**THE BEAUTY OF HOLINESS**
**And Other Articles**

**By J. Prescott Johnson**

* * * * * * *

Digital Edition 03/07/2000
By Holiness Data Ministry

* * * * * * *

Article 1
THE BEAUTY OF HOLINESS

"O Worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness." -- Psalm 96:9

In the springtime of impressionable youth, I lived with my family in southwestern Oregon, where we attended a small church whose members were committed to the perfectionist persuasion that had emerged from the American Wesleyan movement. On the wall just behind the platform was a lovely banner, painted by my artistic father, which carried the words of the Psalmist, "O worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness." Those words, so beautifully inscribed, remain yet in my deepest consciousness and impel me in the effort better to understand and appreciate their meaning in a day so far removed from an earlier time in my religious life.

The expression, "the beauty of holiness," occurs in several places in the Psalms, as well as in the Chronicles. These latter works, drawn from the Psalms, paint a picture of the past as a way of conveying an Hebraic philosophy of history. But the original inspiration of the expression is found peculiarly in the Psalms.

Psalm 29:2 reads: "Give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name; worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness." The same thought is found in Psalm 96:8-9. After the "families of the people" are enjoined to "give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name," they are called to worship "in the beauty of holiness." Psalm 110:3 employs the plural, "the beauties of holiness": "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth."

In all of this lovely, and significant, poetry, not only are the ideas of holiness and beauty associated together; these are also associated with the idea of glory, along with other kindred ideas of strength, honor and majesty.

Now the expression "beauty of holiness" (behadrath kodesh), which is found both in Psalm 29:2 and Psalm 96:9, means literally "holy array." Thus Adam Clarke translates Psalm 29:2 as holy ornaments, and Psalm 96:9 as the beautiful garments of holiness. The plural form, "the beauties of holiness," as found in Psalm 110:3, is behadrey kodesh, which Clarke translates as the splendid garments of holiness.

All of these passages allude to the sacerdotal garments that the High Priest wore in carrying out his ministrations. They were given to him for beauty and glory -- qualities indispensable in the high priestly function of intercession before the Divine Majesty. Now there is the question of the contemporary meaning of the ancient association of the ideas of holiness and beauty. What is the significance of "the beauty of holiness" for the Christian today? And how may that significance be ascertained?

Some progress has been made already in the direction of an answer to these questions. The terms used in these verses are, of course, Hebrew terms. "Holy array" is array that exudes beauty and glory. There is thus a certain justification for reading the original expression, "holy array," as "beauty of holiness," since the holy array is, inevitably, also splendid and beautiful.

Among biblical scholars there is some disagreement as to whether or not the root-idea of the term "holiness," or kodesh, is negative or positive. The term may be associated with the Sumerian kadistu, which means "free from defect." On this interpretation the term is connected with sacrifice, and connotes separateness -- the separateness of the sacrificial offering, thus its holiness. The view that the term is positive is supported by the suggestion that the term is derived from a root that is kindred to "newness," hadhash. What "newness" may connote is the uniqueness of essential character -- the character of fresh, vital, self-contained purity. On this reading, holiness is "that which belongs to God and is devoted to God."

Regardless of the origin of the word, the Old Testament fixes the usage of the term: it means "separateness" as the basis of relation to God. And this because God's separateness is, positively, God's uniqueness. God's holiness is His divinity. God is holy because He is God. Thus God's separateness, as His uniqueness, requires of us a comparable separateness in our service before Him.

Now why is holiness beautiful? How can "holy array" be properly translated as "beauty of holiness?" What legitimizes the association of holiness, as separateness, with beauty? The fact that the term "glory" is used by the Psalmist as that which is appropriate to God's name is significant. The term "glory" is kebob, which means "splendor," "excellence." Coming back to the ritual meaning of the passages, then, we have this: the holiness, or the separateness and uniqueness of God, is the ground of that glory, or splendor and excellence, which is due unto his name. Or put somewhat differently, although with the same import, the glory of God is His disclosed holiness. And it is the comparable holiness, or separateness, of the people of God that confers upon them a

splendor and excellence, a glory, which shines forth with beauty. So it is, then, with justification that "holy array" is also "the beauty of holiness."

If we look at the question from a more contemporary point of view, however, what we find is this: the expression "the beauty of holiness" associates together two quite distinct ideas, the moral idea of holiness and the aesthetic idea of beauty. What, now, is meant by bringing two such seemingly divergent categories, the moral and the aesthetic, into union? More precisely, what is there about the category of the aesthetic, of the idea of the beautiful, that permits the qualification, or characterization, of the moral quality of holiness as possessing the aesthetic quality of beauty? We have thus far shown that the root meanings of the ancient Hebrew notions support this association, but can we look to more contemporary considerations to lend further support to this association? That is our present question.

It is helpful, first, to consider the term "holiness" with respect to its moral connotation. And it is instructive at this juncture to look into the writings of Wesley, whose writings contain a great deal of discussion of this particular subject.

"There are," Wesley writes (Sermon CXXXIV, vii. 455-56) [1], "two branches of holiness: negative and positive." Thus,

"All the Liturgy of the Church is full of petitions for that holiness without which, the Scripture everywhere declares, no man shall see the Lord. And these are summed up in those comprehensive words which we are supposed to be so frequently repeating: 'Cleanse the thoughts of your hearts by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love thee, and worthily magnify thy holy name.' It is evident that in the last clause of this petition, all outward holiness is contained: Neither can it be carried to a greater height, or expressed in stronger terms. And those words, 'Cleanse the thoughts of your hearts,' contain the negative branch of inward holiness; the height and depth of which is purity of heart, by the inspiration of God's Holy Spirit. The remaining words, 'that we may perfectly love thee,' contain the positive part of holiness; seeing this love, which is the fulfilling of the law, implies the whole mind that was in Christ."

It may be well, at this point, to say something concerning Wesley's view as to how inward holiness is obtained. The "holiness movement" of the 19th and up into the 20th centuries, at least certain aspects of that movement, stressed the instantaneous obtainment of holiness. In placing such absolute stress upon instantaneous sanctification, a certain artificiality came to characterize the doctrine of holiness.

Wesley is clear that justification and sanctification are distinct works of grace. In the preface of his second volume of hymns, he wrote:

"9. Neither, therefore, dare we affirm (as some have done) that this full salvation is at once given to true believers. There is, indeed, an instantaneous (as well as a gradual) work of God done in the souls of his children; and there wants not, we know, a cloud of witnesses, who have received, in one moment, either a clear sense of forgiveness of their sins, or the abiding witness of the Holy Spirit. But we do not know a single instance, in any place, of a person's receiving, in one

and the same moment, remission of sins, the abiding witness of the Spirit, and a new, a clean heart" (xiv. 326).

Yet the distinctness of the two experiences, justification and sanctification, does not signify, for Wesley, that sanctification is wholly instantaneous. It has, to be sure, an instantaneous phase, but this along with its gradual phase. Sanctification begins with justification, proceeds in a line of development, but then, at some time, is brought to qualitative completion in an instantaneous bestowal of the Holy Spirit, and then, further, progresses, quantitatively, throughout life. All this is clearly and unmistakably set forth in Sermon LXXXV (vi. 509):

"1. Afterwards we experience the proper Christian salvation; whereby, 'through grace,' we 'are saved by faith;' consisting of those two grand branches, justification and sanctification. By justification we are saved from the guilt of sin, and restored to the favour of God; by sanctification we are saved from the power and root of sin, and restored to the image of God. All experience, as well as Scripture, shows this salvation to be both instantaneous and gradual. It begins the moment we are justified, in the holy, humble, gentle, patient love of God and man. It gradually increases from that moment, as 'a grain of mustard-seed, which, at first, is the least of all seeds,' but afterwards puts forth large branches, and becomes a great tree; till, in another instant, the heart is cleansed from all sin, and filled with the pure love to God and man. But even that love increases more and more, till we 'grow up in all things into Him that is our Head;' till we attain 'the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.'"

