrinth*. Edited by S. H. Hooke. London: S.P.C.K., 1935. Pp. 71-111.
- _____. *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1964.
- Johnson, J. S., Jr. "Jesus: The Liberator." *Andover Newton Quarterly* 10 (1970):85-96.
- Johnsson, William G. "Issues in the Interpretation of Hebrews." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 15 (Autumn 1977) :169-87.
- Jones, G. H. "The Decree of Yahweh (Ps. II, 7)." *Vetus Testamentum* 15 (1965):336-44.
- Jong, G. de. "The Nature of Human Geography in the Light of the Ordinances of Creation." *Free University Quarterly* 5 (March 1958):97-119.

- Judson, H. P. "The Political Effects of the Teaching of Jesus." *Biblical World* 11 (1898):229-38.
- Kahlefeld, Heinrich. "Community Life in the New Testament." Translated by Robert Kress. *Man before God*. Compiled at the Canisianum. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1966.
- Kaiser, Otto. *Isaiah 13-39*. Translated by R. A. Wilson from the Ge. Lwan *Der Prophet Jesaja/Kap. 13-39*. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974.
- Kalsbeek, L. *Contours of a Christian Philosophy*. Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundations, 1975.
- Kapelrud, Arvid S. "The Mythological Features in Genesis Chapter I and the Author's Intentions." *Vetus Testamentum* 24 (April 1974):178-86.
- Katz, Steve. "Christology--A Jewish View." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 24 (May 1971):184-200.
- Kaufman, Gordon D. "Some Theological Emphases of the Early Swiss Anabaptists." *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 25 (April 1951):75-99.
- Kee, Alistair. *A Reader in Political Theology*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974.
- Kelly, J. N. D. *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*. Harper's New Testament Commentaries. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Kemp, E. W., ed. *Man: Fallen and Free*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1969.
- Kent, Homer, A., Jr. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Winona Lake, IN: BMH Books, 1972.
- Kingsbury, Edwin. "The Prophets and the Council of Yahweh." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 83 (September 1964): 279-86.
- Kistemaker, Simon. *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Amsterdam: Wed. G. van Soest N.V., 1961.
- Kline, Meredith G. *Images of the Spirit*. Baker Biblical Monograph. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980.

- Knife, D. Wayne. "Psalm 89 and the Ancient Near East." Unpublished doctor of theology dissertation. Grace Theological Seminary, 1973.
- Knight, George A. F. *A Christian Theology of the Old Testament*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959.
- _____. "Eschatology in the Old Testament." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 4 (December 1951):355-62.
- Kofahl, Robert. "Entropy Prior to the Fall." *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 10 (December 1973):154-56.
- _____. "Reply Concerning Entropy Prior to the Fall." *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 11 (December 1974):175-77.
- Kohler, Ludwig. "Die Grundstelle der Imago-Dei-Lehre." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 4 (1948):16-22.
- _____. *Hebrew Man*. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1956.
- _____. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by A. S. Todd. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957.
- Kohler, Ludwig and Baumgartner, Walter, eds. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*. 2 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1951.
- Korosec, Victor, "Les Rois Hittites et la Formation du Droit." In *Le Palais et la Royaute*. Edited by Paul Garelli. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, 19. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1974. Pp. 315-21.
- Krahn, Cornelius. "Prolegomena to an Anabaptist Theology." *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 24 (January 1954):5-11.
- Kramer, Samuel N. *From the Tablets of Sumer*. Indian Hills, CO: The Falcon's Wing Press, 1956.
- _____. "Inanna and Sulgi: A Sumerian Fertility Song." *Iraq* 31 (Spring 1969):18-23.
- _____. "Kingship in Sumer and Akkad: The Ideal King." In *Le Palais et la Royaute*. Edited by Paul Garelli. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, 19. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1974. Pp. 163-76.

- _____. *The Sumerians*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1963.
- _____. "Ur-Nammu Law Code." *Orientalia* 23 (1954):40-51.
- Kraus, F. R. *Ein Edikt des Königs Ammi-Saduqa von Babylon*. Studia et Documenta ad Jura Orientis Antiqui Pertinentia, vol. 5. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalmen*. 2 Tielbände. 4., durchgesehene and mit Literaturnachtragen ergänzte Auflage. Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972.
- _____. *Worship in Israel*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1965.
- Kroner, Richard. *Culture and Faith*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951.
- Kruse, H. "Two Hidden Comparatives: Observations on Hebrew Style." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 5 (October 1960): 333-47.
- Kselman, John S. "Psalm 72: Some Observations on Structure." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 220 (December 1975):77-81.
- Kuyper, Abraham. *Lectures on Calvinism*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1931.
- _____. *Principles of Sacred Theology*. Translated by J. Hendrik de Vries. With an introduction by Benjamin B. Warfield. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954.
- Kuyper, Lester J. "Righteousness and Salvation." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 30 (1977):233-52.
- _____. "The Biblical View of Nature." *Reformed Review* 22 (1969) :12-17.
- Ladd, George Eldon. "The Origin of Apocalyptic in Biblical Religion." *The Evangelical Quarterly* 30 (July-September 1958):140-46.
- _____. "The Place of Apocalyptic in Biblical Religion." *The Evangelical Quarterly* 10 (April-June 1958):75-85.
- Laing, David, ed. *The Works of John Knox*. 6 vols. Edinburgh: James Thin, 1895; Los Angeles: Images Enterprises, n.d.

