

THE NEW TESTAMENT VIEW OF THE OLD TESTAMENT WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO GENESIS 1-3

By Dr JTE Renner
(Queensland Pastors' Conference, Sept 1967)

This topic is an exceedingly important and intriguing one, but at the same time too wide to treat fully in a paper of this kind. The question of the relationship between the Old and New Testaments has often been discussed, sometimes more directly, at other times more peripherally in the long history of Christian theology. For the synagogue it was of course no problem – the OT alone was for it the Word of God, authoritative and binding – although it is not quite as simple as that, for it is a well-known fact that as far as the public use in the synagogue went certain books were questioned as late as about 90 AD and Luther makes reference in his commentary on Genesis that no one among the Hebrews under the age of 30 should read Genesis 1 and explain it. For the Jew there is no NT and so any discussion and debates amongst the rabbis on the canon were confined to the normative nature of the OT and its use.

It is a well-attested fact which defies any contradiction that for the early church and the apostles the sacred Scripture was the OT. This has unfortunately not been as sharply emphasised in all theological circles as it might have been. The Scriptures of the early church were the writings of the prophets as “they were moved by the Holy Ghost”; they had binding validity and determinative force for all doctrine and practice in the Church. It is a good thing that some more recent biblical scholarship has again begun to recognise this and is leaving its rather too rabid interest in Hellenistic influences. In this context the words of E Heskyns quoted by E Ellis in his book on “Paul’s Use of the OT” (p1) may not be amiss: “There are grounds for supposing no further progress in the understanding of primitive Christianity to be possible unless the ark of the NT exegesis be recovered from its wanderings in the land of the Philistines and be led back not merely to Jerusalem, for that might mean to contemporary Judaism, but to its home in the midst of the classical OT Scriptures – to the Law and the Prophets”. In other words there is a growing recognition at least in some theological circles today of the great church father’s words: “The NT lies hidden in the Old and the Old is made plain in the New.” (Augustine).

If a little more concentration be focussed on what the OT looked like in early Christianity then a number of problems easily and quickly arise. We knew that there were at the time of the early Church strictly speaking two Scriptures, the one in Hebrew which was finally determined at the Synod of Jamnia (approx 100 AD) and of course the LXX, the Alexandrian Canon, the origin of which is fascinatingly told by the Letter of Aristeas and Philo in his “Life of Moses”. It is not the purpose of this paper to delve into the septuagintal problems – they are prodigious and highly complicated, but it is worth noting that even in Christendom today there are churches whose canonical OT is not the same as ours. It is necessary to know why we hold to the OT as we have it, and this in spite of the fact that for the majority of Christians in the early Church the LXX was the unalterable, inspired and authoritative text. It was this text that Philo (20 BC – 45 AD) praises in his *de Vita Mos* 11.60 as having been written by men, who “became as possessed, and, under inspiration wrote, not each several scribe something different, but the same word for word as though dictated to each by an invisible prompter.” When the Jews noted that the Christians, too, were employing the LXX as their graphé, it fell out of favour and the translation of the Hebrew Law into Greek was held to be a disastrous event. It was then, too, that Greek-speaking Jews, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion retranslated the Hebrew OT slavishly rendering it quite literally into Greek so that in the one case at least the Genesis 1 account reads quite differently in Greek than in the Hebrew.

Furthermore, it is a well-known fact that for the early Church there was no NT as we know it today. Certainly the congregations of St Paul had his letters, but there was no canon as yet. For a long time what determined the normative books of the NT was in a state of growth. The tradition concerning Jesus Christ, His life, His death and resurrection was transmitted orally in the main. Without doubt the factors contributing to this were the belief that Christ’s return could be expected in the lifetime of the people [p. 2] living, and that the risen and exalted Lord was ever present in his ecclesia through his Word and Sacraments. At the beginning of the Church the evangelists were proclaimers of the kerygma of Christ and through the euangelion Christ was present with His people. “Where two or three are gathered together in my name there I am in the midst of them”, He had said. He had given no specific command to write the euangelion – “Go and preach” was His mandate and He Himself had not written a new Scripture for them. Before He had left them He had promised them the Paraclete who would lead them into all truth and bring to their remembrance the things that he had taught them. (John 14:26) The