This passage, too, points up the negative and positive aspects of inward holiness. The negative aspect is stated in the phrase, "the heart is cleansed from all sin." The positive aspect is found in the words, "filled with the pure love to God and man."

It is the positive aspect, as Wesley defined it, which is particularly important in our developing the association of holiness with beauty. Several further references to Wesley are helpful at this point. In his Journal of Thursday, September 13, 1739 (i. 225), he wrote:

"I believe it [sanctification (or holiness)] to be an inward thing, namely, the life of God in the soul of man; a participation of the divine nature; the mind that was in Christ; or the renewal of our heart, after the image of Him that created us."

Throughout his writings there are other phrases that express the same idea of inward holiness: "the image of God stamped on the heart" (iii. 341), "the renewal of the soul 'in the image of God wherein it was created'" (vii. 316). From inward holiness springs outward holiness: "perfection is another name for universal holiness: Inward and outward righteousness: Holiness of life, arising from holiness of heart" (vi. 414). "In a word, holiness is the having 'the mind that was in Christ,' and the 'walking as Christ walked'" (vii. 317).

Now there are passages in Wesley in which he characterizes the content of positive holiness. It embraces, he said, "every holy and heavenly temper -- in particular, lowliness, meekness, gentleness, temperance, and longsuffering" (vii. 316). In the Extract from the Difference between the Moravians and the Methodists, he wrote:

"Scriptural holiness is the image of God; the mind which was in Christ; the love of God and man; lowliness, gentleness, temperance, patience, chastity" (x. 203).

And, referring to Paul's words to the Galatians, Wesley further listed the qualities of inward holiness: "It is the one undivided fruit of the Spirit, which he describes thus: 'The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity (so the word should be translated here), meekness, temperance'" (vi. 413).

Immediately following the reference to Galatians, Wesley went on to say:

"What a glorious constellation of graces is here! Now, suppose all these to be knit together in one, to be united together in the soul of a believer, this is Christian perfection" (vi. 413-14).

In Sermon XXIV (v. 294-95), Wesley used the expression, concerning which we are particularly concerned in this discussion, "the beauty of holiness." He wrote:

"1. The beauty of holiness, of that inward man of the heart which is renewed after the image of God . . . . The ornament of a meek, humble, loving spirit . . . . This inward religion bears the shape of God so visibly impressed upon it . . . . We may say of this, in a secondary sense, even as the Son of God himself, that it is the 'brightness of his glory, the express image of his person;' . . . 'the beaming forth of his' eternal 'glory;' and yet so tempered and softened, that even the children of men may herein see God and live; . . . 'the character, the stamp, the living impression of his person,' who is the fountain of beauty and love, the original source of all excellency and perfection."

Wesley encouraged others to testify to the obtainment of Christian perfection, and the Journal records many instances in which they professed the experience. But he was disinclined to reveal matters concerning his own religious life. Yet there are occasions when he did so. In 1725, at the age of twenty-two, Wesley read Jeremy Taylor's discussion of purity of intention. Forty years later he wrote in his Journal, May 14, 1765, of the profound impact Taylor's discussion made upon him:

"I was struck particularly with the chapter upon intention, and felt a fixed intention 'to give myself up to God.' In this I was much confirmed soon after by the 'Christian Pattern,' and longed to give God all my heart. This is just what I mean by Perfection now: I sought after it from that hour..."

"...In 1730 I began to be homo unius libri [a man of one book]; to study (comparatively) no book but the Bible. I then saw, in a stronger light than ever before, that only one thing is needful, even faith that worketh by the love of God and man, all inward and outer holiness; and I groaned to love God with all my heart, and to serve Him with all my strength" (iii. 212-13).

The question is now raised as to whether Wesley himself reached the experience that he sought. Is there any indication in his writings that he found "the Great Salvation?"

Dr. Olin Curtis believes that he has found the passage in the Journal where Wesley records his own obtainment of Christian perfection. In the Journal entry of December 23-25, 1744, Wesley writes:

"Sun. 23. -- I was unusually lifeless and heavy, till the love feast in the evening . . . .

"Yet the next day [December 24] I was again as a dead man; but in the evening, while I was reading Prayers at Snowsfield, I found such light and strength as I never remember to have had before. I saw every thought, as well as action or word, just as it was rising in my heart; and whether it was right before God, or tainted with pride and selfishness. I never knew before (I mean not as at this time) what it was 'to be still before God.'"

"Tues. 25. -- I waked, by the grace of God, in the same spirit; and about eight, being with two or three that believed in Jesus, I felt such an awe and tender sense of the presence of God as greatly confirmed me therein: So that God was before me all the day long. I sought and found him in every place; and could truly say, when I lay down at night, 'Now I have lived a day'" (i. 478-79).

Dr. Curtis sums up the subject:

"To anyone familiar with John Wesley's careful, realistic manner of speech, it is evident that we have here the same sort of testimony to the experience of holiness that we have in his Journal, May 24, 1738, to the experience of conversion. If the one is not quite so near a full definition as the other, it surely is just as expressive of the fact. I find it almost impossible to read Wesley's words in the light of all his later utterance about the doctrine of Christian perfection, and not consider this date, December 24, 1744, as the probable time when he began to love God supremely." [2]

Viewed from the side of the term "holiness," which is one of the terms in the title of this discussion, we are now in a position to grasp the import of the association of the idea of holiness with the idea of beauty. The beauty of holiness, as Wesley himself suggested, consists in the "glorious constellation of graces," their being "knit together in one, . . . united together." Christian perfection is the harmony of the graces of inward holiness. It now remains, to complete this study, to view the association of holiness and beauty from the viewpoint of beauty. What is there in the idea of beauty that serves properly to characterize holiness as beauty?

Although none is employed in the passages in the Psalms that we have considered above, the Hebrew vocabulary does contain words that are properly translated as "beauty." Thus, in Psalm 27:4:

"One thing have I desired of the Lord, that I will seek after; that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to enquire in his temple."

And in Psalm 50:2,

"Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined."

The word "beauty" in Psalm 27:4 is no`am, which means agreeableness, and, by implication, delight, suitableness, splendor, or grace. It can also be translated as "pleasantness." The word has its root in nawame, which means to be agreeable. This particular form of the term "beauty" is appropriately used in the Psalm, since here beauty -- the beauty of the Lord -- is the object of our desire and is thus suited to that desire agreeably. Thus we find delight in the Lord.

But in Psalm 50:2 the word "beauty" is yofee, which is translated simply as "beauty." The word is derived from the primitive root yawfaw, which means to be bright. And, it may be readily seen, it is the appropriate word in this Psalm, since the reference is to the shining forth of the Lord.

Thus, in terms of these two forms of the term "beauty," the Old Testament sense of beauty is agreeableness, or pleasantness, and brightness.

We are now at the place where we may approach the question of beauty from the viewpoint of aesthetic theory. And here caution is well-advised. First, care must be taken not to force a contemporary aesthetic theory, in an ad hoc fashion, upon the biblical expression. To do this is but to come up with something artificial and thus irrelevant to the tenor of the ancient literature. Second, there is -- as is the case with most of the things that occupy philosophers -- no agreement upon an aesthetic theory. That is, there are varied and even radically differing views as to the nature of beauty.