- Lambert, F. David. "On Understanding the Philosophy of Sphere-Sovereignty As Related to Civil Government and Social Order in Dutch-Calvinistic Thought." Master of theology thesis. Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1972.
- Lambert, W. G. *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960.
- _____. "The Seed of Kingship." In *Le Palais et la Royale*. Edited by Paul Garelli. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, 19. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1974. Pp. 427-40.
- Lambert, W. G. and Millard, A. R. *Atra-hasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood*. With The Sumerian Flood Story by M. Civil. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1969.
- Lampe, G. W. H. "The New Testament Doctrine of *Ktisis*." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 17 (1964):449-62.
- Lane, Edward William. *Arabic-English Lexicon*. 8 parts, book 1. London: Williams-and Norgate, 1867; New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1956.
- Lang, August. "The Reformation and Natural Law." *Calvin and the Reformation*. Edited by William P. Armstrong. Princeton: The Princeton Theological Review Association, 1909; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980.
- Langdon, Stephen. *Sumerian Liturgical Texts*. The University Museum Publications of the Babylonian Section, Vol. X. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, the University Museum, 1917.
- Larsen, Mogens Trolle. *The Old Assyrian City-State and Its Colonies*. Mesopotamia: Copenhagen Studies in Assyriology, vol. 4. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1976.
- Laws, Sophie. *A Commentary on the Epistle of James*. Harper's New Testament Commentaries. San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers, 1980.
- Leaney, A. R. C. "Conformed to the Image of His Son (Rom 8: 29)." *New Testament Studies* 10 (July 1964):470-79.
- Lee, Francis Nigel. *The Central Significance of Culture*. Coronation Series. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1976.

- Lemche, N. P. "The 'Hebrew Slave.'" *Vetus Testamentum* 25 (April 1975):129-44.
- _____. "The Manumission of Slaves--the Fallow Year--the Sabbatical Year--the Jubel Year." *Vetus Testamentum* 26 (January 1976):38-59.
- Lenski, G. and Lenski, J. *Human Societies: An Introduction to Macrosociology*. 2nd edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- Lenski, R. C. H. *The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians*. Columbus, OH: Wartburg Press, 1937.
- _____. *The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the Epistle of James*. Columbus, OH: Lutheran Book Concern, 1938.
- Leupold, H. C. *Exposition of Genesis*. Columbus, OH: The Wartburg Press, 1942.
- Levy, Jacob. *Worterbuch uber die Talmudim and Midraschim*. 3 B'Inde. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963.
- Lewis, Edwin. "A Christian Theodicy: An Exposition of Romans 8:18-39." *Interpretation* 11 (July 1957):405-20.
- Liddell, Henry G. and Scott, Robert, compilers. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised and augmented throughout by Henry S. Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie et al., with a supplement. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Limburg, James. "What Does It Mean to Have Dominion Over the Earth?" *Dialogue* 10 (1971):221-23.
- Lindeskog, Gosta. *Studien Zum Neutestamentlichen Schopfungsgedanken*. In the series *Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift*, no. 11. Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistaka Bokhandeln, 1952.
- _____. "The Theology of Creation in the Old and New Testaments." *The Root of the Vine*. Edited by Anton Friedrichsen et al. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1953.
- Lisowsky, Gerhard. *Konkordanz zum hebraischen Alten Testament*. Stuttgart: Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958.

- Littell, Franklin H. "The Anabaptist Doctrine of the Restitution of the True Church." *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 24 (January 1950):33-52.
- Loane, Marcus L. *The Hope of Glory: An Exposition of the Eighth Chapter in the Epistle to the Romans*. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1969.
- Lohfink, N. "Macht euch die Erde untertan?" *Orientierung* 38 (1974):137-42.
- Long, Charles H. *Alpha: The Myths of Creation*. New York: G. Braziller, 1963.
- Loretz, Oswald. "Der Mensch als Ebenbild Gottes." *Anima* 19 (1964) :109-20.
 _____ . *Die Gottebenbildlichkeit des Menschen*. Munich: Kessel-Verlag, 1967.
 _____ . "Die Psalmen 8 and 67." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 8 (1976):117-21.
- Lowe, Benjamin Franklin. *The King As Mediator of the Cosmic Order*. Ph.D. dissertation, Emory University, 1967; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 68-11963, 1968.
- Lucretius. *De Rerum Natura*. Translated by W. H. D. Rouse. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1924.
- Ludwig, Theodore M. "The Traditions of the Establishing of the Earth in Deutero-Isaiah." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (September 1973):345-57.
- Lurker, Manfred. *The Gods and Symbols of Ancient Egypt*. English edition. Translated by Barbara Cummings from the German *Götter und Symbole der Alten Ägypter*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1980.
- Lyonnet, Stanislas. "The Redemption of the Universe." In *Contemporary New Testament Studies*. Edited by M. R. Ryan. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1965. Pp. 423-36.
- MacGregor, G. H. C. "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought." *New Testament Studies* 1 (September 1954):17-28.
- Mackenzie, George. "The Earnest Expectation of the Creature." *The Expository Times* 5 (October 1893-September 1894): 333-34.