exalted Kyrios Himself was thus ever speaking to and in His ecclesia through his witnesses, filled with His pneuma. Urged on by the Pentecostal Spirit, His apostles proclaimed the Gospel to both Jews and Gentiles alike. The Gospel did not belong to the museum of the past – it was not to be archivistically stored away, but proclaimed and carried to the ends of the earth. We all know that Luther had a very fine sense for this oral side of the Gospel. “Gospel (evangelium)” writes Luther in his Preface to the NT “is a Greek word and means in Greek a good message, good tidings, good news, a good report, which one sings and tells with gladness.” And what was the content of such good news and why must it be proclaimed? There is hardly any need to answer, for it is abundantly plain from the NT that the euangelion is the good news that Jesus Christ died for our sins and rose again for our justification. That was the great rediscovery of the Reformation that the Gospel is the grace of God, who in Christ redeemed us from all sin, from death and from the power of the devil and has taken us up into koinonia with Himself forever. That was the kerygmatic content of the apostolic age and the ecclesia. This is the only Gospel (significant that there is no plural for euangelion in the NT just as the Greek word for “truth” is nowhere pluralised in the Canon) any other gospel is no gospel and he who proclaims the hetero-euangelion is to be anathematised as Galatians 1:8 strongly enunciates.

If then the Gospel, the verbum Dei for the aphasis ton hamartion, was proclaimed by the Church without a NT, why then the writings called the NT? Why it may be asked did it become necessary to write and collect Scriptures of the ecclesia which were finally canonised? Why did not the early Church stay with OT as her Scriptures? At this point we have possibly reached a very crucial matter, which can be but briefly ventilated. If the history of the Canon of the NT is carefully studied it can be shown that with the growth of much doubtful literature, phantastic and apocalyptic, emanating from Jewish and Hellenistic sources, it became necessary to delineate clearly what writings should be authoritative and which had to be pushed out of use in the worship of the congregation. It is significant that Luke’s prologue (chapter 1:1-4) emphasises to Theophilus that the material of his work has been thoroughly and carefully collected “inasmuch as many have undertaken to compile a narrative of the things which have been accomplished among us”. We know too that the struggle with the heresies, Gnosticism and Marcionism hastened the process of the canonisation of the Scriptures, which meant the exclusion of certain books not valid and authoritative and the inclusion of these which were held to be apostolic and inspired. Whilst Marcion cannot be regarded historically as the primary cause for the formation of the NT Canon, yet his own creation of a Canon, which as is known excluded the whole of the OT because the God of Israel was held by him to have been of a lower order than the NT Christ, kept Luke of the Gospels and 10 purged letters of St Paul, was undoubtedly an important contributing factor towards the fixation of the Church’s normative NT books. Even then it was a long process before that came about. We know that Eusebius (about 303) distinguished three kinds of books: 1. homologoumena 2. antilegomena and 3. those which were heretical. To the second class belonged James, Jude, 2 Peter and 2 and 3 John, whilst the Apocalypse of St John seems to have been difficult to classify. Even after the 39th Easter Epistle of the great Athanasius had been written (367 AD) in which the books of both OT and NT are listed which are canonical in the Church, the Apocalypse of St John was challenged again and again in the Church. At the time of the Reformation, Luther had no compunctions about stating that he doubted whether the Holy Spirit had inspired this book (cf Luther’s introduction to the Apocalypse in his Prefaces), without however pushing it out of the Canon.