Aesthetic theories are, usually, arrived at on the basis of an already-held theory of reality. A given philosopher will develop a theory of beauty based upon his theory as to the nature of things. For example, Etienne Gilson's theory of beauty is founded upon the philosophy of Aquinas, and through Aquinas goes back to Aristotle. A philosophical naturalism, as in George Santayana, is developed as the basis for a quite different theory of beauty.

Now it seems to me that one cannot proceed in this fashion. Thus, the question is raised as to just how is it that one can come up with an aesthetic theory that does not depend upon a given metaphysical prejudice. Is an alternative possible?

There is, I think, such an alternative. The alternative comes to view when we raise the question, from the standpoint of our human experience of beauty and art, as to what that experience evidently is and involves. We know this for sure: we do experience beauty, both beauty in nature and beauty in the creation and response to art.

We will narrow our investigation to the sphere of beauty in art. This will, it is hoped, give us a platform upon which to come to some understanding of beauty, not only in art, but in nature. Since, now, the majority of us are not artists who create the art object, we will have to begin at the only point where we have the requisite acquaintance with the aesthetic sphere; and that is the response to beauty in art.

We respond to many stimuli. In the process of everyday living, this response is carried out, in the main, through what are called signs. Some datum of perceptual experience, for example, is named, taken as a sign for some further datum of experience, acted upon with either agreeable or

disagreeable results. The tissue of our perceptual experiences, the connections among them in which some signify others, is the makeup of our practical living.

The same sort of sign-function is at work at the level of theory and science. A theoretical construct, or scientific concept, has meaning because it refers to some aspect of the world. The reference can be put to an appropriate test and be verified, if, that is, the reference does indeed hold.

Now this characteristic of both the perceptual and cognitive -- in the sense of scientific -- consciousness is what is known as transitive. By that term it is meant that the sign, whether a perceptual item or a conceptual item, points to something beyond its own occurrence in consciousness, refers to something else transcendent to it.

The response to beauty is wholly unlike the response to a sign, either as perceptual or conceptual sign. In the response to beauty, as in a work of art, the response is locked into the beautiful object. One's attention is fixed upon the beauty that is beheld, and thus does not move away to something else -- as an emotion or some happening in the real world --, does not take the beauty as a sign for something outside of that beauty itself. In sum, the response to beauty is what is known as intransitive.

This brief description of the aesthetic response, the response to beauty, raises the question, it will be readily seen, as to just what there is about beauty, as in a work of art, which causes this unique kind of response, this intransitive response, that focuses its attention in an all-consuming fashion upon the object of beauty. Or, to pick up on the language of the Psalms, what is it about beauty that is responsible for that absorption of consciousness in which delight is taken in the brilliance of beauty in and for itself?

There are two, inseparable, elements of a work of art; hence, there are two inseparable elements in artistic beauty. These are form and content. An adequate theory of art must do justice to both of these elements; must not overemphasize one at the neglect of the other.

Thus art is about something. There is a material content that is contained in the art object. In music, for example, there is sensuous, and pleasing, sound. In a poem there is some reference to an element of the experienced world.

But there is also the element of form. In music, again, the sensuous sound is organized, patterned, so that, for example, a symphony is developed, in the organization of which the complex of sound moves through phases of fulfillment and completion. And in a poem the material of experience is expressed through the forms of cadence and rhythm.

What occurs, now, is that in the art object both the content and the form are changed from what they are outside of that object of beauty. The form is not now the abstract form of logic or mathematics, and the content is not now the content of actual experience. In the grip of beauty, the form is transformed and the content is transubstantiated. We can, to be sure, state what, e.g., a poem is about, or paraphrase the poem, but in so doing we miss the content that is within the language of the poem. Ordinary and scientific language is transparent, the object meant comes

through the language. For example, a scientific statement can be made in many different languages and the same content, or meaning, is disclosed without any loss. Here the object meant is independent of the language and thus comes through the language. The content of the poem, what the poem, as a poem, is about, however, is not something that exists independently of the poetic language. On the contrary, poetic content exists, exclusively, within the language, with the result that something of the meaning of a poem is lost in the attempt to translate the poetic language. Poetic language is untranslatable. Poetic language is thus opaque. The meanings and values that the poem carries are disclosed in the language of the poem. This restriction of poetic content to the language of the poem is the result of the organic fusion of form and content, which, as we have observed, is characteristic of all art. Immanent meaning rules the art object in the fusion of form and content.

It may be helpful to give a couple of illustrations of the immanent meaning of a poem, resulting from the organic fusion of form and content.

Take the statement: "I love you and always shall." This statement asserts a subject matter, that of pledged love. This subject matter, as we have just done, can be asserted in a factual statement. The factual statement is the paraphrase. But now the poetry:

"As fair as thou, my bonnie lass,
So deep in love am I;
And I will love thee still, my dear
Till a' the seas gang dry."

What the poem is about, now, is different from what can be stated propositionally. The choice of words, their organization, yield something entirely new. In contrast to the words of the paraphrase, the logical proposition, "the words of the poem . . . are handled for their own sakes, and with that strangeness which enters into the proportion of beauty." [3]

In the book of Ruth, Ruth expresses the devotion of an alien daughter to her husband's mother. This subject matter, too, can be stated in the form of a factual proposition. But how different is the poetic content:

"And Ruth said, Intreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee: for whither thou goest, I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge: thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God: where thou diest, will I die, and there will I be buried: the Lord do so to me, and more, if aught but death part thee and me" (Ruth 1:16-17).

In these lines the emotion of love overflows into a perfection of words beyond description in other terms.

The organizing principles that are at work with subject matter, or content, are those of harmony, balance, and centrality. Harmony, which achieves unity by recurrence and complex unification of temporal and spatial items, is especially significant in the temporal arts, as music. Balance achieves unity by contrast, by a close and complex juxtaposition of similar and dissimilar items, especially spatial items. It is particularly important in painting. The combination of

harmony and balance yields rhythm. Centrality obtains when items are so arranged in a complex that one item, or group of items, dominates the others. It is these principles, then, that work up the content of experience into beauty, the meaning of which is immanent in the object of beauty and which is beheld intransitively for the sake of beauty itself.

Beauty then, whether created or natural, obtains as the order and unification of the elements of content. Beauty is the proportionality of the material of experience. It is for this reason, when viewed from the viewpoint of the nature of beauty, that it can be said, with accuracy, that there is the "beauty of holiness." In the disposition and life of the Christian, there lie the graces of the Spirit of God, and they lie within the matrix of proper proportionality. For this reason, Christian holiness is a form of beauty. "What a glorious constellation of graces is here," Wesley said. As "knit together in one," as "united together in the soul of a believer," these graces yield Christian perfection, which is, precisely, the beauty of holiness. Inward holiness is beautiful because, within the soul of the Christian, there works the leaven of Godliness: harmony, balance, and centrality. With harmony and balance, centrality lifts the human spirit, with all of its inner resources and powers, into passionate focus upon the clarity and brightness of divine holiness and divine beauty.

Christian holiness is also, as Wesley always insisted, outward holiness. Not only is holiness the having the "mind that was in Christ," it is also the "walking as Christ walked." Christian perfection is, he said, "universal holiness: Inward and outward righteousness: Holiness of life, arising from holiness of heart" (vi. 414). Just as is inward holiness, as we have tried to show, a form of beauty, so is outward holiness marked by the proportionality of beauty. I want to bring this discussion to a close by some mention of this dimension of the "beauty of holiness."