- Macqueen, J. G. *The Hittites and Their Contemporaries in Asia Minor*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1975.
- MacRae, George W. "The Coptic Gnostic Apocalypse of Adam." *Heythrop Journal* 6 (1965):27-35.
- Malamat, Abraham. "Doctrines of Causality in Hittite and Biblical Historiography: A Parallel." *Vetus Testamentum* 5 (1955):1-12.
- Maly, Eugene H. "Creation in the New Testament." In *Biblical Studies in Contemporary Thought*. Edited by Miriam Ward. Burlington, VT: Trinity College Biblical Institute, 1975. Pp. 104-12.
- _____. "Man and Nature in the Old Testament." *Studia Missionalia* 20 (1970):301-14.
- Mandelkern, Solomon. *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae*. Graz: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1955.
- Marcus, David. "Civil Liberties under Israelite and Mesopotamian Kings." *The Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 10 (1978): 53-60.
- Mare, Harold W. "The Cultural Mandate and the New Testament Gospel Imperative." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 16 (Summer 1973) :139-47.
- Markus, R. A. *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1970.
- Marzal, A. "The Provincial Governor At Mari: His Title and Appointment." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 30 (July 1971):186-217.
- Mathew, K. V. "The Concept of God and Nature in the Psalms." *Indian Journal of Theology* 20 (1971):142-49.
- May, H. G. "The King in the Garden of Eden: A Study of Ezekiel 28." In *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*. Edited by B. Anderson and W. Harrelson. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.
- Mayor, Joseph B. *The Epistle of St. James*. Classic Commentary Library. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1954.

- Mayor, Stephen. "Jesus Christ and the Christian Understanding of Society." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 32 (February 1979):45-60.
- McCasland, S. V. "'The Image of God' According to St. Paul." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 69 (June 1950):85-100.
- McConville, Gordon. "A Genesis Reading-List." *Biblical Creation* 3 (February 1981):16-20.
- McFadden, Thomas M., ed. *Theology Confronts a Changing World*. The Annual Publication of the College Theology Society. West Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications, 1977.
- McKenzie, John L. "Royal Messianism." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 19 (January 1957):25-52.
- McRay, John. "Atonement and Apocalyptic in the Book of Hebrews." *Restoration Quarterly* 23 (1980):1-9.
- Meli, Angelo. "I beni temporali nelle profezie messianiche." *Biblica* 16 (1935):307-29.
- Mercer, Samuel A. B. "Divine Service in Ur." *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research* 5 (March 1921):1-17.
- Mettinger, T. N. D. "Abbild oder Urbild? 'Imago Dei' in traditions-geschichtlicher Sicht." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 86 (1974): 403-24.
- Meyer, Heinrich A. W. *Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by John C. Moore and Edwin Johnson. Revised and edited by William P. Dickson. With preface and supplementary notes to the American edition by Timothy Dwight. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1889.
- Mielziner, Moses. *Introduction to the Talmud*. 4th edition. New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1968.
- Mihaly, Eugene. *A Song to Creation: A Dialogue With a Text*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1975.
- Miller, Frank J. *Ovid: Metamorphoses*. 2 vols. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1928.

- Miller, J. Maxwell. "In the 'Image' and 'Likeness' of God." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (September 1972): 289-304.
- Miller, Patrick D., Jr. *Genesis 1-11*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, no. 8. Sheffield: Department of Biblical Studies, The University of Sheffield, 1978.
- Mitchell, John J. "Editor's Comment." *The Presbyterian Guardian* 41 (October 1972):122.
- _____. "Educational Creeds' for Christian Schools? NO!" *The Presbyterian Guardian* 41 (August-September 1972): 107.
- Moll, Carl Bernhard. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Translated by A. C. Kendrick. Lange's Commentaries. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896.
- Moloney, Francis J. "The Targum on Ps 8 and the NT." *Salesianum* 37 (1975):326-36.
- Moltmann, Jurgen. *Man*. Translated by John Sturdy. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- _____. *Theology of Hope*. Translated by James W. Leitch from the German *Theologie der Hoffnung*, 5th edition, 1965. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- Montet, Pierre. *Egypt and the Bible*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.
- Morenz, Siegfried. *Egyptian Religion*. Translated by Ann E. Keep. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1973.
- Morgenstern, Julian. "Psalms 8 and 19A." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 19 (1945-1946):491-523.
- _____. "The Cultic Setting of the Enthronement Psalms." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 35 (1964):1-42.
- Morris, Henry M. "Another Reply to Robert Kofahl." *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 10 (December 1973):157.
- Morris, Leon. *Apocalyptic*. Grand Rapids: William M. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972.
- _____. "The Religion That Stands Above Culture." *Christianity Today* 24 (6 June 1980):55-56.
- Moulton, James H. and George Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*. Reprinted. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974.

- Moulton, W. F. and Geden, A. S., eds. *A Concordance to the Greek Testament*. 5th edition. Revised by H. K. Moulton. With supplement according to the text of the United Bible Societies' 3rd edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978.
- Mouw, Richard. "Reforming Cultural Calvinism. *The Reformed Journal* 31 (3 March 1981):12-17.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. *He That Cometh*. Translated by G. W. Anderson. Nashville: Abingdon Press, n.d.
- _____. *The Old Testament As Word of God*. Translated by Reidar Bjornard. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959.
- _____. *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*. Translated by D. R. Ap-Thomas. 2 vols. in 1. New York: Abingdon Press, 1967.
- Muckenhirn, M. Charles Borromeo. *The Image of God in Creation*. Foundations of Catholic Theology Series. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Mueller, William A. *Church and State in Luther and Calvin*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1954; New York: Anchor Books, 1965.
- Murdock, William R. "History and Revelation in Jewish Apocalypticism." *Interpretation* 21 (April 1967):167-87.
- Murray, John. *Principles of Conduct*. Reprinted. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968.
- Nakagawa, Hideyasu. *Christology in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1955; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, Inc., 69-6681, 1969.
- Napier, B. Davie. "On Creation-Faith in the Old Testament." *Interpretation* 16 (January 1962):21-42.
- Nelson, Joseph Lee, Jr. *The Groaning of Creation: An Exegetical Study of Romans 8:18-27*. Th.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, 1969; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 75-15, 171, 1975.
- Neusner, Jacob. *Invitation to the Talmud*. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- _____. "Scriptural, Essenic, and Mishnaic Approaches to Civil Law and Government: Some Comparative Remarks."