It may be asked why it is necessary to speak about the Canon development at all. Does it not suffice that we have both OT and NT today and hold that they are God’s Word for us? What is the purpose of unrolling something that [p. 3] looks a little like a shift from the great formation sola scriptura? The reason that can best be supplied is this, namely, that when we speak about the Scriptures, it is necessary to realise that the Church of the Reformation knows of the canon within the canon. It is deeply conscious of the fact [that] there are books on the fringe of the Canon, antilegomena, deutero-canonical material which is not centrally Christic, and therefore has not been employed for the dogma of the Church and only insofar as they are in harmony with clear passages of the homologoumena can they be used to fortify the teachings of the Church. Furthermore, when the relationship of the Old to the New Testament is treated then this can be profitably done only as we are aware that the centre of the Scriptures is the great solus Christus, sola fide. It is typical of many of the sects today, who too subscribe to the sola scriptura that they cannot distinguish the core of the Scriptures from its periphery – hence some have bene caught up with all kinds of futuristic apocalyptic excesses as they dwell on certain parts of the Apocalypse or do not distinguish between Law and Gospel and fall into the trap of legalism or produce endless unnecessary dogmas binding on consciences as they interpret the Scriptures atomistically as if it were merely a reservoir or divine oracles which suddenly appeared on earth like the Koran and therefore has no theological “configuration”. It must not be forgotten that both the Testaments and their books have had a long history – they are as has been

shown a collection of books written by many authors over a long period of time. Each of the writers belonged to a certain age, he employed the language and outlook on many matters which were current in his day. Apparently the Holy Ghost who inspired them did not take them out of their context and endow them with omniscience. Nowhere do we hear in the Scriptures that the writers claimed for themselves infallibility in all matters relating to history, geography, culture, cosmogony and cosmology. There is the clear case where the suggestion is made that St Paul relied on his memory for his information. The Jerusalem Bible translates well 1 Corinthians 1:16: "Then there was the family of Stephanas of course that I baptised too, but no one else *as far as I can remember*." ["] Luther commenting respectfully on the work of the second day of creation remarks: "Here Moses seems to be forgetting himself, because he does not deal with two very important matters, namely, the creation and fall of the angels ... It is surprising that Moses should remain silent about these weighty matters." (Luther's Works – Lectures on Genesis, Genesis 1-5 American Edition p22).

Luke, too, in the prologue, that has been mentioned, nowhere declares that what he is writing must be held, because the material is directly given to him by the Holy Ghost; he has done research and what he has received from witnesses can be taken as trustworthy. The point that is being made is this, that when we teach the inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures then we do this in faith. The doctrine of the Holy Scriptures belongs to the articles of faith and therefore there is no rational and apologetic proof for its infallibility. Harmonisations of matters that need not be harmonised have again and again been attempted to preserve or prove the infallibility and inerrancy of Scriptures to others – already Tatian prepared a Diatesseron adopted by a part of the early church for a time – but all to no avail; the great Augustine wrestled with the problem of the two texts (Hebrew and Greek) which did not agree in many matters. His attempt to hold to both indicates the torturous procedure embarked upon to cling to the infallibility of the Scriptures at all costs in all details, even peripheral matters. Many examples could probably be supplied of honest efforts by sincere and earnest Bible students, who sought to defend the doctrine of the inspiration of the Scriptures and its inerrancy in every detail of chronology, history and cosmology.

In coming more specifically to the subject of this paper, we may ask – How did the NT writers employ the OT Scriptures, what did they use of the OT and why? It is, of course, a sheer impossibility to cover all the many passages in the NT that refer directly or indirectly to the OT. One thing becomes abundantly overt as the NT is studied for answers to the above questions and that is that the NT writers quote freely from the Scriptures in which they are fully at home. According to the Acts of the Apostles the early Christian apostles were busily engaged in what might be called biblical research (not in a text-critical or historical way, such criticism of course came many centuries later and was not their particular problem) and since its "Sitz im Leben" was largely a Jewish environment, its christology and apologetics were firmly based on that book which was used by both synagogue and congregation alike in their worship, however, most certainly in a different way. The message of the Church, as has been indicated, was nothing else than Jesus Christ who died for our sins according to the Scriptures (OT) was buried and raised on the third day in accordance with the Scriptures (1 Corinthians 15:3-5). The writers of the Gospels and epistles of the Apocalypse and the Acts all presuppose that their readers are familiar with the OT; they use it freely not as a text-book of authority on [p. 4] any subject but to convince their readers that Jesus is the Christ of God, whom they may trust and to present Him to them as their Saviour.