I want to begin this part of the discussion by referring, again, to Psalm 110:3, where the Psalmist sings of "the beauties of holiness."

"Thy people shall be willing
in the day of thy power,
in the beauties of holiness
from the womb of the morning:
thou hast the dew of thy youth."

Here we find a marvelous example of the immanent meaning of beauty that defies translation into literal terms. Somehow, although we cannot say just how, we yet "know" what the psalmist is saying, although we have no ordinary, or usual, words into which to put the import of the passage. As we dwell upon these words, we see that there are forms and levels of meaning which are combined in a strange, mysterious, manner. These forms and levels reach down into the depth of our earthly experience, yet take those primordial nuances of our intimate humanity and lift them into the idealized world of spirituality. There is talk of the morning with its dew; there is talk of the womb and of youth. But there is more, for the womb is strangely combined with the morning, and the dew is not the dew of the morning, but the dew of youth. And, further, with all this there is talk of the day of divine power and of the willingness of the people of God. What does all this mean -- this gem that glitters with such a wondrous mixture of nuances of significance?

It is the power of grace that saves and brings Christian holiness. "The splendid garments of holiness" are the possessions of the children of God, their holiness of heart and life. These are the noble dispositions and the noble patterns of conduct. It is these splendid garments that become the children of the majestic Lord. The work of inward and outward holiness is the work of God. There is "the womb of the morning," suffused with freshness and purity, from which issue the godly in heart and life. There is the "the dew of thy youth," the divine nativity whose years are ageless in eternal youth and whose offspring, as the dew radiates the brilliance of the morning light, radiate in heart and life the divine splendor.

In the day of power, God's people are willing. The carrying out of that willingness in the conduct of life yields the beauty, the proportionality, of outward holiness. What this means, essentially, is that the unity that brings the inward graces into harmony serves to bring unity and harmony within the fabric of humanity. To live outwardly the "glorious constellation of graces," as these are "united together in the soul" of the Christian, is to see one another, not as many and mutually conflicting creatures, but as gathered into a unity of all human life encompassed within the enclosure of supernatural and divine embracement. The beautiful embodies, as we have seen, harmonious relations. In the harmony of all life, there is, then, beauty. In the beauty of holiness, there lies the promise that all human life can be linked in genuine spiritual unity. The harbinger of the redemption of all peoples is the redeemed Church, the ekklesia of God. In the mystic union of the faithful in the Church, in the very beauty of that harmony, is found the hope of healing and redemption for the world. Holiness is the beauty of harmony, the harmony of the graces of the spirit, the harmony of the people of God, and the final and decisive promise, in the unity with the Lord of all, of the harmony of the children of men.

"Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth.

"That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.

"I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me" (John 17:17, 21, 23).

* * * * * * *

ENDNOTES

1 All quotations are from The Works of John Wesley. 14 vols. Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House.

2 Olin Alfred Curtis, The Christian Faith (Grand Rapids: Kegel Publica tions, 1956), p. 376.

3 Samuel Alexander, Beauty and Other Forms of Value (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1933), p. 55.

* * * * * * *

Article 2
CROWN OF GLORY/DIADEM OF BEAUTY

"In that day shall the Lord of hosts be for a crown of glory, and for a diadem of beauty, unto the residue of his people." -- Isaiah 28:5

There are three phases of the prophetic ministry of Isaiah, the greatest of the Judean prophets. The first phase comprises the period between the death of Uzziah (about 740 B.C.) and the fall of Samaria at the hand of Assyria (722). There occurred during this time the notable events: Isaiah's great vision of God sitting on a throne and the prophet's call to proclaim the divine sentence against the wayward nation (6:1-11); and the Messianic prophecy that "a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel" (7:14).

The second period of Isaiah's work corresponds to the reign of Sargon of Assyria (722-705). During this time, Isaiah prophesied that the Philistines' hope of deliverance from Assyria is ill-founded, while Judah, even its helpless poor, are secure in the Zion "that the Lord hath founded" (14:28-32). The second event of this period is the prophet's three-year walk, bare-foot and clad in the loin-cloth of a war prisoner or slave, and his prediction of the impending ruin of Egypt and Ethiopia (20:1-6).

The final stage at the close of Isaiah's life was stormy (705-700). He endeavored, without success, to keep Hezekiah from joining with Egypt in the hope of throwing off the yoke of Assyrian suzerainty. He argued that such a policy of foreign entanglements but showed distrust in God's ability to save His people and rejection of the rule of the divine king. Egypt's help, he accurately predicted, would prove illusory. In the end, however, Isaiah lived to see the divine deliverance. While Judah was overcome when Sennacherib invaded the land (701), Jerusalem itself was miraculously spared.

Isaiah 28 belongs to the first period of the prophet's ministry, when he looks forward to the fall of the Northern Kingdom. Verses 1-4 describe the conditions in the kingdom leading to its downfall. Then, in verses 7-22, Isaiah turns his attention to Judah, pointing out that this kingdom, too, will suffer dissolution as a result of the irreligion of its leaders. He particularly anathematizes their decision to rely upon Assyria for deliverance rather than upon Jehovah. Their "covenant with death," he cries, will be of no avail: "And your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, then ye shall be trodden under foot" (28:18).

Inserted between these two predictions -- the one concerning Ephraim; the other, Judah -- are marvelous words of divine promise to save Judah: promise of "a crown of glory" instead of "a crown of pride," of "a diadem of beauty" instead of a "beauty [that] is a fading flower," of "a spirit of judgment" instead of a vision that errs and a judgment that stumbles. "In that day," the prophet exultantly cries, "shall the Lord of hosts be for a crown of glory, and for a diadem of beauty, unto the residue of his people."

The word crown is the Hebrew, atarah. It derives from the primitive root, 'atar, to encircle. Its essential meaning is derived from the head, with which it is linked. It not only encircles the head but rises above it and therefore symbolizes the idea of preeminence. The preeminence is of a special kind, however. Rising above the head, the crown marks the bearer's relationship to what is above, to what is transcendent. At the same time, the crown signifies the joining of what is above to what is below, the celestial and the terrestrial, the divine and the human.

The Hebrew word, diadem, is tsephiyrah. It is formed from the primitive root, tsaphar, to return. It is often identified as a crown, but it is not the same thing. Rather, a diadem is a band, or fillet, usually adorned with precious stones, that is tied around the forehead. In ancient times this was the true emblem of royalty.

Yet the two are often combined. The band encompasses the head while the crown, attached to the band, rises from the head. The metal crown, the diadem and the crown of rays of light (the radiant crown), are symbols of light and spiritual enlightenment.

Isaiah 28:1-4 alludes to both crown and diadem. "Woe to the crown of pride, to the drunkards of Ephraim, whose glorious beauty is a fading flower" (vs. 1). The "crown of pride" alludes to Samaria, the capitol city of Ephraim, the most fertile province of the Northern Kingdom. Samaria was located on a hill of oval form, which towered over a rich valley shut in by mountains. Its strength and beauty were as a crown and a glory, of which the people were very proud. But their pride was not in Jehovah, who gave them their land and city, but in themselves.

An allusion to the diadem is found in the words of the prophet: "whose glorious beauty is a fading flower," or, perhaps better, "the fading flower of his glorious beauty." The allusion is to the ancient custom of revellers wearing chaplets or wreaths of flowers on their heads on occasions of festivity. They were used to promote cheerfulness and, as Aristotle mentioned, to mitigate headache. But the flowers soon wilted and faded. Samaria, surrounded by its lovely hills, is, Isaiah declares, like a wreath of fading flowers, its beauty soon to vanish under the crushing heel of Assyria.