- Harvard Theological Review* 73 (July-October 1980): 419-34.
- Newman, William M. *The Social Meanings of Religion*. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1974.
- _____. "News About the University: Dissertations." *Free University Quarterly* 8 (April 1962):133-34.
- Nicol, W. "Faith and Works in the Letter of James." *Neotestamentica* 9 (1975):7-24.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard. *Christ and Culture*. New York: Harper & Row, 1956.
- Nielsen, Eduard. "Creation and the Fall of Man." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 43 (1972):1-22.
- North, C. R. "The Old Testament Estimate of the Monarchy." *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature* 47 (October 1931):1-19.
- _____. "The Religious Aspects of Hebrew Kingship." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 50 (1932):8-38.
- North, Gary. "Basic Implications of the Six Day Creation." *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, 1:1 (Summer, 1974):1-27.
- North, Robert. "Bibliography of Works in Theology and History." *History and Theory*, 12 (1973):55-140.
- Noth, Martin. "The Understanding of History in Old Testament Apocalyptic." In *Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966. Pp. 194-214.
- Oberholzer, J. P. "What Is Man . . .?" *De Fructo Oris Sui: Essays in Honour of Adrianus Van Selms*. Edited by I. H. Eybers et al. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.
- O'Connor, M. *Hebrew Verse Structure*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1980.
- Oehler, Gustav F. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Translated by George E. Day. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1883.
- Oke, C. Clare. "A Suggestion with Regard to Romans 8:23." *Interpretation* 11 (October 1957):455-60.
- Olbricht, Thomas H. "The Theology of Genesis." *Restoration Quarterly* 23 (1980):201-17.

- Olthuis, James H. and Zylstra, Bernard. "Confessing Christ in Education." *The Presbyterian Guardian* 41 (August-September 1972):104-6.
- _____. "Confessing Christ in Education." *The Presbyterian Guardian* 41 (October 1972):120-22.
- O'Neill, J. C. "Hebrews II. 9." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 17 (August 1966):79-82.
- Onvlee, L. "We Humans." *Free University Quarterly* 2 (November 1958):295-315.
- Oosterbaan, J. A. "The Theology of Menno Simons." *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 35 (July 1961):187-96 and 237.
- Oppenheim, A. Leo. *Ancient Mesopotamia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- _____. "Assyriological Gleanings IV." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 107 (October 1947):7-11.
- _____. "Idiomatic Accadian." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 61 (1941):251-71.
- _____. *Letters From Mesopotamia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- Orens, John Richard. "Politics and the Kingdom: The Legacy of the Anglican Left." *Anglican Theological Review* 63 (January 1981):21-41.
- Orr, James. *Christian View of God and the World*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897.
- Pallis, Svend Aage. *The Antiquity of Iraq*. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, Ltd., 1956.
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. *Jesus--God and Man*. Translated by Lewis Wilkins and Duane Priebe. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968.
- _____, ed. *Revelation As History*. London: Macmillan Co., 1968.
- _____. *What Is Man?* Translated by Duane A. Priebe. Paperback edition. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.
- Parker, Gary. "Evangelicals Blossom Brightly Amid El Salvador's Wasteland of Violence." *Christianity Today* 25 (8 May 1981):34-35.

- Parr, P. A. "A Letter of Ur-Lisi, Governor of Umma." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 24 (1972):135-36.
- Parrot, Andre. *Sumer*. Translated by Stuart Gilbert and James Emmons. In *The Arts of Mankind*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1960.
- Patte, Daniel. *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine*. Society of Biblical Literature Series. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975.
- Paul, Shalom M. "A Traditional Blessing for the Long Life of the King." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 31 (October 1972):351-55.
- Payne, J. Barton. *The Theology of the Older Testament*. Grand Rapids: The Zondervan Publishing Co., 1962.
- Pedersen, Johs. *Israel: Its Life and Culture*. 2 vols. Reprinted. London: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Pendergast, R. J. "The Shattered Mirror: Sin in the Cosmos." *Science Espirt* 22 (1970):203-39.
- Perdue, Leo G. "The Riddles of Psalm 49." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93 (December 1974):533-42.
- Perry, John W. *Lord of the Four Quarters*. New York: George Braziller, 1966.
- Persson, Erik. *Sacra Doctrina*. Translated by Ross Mackenzie. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970.
- Petersen, David L. "The Yahwist on the Flood." *Vetus Testamentum* 26 (October 1976):438-46.
- Peterson, G. D. "'The Imago Dei: An Historical and Critical Examination.'" Unpublished doctor of philosophy dissertation. University of Edinburgh, 1974.
- Philip, George. "'Creation Waiting for Redemption: An Expository Study of Romans 8:19-22.'" *The Expository Times* 5 (October 1893-September 1894):315-19.
- Piper, John. "The Image of God: An Approach from Biblical and Systematic Theology." *Studia Biblica et Theologica* 1 (March 1971):15-32.
- Ploger, Otto. *Theocracy and Eschatology*. Translated by S. Rudman. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1968.