The New Testament then clearly regards the OT Scriptures as the Word of God and uses it as such (2 Corinthians missing chapter no.:16-18). Although not all the books of the OT are quoted (and there is good reason for this) nor are all alluded to, there can be no doubt that at the time of the early Church the OT as Law, Prophets and Chetubim was read and employed. It was held to be the Book that pointed to the Messiah, who had come in Jesus Christ. The Scriptures contained the history of God's saving Word and deeds for Israel and for fallen mankind. The OT was an open book and could only be rightly understood from Christ. The history of Israel (cf Stephen's speech in Acts 7 or St Paul's theology of Israel's history in Romans 9-11) is viewed sub specie salutis. Israel's history as told in the OT is not a history like the rest of the peoples of its environment – it is unique because it is God's history with His people which is fulfilled and actualised redemptively in Jesus Christ, in whom all the families of the earth shall be blest. This is what St Paul makes so clear to the Judaisers of Galatia, who cannot distinguish Law from Gospel (so necessary to understand the OT) in Galatians 3: "The Scripture fore-seeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the Gospel beforehand to Abraham saying, 'In thee shall all the nations be blessed'." Indeed it can be said that the greater part of Galatians and Romans is taken up by St Paul to show from the OT that God's promises to Israel in their long and devious history were fulfilled in Christ and that justification by faith alone and not by works of the Law is the content and essence of the Scriptures; James of course,

especially in Chapter 2 of his epistle, uses the OT too, to demonstrate that such saving faith is always active in good works.

We also know that the only one great interest of all the NT writers was that their readers would stand before the Judge in the eschaton as justified; it was this deep pastoral and missionary concern that drove them to their Scriptures to show them that He who was to come had come and would come again. The Acts of the Apostles reporting the post-Pentecostal preaching of Peter demonstrates that it was based four-squarely on the OT: "This Jesus delivered up according to the definite plan and fore-knowledge of God you crucified and killed by the hands of lawless men. But God raised him up having loosed the pangs of death, because it was not possible for him to be held by it". And now comes the word of the Psalm 16, "I saw the Lord always before me, for he is at my right hand, that I may not be shaken ... For thou wilt not abandon my soul to Hades, nor let thy Holy One see corruption. Thou hast made known to me the ways of life; thou wilt make me full of gladness with thy presence." Then in a fitting climax he declares that the psalmist "foresaw and spoke of the resurrection of the Christ ... Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus who you crucified" (Acts 2:23ff). Indeed, if the sermons and addresses of the apostles as presented in the Acts are carefully examined then there is no dubiety that the OT passages which are quoted (eg, Exodus 3:6; Deuteronomy 18:15-16; Genesis 22:18; Isaiah 52:13; Psalm 2:1-2, etc) are all christocentrised, ie, they are shown to have been fulfilled in Him who is the centrum of the Gospel. Luther put it very aptly when he wrote: "All (the Apostles) preaching is based on the OT and there is no word in the NT which does not look back to the Old wherein it was already declared ... The OT is thus the testament of Christ – a letter which he caused to be opened after his death and read and proclaimed in the light of the Gospel." He went so far as to say that "Everywhere the Scripture is about Christ alone" (Luther's Lectures on Romans, 1515/16).

The key to understanding the Scriptures from this vista was most certainly given to His Apostles by the Kyrios Himself, who loved the Word, prayed it defended Himself with it and lived it constantly. Perhaps in this context the most noteworthy example of this is the Lucan appearance story of Christ after the resurrection. In the gloom of the first Easter as the two Emmaus disciples walked with the great Incognito and were confused about the events of the day, Christ said to them: "O foolish men and slow to believe all that the prophets have spoken. Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and enter into His glory? And beginning with Moses and all the prophets he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself" (Luke 24), and in v44 He declares to His eleven: "These are my words which I spoke to you, while I was still with you, that everything written about me in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms must be fulfilled. Then He opened their minds to understand the scriptures". In His dispute with the Jews according to John 5:39 He asserted that the Scriptures "bear witness to me", whilst in the closing verses of that chapter He says: "If you believed Moses, you would believe me, for he wrote of me. But if you do not believe his writings, how will you believe my words?" (v46-47).