Judah must take warning from the fate of Ephraim. For the rulers of Judah and the official heads of Judah's religion are ripe, in wickedness, for the avenging instrument of divine wrath, the Assyrian scourge. They are, as it were, in the last stages of a drunken debauch, incapable of rendering correct judgment and prophetic vision (Isa. 28:7-8). They are insensitive to Jehovah's words when He offers the way wherein rest for the weary and refreshing for the exhausted nation are found (Isa. 28:12). They had trusted in Assyria, rather than in Jehovah. They had made their "covenant with death," and that covenant is soon to be dissolved. Jehovah's purpose is now fixed and final: His justice shall be rendered to those who have mocked at judgment and righteousness (Isa. 28:22, 17). The overthrow of Judah is inevitable. Yet in this final dissolution there is one fixed and immutable refuge:

"Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste" (Isa. 28:16).

Yet, in the midst of the deluge, a remnant shall be saved. For this remnant, God shall be "a crown of glory, and . . . a diadem of beauty."

Now, as the above has indicated, both "crown" and "diadem" denote something physical and tangible. While a crown and a diadem are real objects, they carry symbolic significance. We have indicated something of that significance. The crown symbolizes a relationship with heaven, the joining of the divine and human. The diadem symbolizes royalty.

Our own time is one in which, in a democratic age, we are critical of and unmoved by the ancient symbolism of crown and diadem. Those who bear these artifacts are no closer to kinship with heaven or royalty than are the ordinary people of the world. The crown and the diadem offer no extraordinary access to divinity. How, then, can Isaiah's ancient symbolism hold true for us today?

The answer is close at hand. For Isaiah, the crown and the diadem do not represent humanity's ascent to and closure with heaven and the divine. Indeed, on the purely human level, the crown becomes a "crown of pride" and the diadem, a diadem of "fading flower." It is not humanity that achieves the true crown and the true diadem. It is only "the Lord of Hosts" who is the true crown and the true diadem. It is He, and only He, who shall "be for a crown of glory, and for a diadem of beauty." True union with the celestial, true royalty, are spiritual, and they are achieved, not from the side of humanity, but from the side of deity, from "the Lord of Hosts."

The terms, "glory" and "beauty," are far more difficult to define than are the terms, "crown" and "diadem." The former pair of terms does not, like the latter, refer to anything that can be denoted by sense-reference: they cannot be pointed to as actually existing things.

The usual Hebrew word for "glory," which is used in Isaiah 28:5, is tsebiy. It derives from the primitive root, tsabah, which means "to amass." The root idea is "heaviness," or, in a metaphorical sense, "weight," "worthiness." Thus the Hebrew idea of glory is prominence and conspicuousness.

The Hebrew term, "beauty," is tiph`reth. It derives from the primitive root, pa`ra, "to gleam."

Whatever the Bible means by glory and beauty, as they refer to God's relationship with His people, it is much more than something merely intellectual and formal. Rather, they are qualities that relate to the innermost depth of human experience.

We have pointed out earlier that, while the crown and the diadem are observable objects

we can point.

But this is not quite the case. There is a respect in which both glory and beauty are qualities disclosed with reference to sense perception. This is evident from the primary, or root, meanings of the terms. In Hebrew, the primary meaning of "glory" is heaviness, while the primary

meaning of" beauty" is brightness. Thus tactile and visual perceptions are basic to the meaning of these terms. What this signifies is that the spiritual import of even the divine glory and beauty, as conferred upon the people, can be brought to consummate view only by way of some kind of reference to the primordial experience of humanity.

The idea that the highest of realities can be brought to view only in an experience closely akin to perception is also found in secular thought. Plato, for example, speaks of "the eye of the soul" (Republic 533d). It is the intelligible power in the person that apprehends those realities, which Plato calls Ideas. The world of Ideas consists of the various departmental Ideas, as justice, beauty, etc., and the supreme Idea, the Idea of the Good.

For these realities, Plato uses two terms: Eidos and Idea. Idea refers primarily to the act of seeing a visible object, while Eidos refers primarily to what is seen, the form of the object seen. These terms, then, have an intuitive origin, and, according to Plato, cannot be wholly defined in conceptual terms. The apprehension of the ultimate reality, The Idea of the Good, then, is not an abstract conceptual exercise. Rather, it is an ecstatic intuition, a "seeing" with "the eye of the soul." It is "the contemplation of essence and the brightest region of being" (Ibid. 518d), and can best be characterized in terms of the vision of the sun (Ibid. 508c-d).

There is, however, a significant difference between Plato's vision of the Good and Isaiah's vision of the glory of God. Plato does, indeed, know that it is an arduous task "to win to the vision of the good" (Ibid. 519d) and that some sort of "conversion" is requisite. But he is at a loss to indicate the nature of the conversion. About all he can say is "'Consider, then, what would be the manner of the release and healing from these bonds and this folly if in the course of nature something of this sort should happen to them . . . (Ibid. 515c). What is lacking in Plato is revelatory disclosure from divinity. It is that disclosure of light, of glory, of Isaiah speaks: "In that day shall the Lord of Hosts shall be for a crown of glory, and for a diadem of beauty, unto . . . his people."

Glory and beauty are behold in the immediacy of intuition. They are "brilliancies" to be perceived via an inner intuition, not abstractions to be conceptually apprehended and defined. This is the reason that the Old Testament speaks of them in terms analogous to sense perception.

The Old Testament experience of divine glory is in line with this interpretation. Exodus 16:10 records the incident when the Children of Israel ". . . looked to the wilderness, and, behold, the glory of the Lord appeared in the cloud." Ezekiel characterizes the divine glory as a bright, fiery appearance that resembles a rainbow:

> As the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord. Then the glory of the Lord went up from the cherub, and stood over the threshold of the house; and the house was filled with the cloud, and the court was full of the brightness of the Lord's glory. -- Ezekiel 1:28; 10:4.

Here, then, is found the visual registration of God's glory. The glory of the Lord is manifest as brightness. The divine glory is the visible radiance of light, by which the divine

presence is disclosed to the people. This is a motif that is carried forward into the New Testament.

The New Testament word for "glory" is doxa. It is formed from the verb, dokeo, which means "to think" or "to seem." The fundamental idea of glory is subjective judgment. The best literal translation of the New Testament word for glory is "opinion."

Now, there is a certain parallelism as regards the Hebrew and Greek words for glory. When the primitive meanings of these terms -- the Hebrew heaviness and the Greek opinion -- are expanded conceptually, we get the ideas, respectively, of weight or worthiness and reputation or honor. But how far removed from the "sense" of the meaning of the term, "glory," as it functions poetically in Scripture, is this strictly "rationalizing" expansion of the primitive meanings! What is lacking? What is lacking is a further expansion: an expansion in terms that are imbedded in perceptual experience. Only this type of expansion can yield the rich, full, experience-bearing meanings that register so eloquently the sense of divine presence, the sense of the glory and beauty of God.

The New Testament does, to be sure, employ the term "glory" in the sense of reputation or honor. This is the sense of the term in John 12:34: "For they loved the praise (doxa, honor) of men more than the praise of God."

But the prevailing use of the term is its expansion, via the allusion to sense perception, into outward splendor or manifested excellence. In prior days, Isaiah had seen the glory of God, which is the self-revealed and manifested character of God as Holy:

. . . I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphims: . . . And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory (Isaiah 6:1-3).