- Poettcker, Henry. "Menno Simons' Encounter with the Bible." *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 40 (April 1966):112-26.
- Pope, Marvin H. *Job*. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965.
- Porter, Frank C. "Judaism in New Testament Times." *Journal of Religion* 8 (January 1938):41-44.
- Porter, J. R. "The Legal Aspects of the Concept of 'Corporate Personality' in the OT." *Vetus Testamentum* 15 (1965):361-80.
- Postgate, N. J. "Royal Exercise of Justice Under the Assyrian Empire." In *Le Palais et la Royaute*. Edited by Paul Garelli. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, 19. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1974. Pp. 417-26.
- Preez, J. du. "Bible Study on Ps. 8: A Prayer of Praise on the Glory and Greatness of God." *Nederduitse Gereformeerde Teologiese Tydskrif* 14 (1973):206-13.
- Prenter, Reginald. *Creation and Redemption*. Translated by Theodor I. Jensen. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- Pritchard, James B., ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 3rd edition with supplement. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- _____. ed. *The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament*. 2nd edition with supplement. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Procksch, Otto. *Theologie des Alten Testament*. Gutersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950.
- Quasten, Johannes, Burghardt, Walter J., and Lawler, Thomas C., eds. *Ancient Christian Writers*. 40 vols. New York: Newman Press, 1946-75.
- Quinney, Richard. "The Theology of Culture: Marx, Tillich, and the Prophetic Tradition in the Reconstruction of Social and Moral Order." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 34 (Summer 1979):203-14.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Genesis*. The Old Testament Library. Revised edition based on the 9th German edition. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1972.

- _____. *Old Testament Theology*. 2 Vols. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962-65.
- _____. *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. Translated by E. W. Trueman Dicken. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.
- Rahlfs, Alfred. *Septuaginta*. 2 vols. Editio nona. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1935.
- Raines, John C. *The Cosmic Kingdom in the Rise of the Christian Interpretation of the State: A Study of the Interaction of Religious and Political Mythology from Hebraic Prophetism through John Calvin*. Th.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York, 1967; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 67-12, 176, 1981.
- Rainey, Anson F. *The Social Stratification of Ugarit*. Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1962; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 63-5836, 1963.
- Rapaport, Samuel. *A Treasury of the Midrash*. New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1968.
- Redding, David A. *What Is the Man?* Waco, TX: Word Books, 1970.
- Redlich, E. Basil. *The Early Traditions of Genesis*. The Colet Library of Modern Christian Thought and Learning. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1950.
- Reicke, Bo. *The Epistles of James, Peter, Jude*. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1964.
- Reid, Richard. *The Use of the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Th.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York, 1964; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 64-10, 527, 1964.
- Renckens, Henricus. *Israel's Concept of the Beginning*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964.

- Reventlow, Henning Graf. "Der Psalm 8." *Poetica* 1 (1967): 304-32.
- Rice, G. "Cosmological Ideas and Religious Truth in Gen. 1." *Journal of Religious Thought* 23 (1966):15-30.
- Richardson, William J. *Social Action vs. Evangelism: An Essay on the Contemporary Crisis*. South Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1977.
- Ricketts, M. L. "Christians and the State: The New Testament View." *Religion in Life* 33 (1963):74-79.
- Ridderbos, Heiman. *The Coming of the Kingdom*. Translated by H. De Jongste. Edited by Raymond O. Zorn. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1962.
- Ringgren, Helmer. "Psalm 8 och kristologin." *Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok* 36 (1972) :16-20.
- _____. *The Messiah in the Old Testament*. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- _____. *Word and Wisdom: Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East*. Lund: Hakan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1947.
- Rist, M. "Caesar or God (Mark 12, 13-17)? A Study in Form-Geschichte." *Journal of Religion* 16 (1936):317-32.
- Robinson, H. Wheeler. *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946; Oxford Paperbacks, 1963.
- _____. *The Christian Doctrine of Man*. 3rd edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1926.
- Robinson, James M. "The Biblical View of the World." *Encounter* 20 (1959) :470-83.
- _____. director. *The Nag Hammadi Library*. Translated by members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1977.
- Robinson, Theodore H. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1933.

- Rodd, Cyril S. "On Applying a Sociological Theory to Biblical Studies." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 19 (February 1981):95-106.
- Roehrs, Walter R. "The Creation Account of Genesis: Guidelines for an Interpretation." *Concordia Theological Monthly* 36 (May 1965):301-21.
- Rollins, Wayne. "The New Testament and Apocalyptic." *New Testament Studies* 17 (1970-71):454-76.
- Rosenbaum, M. and Silbermann, A. M., trans. *Pentateuch with Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Rashi's Commentary: Genesis*. New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, n.d.
- Ross, Alexander. *The Epistles of James and John. The New International Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954.
- Rowe, Margaret. "Genesis and the Natural Order." *Cross and Crown* 23 (:1971):272-82.
- Rowley, H. H., ed. *The Old Testament and Modern Study*. Reprinted. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961.
- _____. *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*. Revised edition. London: Lutterworth Press, 1963.
- Rozenberg, Martin S. *The Stem spt: An Investigation of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Sources*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1963; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 63-7081, 1980.
- Rupp, E. Gordon. "Thomas Mantzer, Hans Huth and the 'Gospel of All Creatures.'" *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 43 (March 1961):492-519.
- Russell, D. S. *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.
- Russell, S. H. "Calvin and the Messianic Interpretation of the Psalms." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 21 (1968): 37-47.
- Rust, Eric C. *Nature and Man in Biblical Thought*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.
- _____. *Science and Faith*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