It is just amazing how the NT writers joyfully and freely take up this theme of Christ the fulfilment of the Scriptures in their writings. Using the Exodus theology [p. 5] so often emphasised in the OT, St Paul declares firmly that Christ was actually present in the Old covenant-history the "supernatural Rock" (1 Corinthians 10:4) from which the fathers of Israel drank was none other than Christ. This spiritualising, Christocentrising process is frequently found in the epistles of the NT. The writers see Christ present in the OT and declare that the Christ in the flesh which eye-witnesses visibly saw and heard was not only the One fore-told in the Scriptures, but was already present with His people in their long history of rebellion against Him.

Another example may be adduced to show how the author of Hebrews employed his Greek OT to proclaim Christ from it. It is the quotation Psalm 8:4-6 which in Hebrews 2 is understood christologically. A careful literal exegesis of the NT will convincingly show that the ben-adam referred to there is most certainly the proto-man. The greatness and sublimity of adam quite in harmony with Genesis 1 (the creation of man by God in His own image) is obviously in the fore-front of the psalmist's thinking – he looks *back* to creation, when God crowned him with glory and honour and placed everything under him. What then is the starting-point for the christologising in Hebrews 2? It is simply the Greek text of the Psalm which translates ben-adam quite literally with Hyios Anthropou, "Son of Man" which is the title for Christ. Here then the author of Hebrews exegises the OT not according to the original Hebrew but with the help of his Greek refers the ben-adam to Jesus, who "for a little while was made lower than the angels (note here the shift from the Hebrew text which has "a little lower than the Elohim" – no reference to time) and crowned with glory and honour because of the suffering of death so that

by the grace of God he might taste death for everyone.” Other illustrations could be adduced from NT writers’ usage of the OT to demonstrate that they find the Christ in “the swaddling clothes” of the OT because they viewed it holistically as pointing to Christ.

The Matthean Gospel is firmly built on the promise-fulfilment schema and for this the OT is again freely used. The Gospel begins the biblos geneoses of Jesus Christ, son of David and son of Abraham. This sepher toledot (Genesis 1) starts with Abraham and then provides the reader with the ancestors of Christ employing the seven times two = 14 generations schema (note that there are only 13 in the third list). In the cluster of the five infancy and childhood accounts of Christ (1:18-2:23) it is the OT quotes that hold them together. These stories are seen through the texts of the Scriptures. As God was at work in the history of Israel, so with the child Jesus. As He led and guided the infant Israel, so He preserved and helped this child born to be the Saviour of the world. First the Isaiah 7:14 passage is quoted from the LXX with a small difference. In chapter 2:5-6 two passages are cited from different parts of the canon and in v15 after the Moses/Christ typology has been implicitly employed there comes the familiar phrase of Matthew: “This was to fulfil what the Kyrios had spoken by the prophet” and then follows the citation of Hosea 11:1 “Out of Egypt I have called my son”. (Here the Hebrew text seems to be preferred to the LXX). Again it can be seen that the Israel of the OT is Jesus Christ, who is its fulfilment. In other words the Matthean use of Hosea 11 shows that it cannot be understood fully without christology. Now there are many of these testimonia in the Gospels, but we have not the time to explore any more here. CH Dodd in “According to the Scriptures” p126 says well: “The method included the selection of certain large sections of the OT scriptures ... These sections were understood as wholes, and particular verses or sentences were quoted from them as pointers to the whole context than as constituting testimonies in and for themselves. At the same time, detached sentences from other parts of the OT could be adduced to illustrate or elucidate the meaning of the main section under consideration. But in the fundamental passages it is the total context that is in view and is the basis of the argument.”