The sense of brightness, or manifested excellence, is found in Luke 2:9: "The glory (brightness) of the Lord shone round about them." 2 Corinthians 3:9 carries the same thought: ". . . much rather doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory (manifested excellence)."

The New Testament regards glory, as brightness, in an ethical sense. This is evident in such passages as Romans 3:23, "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God," i.e., the manifested perfection of His character, of His righteousness. The ethical sense is also found in John 1:14, where the writer speaks of Christ, ". . . we beheld his glory . . . full of grace and truth." The glory of which Paul writes, signalizing the spiritual transformation and glorification of human nature, is also ethical: "We all, unveiled face, mirroring in ourselves the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit" (2 Corinthians 3:18).

Although the above passages employ the term, "glory," in an ethical sense, there is yet a subtitle reference to the perceptions of sense. This is unquestionably the case with regard to the last two passages. Christ's glory is beheld, i.e., is perceived through an apprehension that is

something of the order of sight. And transformed human nature is a reflecting of the divine glory, which is brightness or splendor. Thus the New English Bible translates 2 Corinthians 3:18:

"And because for us there is no veil over the face, we all reflect as in a mirror the splendour of the Lord; thus we are transfigured into his likeness, from splendour to splendour; such is the influence of the Lord who is Spirit."

There are other passages in which glory is viewed more literally, in terms drawn from the perceptions of sense. On the night of Jesus's birth, "the glory of the Lord shone round about" the shepherds (Luke 2:9); on the Mount of Transfiguration, Moses and Elias "appeared in glory," and the disciples "saw his [Christ's] glory" (Luke 9:31-32); on the Damascus road Paul fell transfixed by the vision of glory, ". . . and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven . . ." (Acts 9:3); and, moved yet by this vision, he later writes of resurrection reality, when our bodies ". . . may be fashioned like unto his glorious body . . . ," or, literally, body of glory!

Thus the glory and beauty of God, of Him who is for His people, "a crown of glory and . . . a diadem of beauty," is a brilliant light that is revelatory of the character and majesty of God. We today, of course, are not privileged to witness that shining forth of light as did those of old. Old Testament saints caught a faint glimpse of that light. But those who actually walked beside the Galilean caught the full vision of glory. In Him they saw the majesty of God, "the glory as of the only begotten of the Father . . . and of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace" (John 1:14, 16). And the Apostle later writes of this:

"That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of Life." -- 1 John 1:1

Here, in terms of the elemental perceptions of sense, is recorded the beholding of glory. It is no intellectual content or abstract proposition; it is a real experience of divine presence. We today, of course, cannot have this same perception of brightness, of glory and beauty. But we have the sacred memory, the memoria, and if we will but turn to it we will find in the transcript of an earlier time the vestige of a vision that may become for us the cue to an inward appropriation of a spiritual clarity transforming our lives and destinies. We may, in our time, experience the emotional beholding of Supreme Perfection, whose majesty becomes an inward radiance illuminating the spirit and the pathways of life. In the luminous light of His glory God reveals Himself; the appreciative response to His manifested excellence is a vision, a beholding, of glory and beauty. While not a visual experience in the sense of earth, it is yet something like it: a clarity that graces and ennobles the human spirit. That is the glory and beauty that God may become to and for the children of earth.

"In him was life; and the life was the light of men (John 1:4).

* * * * * * *

ENDNOTES

1 The passage is better translated: "Woe to the crown of pride of the drunkards of Ephraim, and to the fading flower of his glorious beauty."

2 The references to Plato are from The Republic, tr. Paul Shorey (2 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953-56).

* * * * * * *

Article 3
"WE HAD BEEN HOPING"

"But we had been hoping that he was to be the liberator . . . ."

"Were not our hearts on fire as he talked with us on the road . . . ?"
Luke 24:21, 32 (Revised English Bible).

A most mysterious day was soon to be enwrapped within the shrouds of eventide. Two men, sad at heart, were slowly walking from Jerusalem to Emmaus. As that day was ending, so were their hopes that they and their people would be delivered from Roman bondage. They recalled the recent events: the crucifixion of Him in whom their hopes had rested; the report of the women's vision of angels who announced that the deliverer yet lived; and the incontrovertible reality of the empty tomb.

"But we had been hoping . . . ." What was it for which these early followers of Jesus had been hoping? In their own words, it was that Jesus "was to be the liberator of Israel." On the surface, this hope was a political hope: the restoration of the temporal sovereignty of Israel. Once the corporate identity of the nation were established, it was believed, then the people would find liberation, freedom, and salvation.

But now this hope had been dashed to pieces. He who "was to be the liberator," had received at the hands of the Romans a robe and crown of mock royalty and had been led to infamous death on a malefactor's cross.

But a Stranger appeared on the Emmaus road. He talked not of a temporal kingdom, or of historical restoration, or of earthly glory. He told the two, in effect, that salvation can never be reduced to anything achieved by man. He told them, instead, of God's way of salvation through suffering. He told them that the abyss in which all hope seems thrown is yet God's way of bringing deliverance. He told them that there is a high place, the Mount of Calvary, from which issues the redemption of humanity. At the Emmaus meeting the Stranger placed two ways in stark contrast: the human way of power and glory, in which humanity hopes to secure its destiny, and the divine way of submission and reproach, in which God redemptively grants to humanity its destiny.

Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself (Luke 24:25-27).

The ancient contrast between the political destiny of a people and the personal destiny of an individual is apropos today. For that very contrast is our own contemporary contrast. In fact, it is just this kind of an observation that discloses the contemporary meaning of Christianity--its vitality and freshness despite the passage of centuries. As did the disciples of the Master, so we today hope to find our own destiny in the outward dimension of culture and society. We want to make our own human history our own form of deliverance. We believe that our own achievements, managed by our own knowledge and enterprise, are the means of our salvation. But, like the disciples on the Emmaus road, we must listen to another voice and come to know that our own human ways are, finally, futile.

Our present ethos is concerned with "social transformation." The goal of social reform is liberation--in principle the kind of liberation for which the disciples had been hoping.

Liberation means two things: (1) the absence of governmental restrictions, and (2) the absence of social restrictions that inhibit liberty. Both of these forms of liberty are forms of negative liberty. They cannot themselves bring true liberty, which is positive liberty. The belief that they can was the disciples' mistake; and likewise it is our mistake today.

These forms of negative liberty are, without a doubt, necessary conditions that a society must recognize and provide for its people. A despotic and dictatorial government is destructive of positive liberty. For this reason, the spirit of democracy is true to the inspiration of Christianity. The presence of social conditions, as ignorance and poverty, destroys an enlarged liberty. The transformation of society, which is aimed at liberation, is therefore a social requirement.

But, as Jesus in effect made clear to his early followers, these social and political measures cannot exalt the individual and lift him to the spiritual plane of his or her true destiny. And for this reason they cannot in themselves confer collective destiny upon historical humanity.

To take one example. The absence of governmental restriction so as to foster individual initiative and unencumbered enterprise cannot in itself bring human well-being. Private property and capitalism have their advantages. Private property protects against powerful minorities, against the pressures of mass society, and, finally, against the concentration of economic and political power. Notwithstanding these practical benefits, private property and capitalism are not unqualifiedly good. Private property is not sacred. It encourages those who possess it to concentrate exclusively on their own well-being, to interpret their well-being in terms of economic security and physical pleasure, and to set themselves apart from all others. It disposes people to settle down comfortably in the world, isolated from others, and enclosed within a fortress of material satisfactions. In the parable of the rich man, Jesus showed why private property is not sacred as the fulfillment of destiny:

And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry. But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee . . . (Luke 12:19-20).