- Ryder, W. H. "Jesus' Attitude Toward Church and State." *Biblical World* 33 (1909):296-304.
- Saggs, H. W. F. *Everyday Life in Babylonia and Assyria*. Reprinted. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1967.
- _____. *The Greatness That Was Babylon*. New York: The New American Library, 1962.
- Santmire, H. P. *Brother Earth: Nature, God and Ecology in Time of Crisis*. New York: Thomas Nelson, Inc., 1970.
- Sasson, J. M. "Some Comments on Archive Keeping at Mari." *Iraq* 34 (Spring 1972):55-67.
- Sauer, Erich. *The King of the Earth: The Nobility of Man According to the Bible and Science*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962.
- Sawyer, J. F. A. "The Meaning of **בצלם אלהים** ('in the image of God') in Genesis I-XI." *Journal of Theological Studies* 25 (October 1974):418-26.
- Scheffczyk, Leo, ed. *Der Mensch als Bild Gottes*. Wege der Forschung, Band 124. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969.
- Schilder, Klaas. *Christ and Culture*. Translated by G. Van Rangen and W. Helder. Winnipeg: Premier Press, 1977.
- Schmidt, K. L. "Homo Imago Dei im Alten and Neuen Testament." *Eranos Jahrbuch* 15 (1947):149-95.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. "Man Before God: Toward a Biblical View of Man." In *Man Before God: Toward a Theology of Man, Readings in Theology*. Compiled at the Canisianum. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1966.
- Schoene, J. "The Gospel and Political Structures." *Concordia Theological Monthly* 40 (1969):501-11.
- Schopp, Ludwig, ed. dir. *The Fathers of the Church*. 68 vols. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University Press of America, 1947-79.
- Schunzel-Straumann, Helen. "Macht euch die Erde untertan?" *Katechetische Blätter* 101 (1976):319-32.
- Schwantes, Heinz. *Schöpfung der Endzeit*. Aufsätze and Vorträge zur Theologie and Religionswissenschaft. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1963.

- Scroggs, Robin. *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, Press, 1966.
- Scullion, John J. "Sedeq-Sedaqah in Isaiah cc. 40-66." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 3 (1971):335-48.
- Seux, M. J. *Epithets Royales Akkadiennes et Sumeriennes*. Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1967.
- Sider, Ronald J. *Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1977.
- _____. ed. *The Chicago Declaration*. Carol Stream, IL: Creation House, 1974.
- Simpson, D. P. *Cassell's New Latin Dictionary*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1968.
- Sjaberg, Ake W. "Miscellaneous Sumerian Hymns." *Zeitschrift fur Assyriologie* 63 (Dezember 1973):1-55.
- Skillen, James. "God's Ordinances: Calvin in Revival." *Pro Rege* 8 (June 1980):24-33.
- Skilto J. H., ed. *The Law and the Prophets: Studies Prepared in Honor of O. T. Allis*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974.
- Slotki, Judah Jacob. "Psalm XLIX 13, 21 (AV 12, 20)." *Vetus Testamentum* 28 (July 1978):361-62.
- Smith, A. Wilder. *Man's Origin, Man's Destiny*. Wheaton, IL: Harold Show Publishers, 1968.
- Smith, Donald Eugene. *Religion, Politics, and Social Change in the Third World*. New York: The Free Press, 1971.
- Smith, J. Payne, ed. *A Compendious Syrian Dictionary*. Reprint. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1967.
- Smith L. Jerome. "The Influence of Certain Intertestamental Literature Upon Paul's Concept of Cosmic Soteriology: A Key to Interpreting Romans 8:19-23." Doctor of theology dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1975.
- Smith, Morton. "The Image of God: Notes on the Hellenization of Judaism." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 40 (1958):473-512.
- Smith, Sidney. "The Practice of Kingship in Early Semitic Kingdoms." In *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Kingship in the Ancient*

- Near East and in Israel*. Edited by S. H. Hooke. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960. Pp. 22-73.
- Soden, Wolfram von. *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1971.
- _____. "Die Igigu-götter in altbabylonischer Zeit." *Iraq* 28 (Autumn 1966):140-45.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. *Old Testament and Oriental Studies*. *Biblica et Orientalia*, 29. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1975..
- _____. "Textkritische Untersuchung von Ps. VIII vv. 2-3 and 6." *Vetus Testamentum* 21 (1971):565-71.
- _____. "Zum zweiten Psalm." *Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten and Neuen Testaments* 59 (1970):191-207.
- Soloveitchik, Joseph B. "Confrontation." *Studies in Judaica in Honor of Dr. Samuel Belkin*. Edited by Leon D. Stitskin. New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1974.
- _____. "The Lonely Man of Faith." *Studies in Judaica in Honor of Dr. Samuel Belkin*. Edited by Leon D. Stitskin. New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1974.
- Speiser, E. A. *Genesis*. The Anchor Bible. Edited by William F. Albright and David N. Freedman. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1964.
- _____. "The Biblical Idea of History in its Common Near Eastern Setting." *Israel Exploration Journal* 7 (1957): 201-16.
- Sperber, Alexander, ed. *The Bible in Aramaic*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959. Vol. 1: The Pentateuch according to Tarqum Onkelos, by idem.
- Spicq, C. *L'Épître aux Hébreux*. 2 vols. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, Editeurs, 1952-53.
- Spier, J. M. *An Introduction to Christian Philosophy*. Nutley, NJ: The Craig Press, 1966.
- Stacey, W. David. *The Pauline View of Man*. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1956.
- Stagg, Frank. "The Abused Aorist." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (June 1972):222-31.