Before we finally turn to the Creation and the Fall accounts and how they were understood by the NT perhaps a word about typological and allegorical interpretation in the NT as we find it especially in St Paul and Hebrews. J Gerhard writing in 1762 made the following distinction: “Typology consists in the comparison of the facts. Allegory concerns itself not so much with facts, as in their assembly, from which it draws out useful and hidden doctrine.” Now there are many typei found in the OT which find their fulfilment or substance in the NT. Thus Adam (Romans 5:14) and the Paschal Lamb (I Corinthians 5:7) are all prefigurations of Him who ushered in the New Aeon with His death and resurrection. E Ellis (Paul’s Use of the OT p127) says excellently: “For the NT writers a type has not merely the property of typicalness or similarity; they view Israel’s history as Heilsgeschichte and the significance of an OT type lies in its particular locus in the Divine plan of redemption. When Paul speaks of the Exodus events happening typikos and written for our admonition, there can be no doubt that in the Apostle’s mind Divine intent is of the essence both in their occurrence and in their inscripturation.” Allegorical interpretation (Galatians 4:21ff) [p. 6] is not so much concerned with events as with the details of those events; true typology focusses mainly on the actions of God; what He has done in the OT that He has performed in the New. His opus proprium and His opus alienum are to be found in both Testaments and the theological continuum in Old and New is essentially the saving activity of God who became flesh in Jesus Christ. Not that the Old and the New are one in the sense that there is no diversity (here lies one of the weaknesses of Calvin’s exegesis when compared with Luther’s) – Hebrews has much to say about the “how much more” of the NT revelation (cf the so-called antitheses in the Sermon of the Mount), but insofar as promise and fulfilment, preparation and completion belong together the old dispensation fore-shadowed the raw in a typological “gradation”. The events of the OT were all preparatory, carrying in them a meaning which those who lived in them could not fully understand and which were only finally revealed in Christ.

In concentrating on the Creation and Fall accounts (Genesis 1-3) it may be that the above considerations can be helpful in our approach. First it may be good to say that the NT writers belonged to the New Israel of faith. They had been taken up into the New Ktisis. Had not the creative Word come to them and recreated them out of death? Did not the same pneuma, who like a dove had descended on Christ at Jordan come upon them? Certainly they belonged to the old creation, which longs for the liberation of the children of God (Romans 8:19), nevertheless in faith they had been incorporated into the soma of Christ and as such were already partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light (cf, Colossians 1). Thus when the New Testament writers interpret the Genesis 1-3 accounts, they see them sub specie salutis as the OT itself does. They are fully aware at all times that the core of the OT is the Heilsgeschichte and like the OT writers they do not isolate those early accounts of

Bereschit, but see them in the wide context of the saving work of God for Israel. They are certainly not in the slightest concerned with the question of authorship or source problems; for them the whole of the Pentateuch is called Moses and in this they have adopted the strong Jewish tradition current at the time. Furthermore the NT is nowhere caught up in a debate about the historicity of the accounts in Genesis. However, it is vitally concerned with understanding, interpreting and applying the OT especially in the Jewish context of legalism, which had totally misunderstood the Scriptures as a codex and had divorced it from its salvatory purposes (cf the Crucifixion of Christ which according to the Gospels was based on the false understanding of the Messiah and the Law).

If we turn to Genesis 1:1 briefly then we find that the word “beginning” (reschit-arche) is taken up at a number of points in the NT and given a christo-centric meaning. Thus the prologue to St John’s Gospel announces that “In the beginning was the Word and the ‘logos’ was with God and God was the Word. He was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him (John 1:1-3). Obviously with Genesis 1 (including the imago dei theology) in mind Colossians 1:15ff declares that Christ is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation, for in him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible ... he is the beginning”, whilst in Revelation 22:13 the Kyrios announces: “I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end”. In the same vein is the doxological exclamation of Romans 11:36: “For from him and through him and to him are all things.” All these passages point to a Christological exegesis of the creation account.

That man was created in the image of God is expressis verbis stated in a passage like 1 Corinthians 11:7 where he is actually described as the eikon and doxa of God. On the basis of the Genesis 2 account the right relationship between man and woman is declared and in 1 Timothy 2:13 the implications of it are argued. It can be safely stated that the whole of the NT leaves no vestige of doubt that the origins of man and woman lie entirely with God, who placed the desire for one another into them (cf Genesis 1:27 and Matthew 19:14) and what He has creationally joined together that no man shall put asunder. It would take us too far for our purposes to show that the springboard, as it were, of the NT ethics of sex, marriage, work and relationships of man to the Kosmos is in part at least to be found in these creational stories.