Private property thus subverts the true meaning of physical reality. Jesus taught us to pray for "daily bread." It is given as a gift of God. Its true purpose is not mere physical satisfaction. It is God's gift to enable us to fulfill a spiritual destiny.

Capitalism has, indeed, certain practical advantages, such as productive efficiency and freedom from arbitrary governmental interference. But, in the form of money and wealth, it too subverts physical reality. The person becomes defined in terms of his or her wealth, and, in the independence and security that wealth supposedly provides, appears to be securely and unassailably established. Since money brings a variety of physical possessions and services, it adds to the charm of ownership the allure of power. It is not surprising, then, that the New Testament says that "the love of money is the root of all evil" (1 Timothy 6:10).

There are forms of the exercise of liberty that lead to social injustice. The unhindered freedom of individuals with power and opportunity provides the occasion for the concentration of wealth in the hands of the fortunate and the exploitation of the disadvantaged. And this injustice and inequality, in turn, call for social transformation.

In our time, two important forms of social transformation have occurred. They are, first, Marxism, and, second, democratic socialism.

Marx sympathized deeply with the downtrodden and disinherited. He believed that private property was the principle source of social evils. It is the basis of class conflict and the exploitation of the disenfranchised by those with social standing and power. Thus, private property must be eliminated.

For Marx, social justice is to be created by the revolutionary activity of a world-redeeming class, the proletariat. Previous revolutions, he said, had only succeeded in establishing the dominance of one class over another class. What is required, however, is the transformation of humanity, so as to bring justice and community into historical reality. These can come, however, only as the principle of exploitation is eradicated from human affairs. Since private property and capitalism are the cause of the exploitation, they must then be eliminated.

Marx's social transformation by revolution, in theory aimed at liberation, naturally leads to despotism, as the Stalin era so eloquently witnesses. The single individual does not necessarily matter. Thus the individual is disinherited in favor of the classless society and must be treated as but a means to an end. The initiative of the individual, accordingly, is markedly diminished and in many cases even destroyed. The erosion of individual integrity leads, ultimately, to the erosion of society itself. All this, too, has been made clear in recent months, with the breakdown of the Soviet society and economy.

In the American experience, social transformation has been effected through the extension of democratic socialism. Its aim has been the reduction of the exploitive excesses of wealth and power and the creation of liberty and equality for the masses.

Today it is easy to assume a sense of superiority as we view the eclipse of Soviet communism. The absolute value of individual liberty, particularly its economic implications in

terms of individual enterprise and the free- market economy, appear demonstrably substantiated. Nevertheless, there are certain considerations with respect to our own history and time that must give us pause.

If Marx is guilty of simplification in regard to his theory that capitalism is the cause of exploitation, that simplification does not justify us in making the assumption that capitalism, as an extension of individual liberty, is free of any deficiency.

In the American effort to limit the unbridled extension of economic liberty, with its accompanying exploitation of the disinherited, the creation of liberty and equality for the masses has not been without serious defect. For many Americans liberty means nothing more than crass self-indulgence. Life becomes but an affair of security, comfort, and convenience. Although liberty provides the only ground upon which community can be secured, liberty has not brought community to America. Unchecked capitalism still creates exploitation and injustice. Community is the search for truth, and such search is woefully lacking today. We are witnessing a powerful undermining of social relations, of moral standards, and a vulgarization of language and literature. We are not far from becoming an atomized and degraded people, given over to the consumption of physical goods for the sake of self- indulgence. In some fundamental sense, the drive for equality has had this negative outcome.

Alexis de Tocqueville visited America in the early nineteenth-century. From this visit he wrote his masterpiece, Democracy in America. He saw that equality did not inevitably bring undesirable results, but that if Americans were not alert equality would not be an unmixed blessing. He saw that equality could set up conditions that would lead to a desolate form of existence, where people are moved largely by monetary and hedonistic impulses and lacking in many of the disciplines and satisfactions of traditional civilization.

"Mass society," which Tocqueville described, fuses the oppressors and victims. It creates, as he pointed out, a "tyranny of the majority." The only authority becomes an impersonal "everyone," who with but a gesture, dominates over the will and conscience of the individual. The rule to be obeyed is social censure. This tyranny of the majority extends also to government. When the institutions of government are dominated by popular pressures, government can no longer function on the basis of careful consideration but must yield to the unreflective dictates of mass society. Democratic rule then becomes popular despotism.

Mass society leads to alienation: the alienation of the individual from society, and, finally, to the alienation of the individual from himself. Social relations become intrusive and uniform. There is little room for the individual and the reflection of the isolated individual. Conformity, not communication, becomes the bond of society. In these various ways, the masses can destroy the very liberty that it seeks. All this Tocqueville saw, when he said that in democracies:

to live at variance with the multitude is, as it were, not to live. The multitude requires no laws to coerce those who do not think like themselves: public disapprobation is enough; a sense of their loneliness and impotence overtakes them and drives them to despair (Democracy in America, II, 261.)

"We had been hoping," hoping for deliverance. But, as with the disciples of old, our hopes have not been realized. Why is this so?

We must realize that our hopes are not in our own hands and doings. Too long have we thought that the solution to our personal and social difficulties lies within us, within our human virtue and competency. Our human pride causes us to believe, mistakenly, that we can come to an objective understanding of society and that our knowledge can, sooner or later, effect a cure of our ills. Thus Marx thought that private property and capitalism were the causes of human suffering. And in America we have supposed that the spread of liberty, with private property and capitalism as its allies, would eventuate in the good society. In both cases the analyses and proposed solutions have, as we have indicated, failed to bear fruit.

The difficulty lies elsewhere, and not in any particular theory of property or economic liberty, be it communist or capitalist. The difficulty lies in the nature of human nature, in a flaw of humanity that mishandles any theory of society. Yes, "we had been hoping," but now we know that our hoping has been falsely secured.

As were the early disciples, we need to be overtaken by the Stranger on the Emmaus road. If we will listen to what the Stranger says, we may find direction for our lives, both in our individuality and in our larger history. What does he have to say to us? Does he have the key that is able to unlock the mystery of our lives and offer the promise of a destiny that replaces mere fate? What is that key?

In that long ago time, the Stranger reminded the pilgrims of the road that individual and historical redemption cannot be achieved by anything that man can do. But He gave them the key. The key is found in two words that he spoke. Those words are suffering and glory.

Referring to the ancient scriptures, the Stranger spoke of his sufferings, that these are the saving work of the Messiah. He spoke, further, of the glory to which suffering yields, the glory even of his suffering, which makes him the captain of salvation, "bringing many sons unto glory" (Hebrews 2:10).

Perhaps no sentence so eloquently pictures the essential meaning of Christianity as does the words of the Emmaus Stranger: "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?" The words signify the Christian interpretation of human kind and human history. Its essentials are Crucifixion and Resurrection. It is precisely these realities that, in contrast to human plans and programs, bring the hope that humanity longs to enjoy as a present possession.

Crucifixion. Thus, in the first place, crucifixion is the route that leads to deliverance.

The radical flaw in human nature, which subverts any theory and practice of society--communist or capitalist--is human sinfulness. Sin causes social transformations to end in despotism, be it the despotism of a dictator or the despotism of the masses. Sin causes the extension of liberty and equality to end in the insipidity, artificiality, and degradation of mass culture.