- Stauffer, E. *Christ and the Caesars*. Translated by K. and R. G. Smith. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1955.
- Stayer, James M. *Anabaptists and the Sword*. Lawrence, KS: Coronado Press, 1972.
- Stewart, J. S. "On a Neglected Emphasis in New Testament Theology." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 4 (September 1951):292-301.
- Stewart, Roy A. "Creation and Matter in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *New Testament Studies* 12 (1965):284-93.
- Stigers, H. G. *A Commentary on Genesis*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976.
- Stoebe, Hans Joachim. "Sundenbewusstsein und Glaubensuniversalismus: Gedanken zu Genesis Kapitel 3." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 36 (Juli/August 1980):197-207.
- Strack, Hermann L. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1931.
- Stuhlmüller, Carroll. "'First and Last,' and 'Yahweh-Creator' in Deutero-Isaiah." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29 (July 1967):189-205 (495-511).
- _____. "The Theology of Creation in Second Isaias." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 21 (October 1959):429-67.
- _____. "Yahweh-King and Deutero-Isaiah." *Biblical Research* 15 (1970):32-45.
- Sudbrack, J. "Der Hymnus auf die Hoffnung. Eine Einführung in das Verständnis von Rom 8, 19-39." *Geist and Leben* 41 (1968):224-28.
- Surlis, P. "Transforming the World (in NT Ethics)." *Furrow* 21 (1970):227-41.
- Swasso, H. "The Garden of Happiness and the Cursed Earth." *Orientali* 2 (1970):89-108.
- Swetman, James. "On Romans 8, 23 and the 'Expectation of Sonship.'" *Biblica* 48 (1967):102-8.
- _____. "Some Observations on the Background of ק' זצ in Jeremias 23, 5a." *Biblica* 46 (1965):29-40.
- Tanner, Mary. "Psalm 8:1-2." *Theology* 69 (1966):492-96.
- Tasker, R. V. G. *The General Epistle of James*. The Tyndale

- New Testament Commentaries. London: The Tyndale Press, 1956.
- Taylor, Philip F. "Man: His Image and Dominion." Unpublished doctor of theology dissertation. Grace Theological Seminary, 1974.
- Thatcher, Oliver J. and McNeal, Edgar M. *A Source Book for Medieval History*. New York: n.p., 1905; reprinted ed., New York: AMS Press, 1971.
- The Mishnah*. Translated and introduced by H. Danby. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Thomas, Kenneth J.. "The Old Testament Citations in Hebrews." *New Testament Studies* 11 (July 1965):303-25.
- Thompson, James W. "The Structure and Purpose of the Catena in Heb 1:5-13." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38 (July 1976):352-63.
- Thompson, Laura. *The Secret of Culture*. Consulting editor Anthony F.. C. Wallace, New York: Random House, 1969.
- Thrall, Margaret E. *Greek Particles in the New Testament*. New Testament Tools and Studies, vol. 3. Edited by Bruce M. Metzger. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1962.
- Tillich, Paul. *Systematic Theology*. 3 vols. in 1. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- _____. *Theology of Culture*. Edited by Robert C. Kimball. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Torrance, T. F. *Calvin's Doctrine of Man*. New edition. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957.
- Toy, Crawford H. *Quotations in the New Testament*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884.
- Travis, Stephen H. "The Value of Apocalyptic." *Tyndale Bulletin* 30 (1979):53-76.
- Treves, Marco. "Two Acrostic Psalms." *Vetus Testamentum* 15 (1965):81-90.
- Tsevat, Matitiahu., "God and the Gods In Assembly: An Interpretation of Ps. 82." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 40 (1969):123-37.

- Uhl, David L. "A Comparative Study of the Concepts of Creation in Isaiah 40-55 and Genesis 1-2." Unpublished doctor of theology dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1966.
- Van Buren, E. Douglas. "Homage To a Deified King." *Zeitschrift fur Assyriologie* 50 (November 1952) :92-120.
- _____. *Symbols of the Gods in Mesopotamian Art*. Analecta Orientalia., no. 23. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1945.
- _____. *The Cylinder Seals of the Pontifical Biblical Institute*. Analecta Orientalia, no. 21. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1940.
- _____. "The Sun-God Rising." *Revue d'Assyriologie* 49 (1955) :1-14.
- Van der Zijpp, N. "The Conception of our Fathers Regarding the Church." *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 27 (April 1953):91-99.
- Van Dyk, John W. "Why I Support the A.A.C.S." *The Presbyterian Guardian* 41 (August-September 1972):102-3.
- Van Til, Cornelius. *The Defense of the Faith*. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1955.
- Van Til, Henry R. *The Calvinistic Concept of Culture*. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1972.
- Verdam, P. J. "Mosaic Law in Practice and Study Throughout the Ages." *Free University Quarterly* 6 (February 1959):31-81.
- Via, D. "Structuralist Approach to Paul's Old Testament Hermeneutic." *Interpretation* 28 (April 1970): 201-20.
- Voget, Fred W. "History of Cultural Anthropology." In *Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology*. Edited by John J. Honigmann. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1973. Pp. 1-88.
- Vos, Gerhardus. *Biblical Theology*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948.