Worthy of note in our context is the fact that at no point does the NT take up the six days of creation as of theological significance. Of course it can be said that it has presupposed them; the only day that becomes in any way focal is the Sabbath, which is eschatologised in Hebrews 4. The imputations of Christ with the nomistic Jews of his time concerning the observance of the day and His willingness to give the real anapausis to those who were weary as well as the theological arguments of St Paul with the Judaisers in Galatia (cf Epistle to the Galatians) exhibit strongly that the NT understood the Sabbath in a christological-eschatological sense. Indeed if there is one day in the NT which is singled out above all other days then it is the first day of the week, the Resurrection Day, which [p. 7] had ushered in the new aeon, the “last days” which would culminate in the last day, when time would be no more. (Apoc 10, v6). The believer in Christ lives already in these last days and therefore is already exempt from the judgements of legalists in respect to the observance of days (Colossians 2:16). In the new creation, in Paradise regained, no created light is needed – the sun and the moon and the stars will have done their doulological work for which they were created (Note the anti-mythical undertones in Genesis 1). “For the doxa of God is its phos and its lamp is the Lamb.” (Apoc 22, v5).

There is little gained at this point by going to the Apocalypse and demonstrating how protology (Genesis 1-3) and apocalyptic eschatology (Revelation) are inseparately tied. For an understanding of this last book of the NT with its many allusions and references to Genesis it is important to study the prolegomena to the Section on “The Last Things” in the Theses of Agreement of the LCA where some invaluable hermeneutical guidelines are provided. When the Fall of Man account is considered at this stage and how it was interpreted in the NT then there can be no doubt that the NT finds the aitiology of all woe and death in this life in Genesis 3. Not God is the origin of evil in this world but man himself who succumbed to the temptation of Satan in paradise. Matters such as the geographical locality of the Garden and the exact time of the temptation (Luther interestingly thinks that it was on the Sabbath cf his commentary of Genesis 3) or the animalistic features of the curse pronounced on the mysterious serpent (belly-crawling, dust-eating) by God are nowhere taken up in the NT and hence have rightly not been dogmatised by the Church. (cf The Temptation of Christ in the midbar as the Second Adam, where Satan makes the assault on the holy Son of God and Man). In passages such as 2 Corinthians 11:3 and Revelation 12:9 we see that the ophis of Genesis has been satanised and is declared to be the source of all evil, “the deceiver of the whole world”. This fact does, however, not exonerate Adam in any way – the fall is *man’s* disobedience of God’s Word, his desire to be God in place of God and not to let God be God (cf Ezekiel 28). In this fall of the one

man, all of mankind have sinned and all must die. In this context the corporate understanding of Adam so strongly and convincingly presented by HW Robinson in his study "Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel" is of great assistance (cf The Adam/Christ typology in 1 Corinthians 15:45 and more particularly in Romans 5:12ff).

Again it would be wrong if it were not pointed out that Genesis 1-3 is not viewed isolatedly by the NT. Like the OT it sees the accounts there in the wide context of the salutary history of Israel and hence St Paul in 1 Corinthians 15:22 can exclaim that as in Adam all have sinned and therefore must die "so also in Christ all shall be made alive". Through the power of the pneuma fallen man will be changed into the likeness of Christ, who is the express image of God (Romans 8:29; 2 Corinthians 4:4; Hebrews 1:4), the Second Adam, who resisted all the attacks of the Tempter (Matthew 4) and on the Cross, forsaken by God (Psalm 22), clung to His God in obedience (Philemon 2) and was therefore highly exalted and given a name above every other name. Into Him the believer has been insomatized by baptism, and for His sake has been declared just before God; therefore with joyful anticipation he awaits with the groaning creation, the visible return in doxa of the "Man to Come" who will bring the new creation to light.

Our fathers rendered the Church and its interpreters inestimable service when in the Apology (Article IV, Section 2) they stated: "(Justification by faith) ... is of especial service for the clear, correct understanding of the entire Holy Scriptures ... and alone opens the door to the entire Bible."

North Adelaide, SA
6 September 1967

JTE Renner