- Vries, G. J. de. "Christianity and Classical Culture." *Free University Quarterly* 2 (October 1953):251-60.
- Vriezen, Th. C. *An Outline of Old Testament Theology*. Translated by S. Neuijen. Newton, MA: Charles T. Branford Co., 1958.
- Wainwright, Geoffrey. *Doxology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Walter, J. A. *Sacred Cows*. Zondervan edition. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1980.
- Walton, Brian, ed. *Biblia Sacra Polygiotta*. 6 vols. Reprint of 1657 edition. Graz: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1963.
- Waxman, Meyer. *A History of Jewish Literature*. 5 vols. New York: Thomas Yasehoff, 1960.
- Way, Arthur S. *Euripedes*. 4 vols. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1919.
- Weaver, J. Denny. "Discipleship Redefined: Four Sixteenth Century Anabaptists." *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 54 (October 1980) :255-79.
- Wegner, Walter. "Creation and Salvation." *Concordia Theological Monthly* 37 (September 1966):520-42.
- Wenham, Gordon J. "The Coherence of the Flood Narrative." *Vetus Testamentum* 28. (July 1978):336-48.
- Wensinck, A. J. "The Semitic New Year and the Origin of Eschatology." *Acta Orientalis* 1 (1922):158-99.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. 2nd edition. London: Macmillan and Co., 1892.
- Westermann, Claus. *Creation*. Translated by John J. Scullion. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- _____. ed. *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics*. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1963.
- _____. *Genesis 1-11*. Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament, Band 1/1. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974.
- _____. "God and His Creation." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 18 (March 1963):197-209.
- _____. *Isaiah 40-66*. Translated by David M. G. Stalker

- from the German *Das Buch Jesaia 40-66*. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969.
- Whatham, A. E. "Anthropomorphisms of Genesis Chapter I." *Biblical World* 37 (1911):120-27.
- Whitaker, Richard. *A Concordance of Ugaritic Literature*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Whitcomb, John C. and Morris, Henry M. *The Genesis Flood*. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1962.
- White, Lynn, Jr. "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis." *Science* 155 (10 March 1967):1203-7.
- Widengren, Geo. *The King and the Tree of Life in Ancient Near Eastern Religion*. Uppsala Universitets Asskript, vol. 4. Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1951.
- Wieser, Thomas. "The Biblical View of the World." *Encounter* 20 (1959) :484-93.
- Wifall, Walter. "Israel's Prophets: Viziers of the King." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 10 (October 1980):169-75.
- Wildberger, Hans. "Das Abbild Gottes." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 21 (Juli-August 1965):245-59.
- _____. "Das Abbild Gottes." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 21 (November-:Dezember, 1965):481-501.
- Wilder, A. *Otherworldliness and the New Testament*. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.
- Wildung, Dietrich. *Egyptian Saints: Deification in Pharaonic Egypt*. Hagop Kevorkian Series on Near Eastern Art and Civilization. New York: New York University Press, 1977.
- Wilken, Robert L. *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.
- Willis, John T. "Some Recent Studies on Genesis and the Literary-Historical Approach." *Restoration Quarterly* 23 (1980):193-200.
- Wilson, Geoffrey B. *Romans: A Digest of Reformed Comment*. London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1969.

- Wilson, J. V. K. "A Return to the Problems of Behemoth and Leviathan." *Vetus Testamentum* 25 (January 1975):1-14.
- Winston, David, ed. and trans. *Philo of Alexandria*. The Classics of Western Spirituality. New York: Paulist Press, 1981.
- Wiseman, J. *New Discoveries in Babylonia About Genesis*. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott Ltd., n.d.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. *Anthropology of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- Wolff, Richard. *General Epistles of James and Jude*. Contemporary Commentaries. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 1969.
- Woolsey, G. Arthur. "Perspective." *Baptist Bulletin* 46 (February 1981):4 and 15.
- Worgul, George S. "Anthropological Consciousness and Biblical Theology." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 9 (January 1979):3-12.
- Wright, G. Ernest. *God Who Acts: Biblical Theology As Recital*. Studies in Biblical Theology, no. 8. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- Wuellner, Wilhelm, ed. *The Center for Hermeneutical Studies*. Berkeley: The Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, 1974. Colloquy X: *Greek and Christian Concepts of Justice*, by Albrecht Dihle.
- Wurthwein, Ernst. *The Text of the Old Testament*. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1979.
- Yegerlehner, David A. "*Be Fruitful and Multiply and Fill the Earth . . .*": A History of the Interpretation of *Genesis 1:28a and Related Texts in Selected Periods*. Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University Graduate School, 1974; Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 75-12, 270, 1981.
- Yoder, J. H. *The Christian Witness to the State*. Newton, KS: Faith and Life Press, 1964.
- _____. ed. and trans. *The Legacy of Michael Sattler*. Classics of the Radical Reformation, no. 1. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1973.

- _____. *The Politics of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972.
- Young, Edward J. *Genesis 3: A Devotional and Expository Study*. London: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1966.
- _____. *Studies in Genesis One*. International Library of Philosophy and Theology: Biblical and Theological Studies. Edited by J. Marcellus Kik., Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1973.
- _____. *The Book of Isaiah*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969.
- Young, N. *Creator, Creation, and Faith*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1976.
- Zijlstra, J. "Christian Economic Policy." *Free University Quarterly* 1 (April 1951):112-32.
- Zuidema, S. U. "Man in Philosophy." *Free University Quarterly* 5 (March 1958):77-96.
- Zylstra, Bernard. "The Word of God, the Bible, and the AACCS." *The Presbyterian Guardian* 42 (March 1973):40-43.