At its root, sin is the disposition of selfishness. The acts of sin all stem from this dispositional root. It is the principle of self-aggrandizement that causes people to misuse property and capital by restricting their benefits to the self and thereby fostering the unjust distribution within society of the necessary conditions of human existence. This propensity of fallen human nature is also the reason that liberty and freedom are mishandled so as to eventuate both in the exploitation of others less fortunate and in the shallowness and degradation of mass society. These are considerations that, as we have seen, are particularly apropos to our own American experience. But they are equally valid with respect to communist societies. The ideals of community, which lie at the heart of Marxism, are likewise subverted by sin and greed, with the result that individuals--both the governors and the governed--carry little or no responsibility for the common good. The recent events in the Soviet Union attest to this truth. Again, given the character of human nature, no political theory will suffice to bring deliverance to human kind.

The sinfulness of human character is a given. It is for this reason that in any society and government there will be ineradicable ambiguities. Given the human condition, government is a necessity, and with government comes coercion. Certain limits must be imposed upon people, so as to insure even a minimal condition of liberty and freedom for all. This means, accordingly, that people must, in many respects, be viewed as means and not as ends. To treat people as means is to classify people into various groups and classes--those who benefit and those who do not benefit the aims of society and government--and thereby to create injustice and inequality. In some fundamental sense, society and government transgress upon the value and integrity of individuality.

Thus there is a realism regarding human nature and society that must be acknowledged. This realism raises the question, therefore, as to the social and political meaning of Christianity.

In the first place, Christianity has to acknowledge this realism. Deliverance from ambiguity and suffering, individually and socially, is not possible on the plane of temporal history. Yet, to this realism there is a counter-pole of idealism. It consists in Christian attitude: the attitude of isolation and availability. Isolation is the renunciation of, and deliverance from, the perspective of "the world." Availability is the readiness to engage, where it is possible, in the effort to alleviate the sufferings of others.

Crucifixion is the power that effects this isolation and availability. The Emmaus Stranger spoke to the hope for deliverance, not in terms of earthly glory, but in terms of earthly sorrow and suffering. He spoke words that addressed the problem of the suffering of the people of that ancient time. Do his words speak to us today? What is the import of the Cross, its agony and death, for modern Christians?

Perhaps our contemporary situation is not far different from the situation that the people of ancient Israel faced. We, as were they, are faced with social and political structures that bring suffering and loneliness. While nature is to some extent humanized by science and technology, it is still finally alien to us, e.g., death. We stand in community with all peoples of all times in the anxiety of finitude. The forms of suffering change with the ages, but the essential structure of suffering remains intact regardless of the exterior historical patterns. The genius of Christianity is that it reaches, beyond the outer forms, to the essential structure of our human predicament and offers saving hope.

Jesus' way of salvation is the way of the Cross. Here, on the lonely hill of Golgotha, is found God's deepest identification with the suffering of humanity. The Cross is the display of Jesus' own self-giving love for others, persisting even in the radical failure to achieve its intention and holding to its course when those whom it serves reject its saving offer. Jesus' Cross means that within the limits of human history redemption cannot be achieved by any act of heroic transcendence of our finitude, but only in the self- surrender of our finitude in the selfless service of love.

Yet the Cross means more than this negativity of finitude. It means the refusal to give evil the same status as the good. Jesus willingly accepted his radical failure, his historical fiasco, and entrusted it all to his Father, who, in His transcendent providence, promises to bring that salvation and wholeness that love, in the crucible of finitude, can never by itself bring to pass.

All this is the meaning of crucifixion. This it meant for Jesus, and this it means for us today as Christians. Christianity is not a message that is to be believed, an "outer" truth that is to be intellectually accepted. Primarily, it is an attitude and way of life. It is a living stance in which the individual is at the disposal of others, loses oneself to others. It is a "conversion" enabling an individual to work through all anonymous social and political structures for the happiness, the goodness, and the truth of all mankind. Christianity is an experience of faith and it becomes a message offering a new life experience to others who, within their own experience, hear it and rejoice in it.

We have earlier mentioned that the aims of liberty, equality, and social transformation, while containing seeds of fruition, nevertheless contain seeds of decay. Nothing that we can do promises to bring deliverance from suffering. But we do not need to look afar to find the springs of deliverance. Living at the disposal of others is the only means by which the excesses of liberty and equality can be mitigated and a more merciful and just human order be established. And this work is not our own; it is the work of God and His gift of grace. We may be, to be sure, participants in this work, by turning from preoccupation with self and becoming available to others. But to our resource is added the resource of grace.

Resurrection. In some fundamental sense, social transformation aims at resurrection. It is a call to remove the old oppressive conditions and to replace them with new beneficial ones. Social transformation aims at the historical resurrection of humanity.

These days we hear much about the "good society." However, it is doubtful that this is a human possibility. Indeed, the terms are probably self-contradictory, and this for the reasons discussed in the foregoing. This observation is reinforced by a consideration of social justice. Ideally, perfect justice requires that every person be treated as an end rather than as a means. However, given the physical conditions underlying society, this is impossible. The practical aims of society entail infringement upon justice. For example, a market economy, which seems to be a necessity for creating wealth, leads to injustices, reducing human beings to producers and consumers--that is, treating them as means. Further, the standards of justice are themselves in conflict. If everybody were treated equally, injustice would be done to those who, for reasons of

intelligence, discipline, and other legitimate qualities, merit an especial consideration. As Plato and Aristotle pointed out, justice entails injustice.

A visionary ideal of perfect justice, of a perfect world order, is, accordingly, unrealistic. But this does not mean that we should come to terms with particular forms of injustice. On the contrary, it is incumbent on us to right particular wrongs as they become evident. This, rather than an abstract vision, is the truth of Catholic liberation theology. In fact, this is a biblical injunction:

> He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God (Mica 6:8)?

If, then, the "good society" is beyond human reach on human terms, in what then can we hope? We cannot hope for human fulfillment in historical terms.

Societies seem to be permanent. In this regard they seem to be in fundamental contrast to individuals. However, when we think about it, societies are really impermanent. We need only to think of the great societies that once flourished in the past and are now forever gone. Most of us believe, probably, that our own American society is durable, if not immortal. Yet, if history is any guide, our own society will itself vanish. To exempt it from the fate of the ages is but a pretentious assumption. To this historical evidence, Christianity adds the explicit teaching that all societies are impermanent.

The only condition under which history is meaningful is that it end in eternity. Human personality is transcendent in that its ultimate concern is for things that do not vanish with the passage of time. We have an indefinite capacity for imagination, we are dissatisfied with all finite ideals and values, we long for and are fitted for eternity. We are strangers in a temporal landscape. Unless history itself ends, our lives in history are meaningless. And this means that unless history ends, history too is senseless. History has meaning only as it leads into eternity. This is the meaning of Jesus' proclamation of the Kingdom of God, that all history will end in the manifestation of God's sovereignty and righteousness. This Kingdom, Jesus said, is even now at the point of breaking in upon the affairs of humanity.

For history, then, resurrection must be other-worldly and transcendental. And it must be so for the individual.

Resurrection fulfills the meaning of crucifixion. Without resurrection, the meaning of crucifixion for the individual would vanish. At this juncture, however, caution must be exercised.

For Jesus, the Resurrection does not mean that something lacking in the earthly life of Jesus was corrected. The New Testament emphasizes repeatedly that the life of innocent suffering for others is valid in and of itself and does not need further revision. On the contrary, the Resurrection means that God has acknowledged what Jesus already was before and in his death, the innocent sufferer who was the Son of God. Of this resurrection Paul writes (Romans 1:3-4):

> Concerning his son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh;

And declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.

The Cross is a witness to God's concern for humanity. It is the symbol of the resistance to the point of death against the alienation of our human history of suffering. Yet to the Cross must be added the Resurrection. If the last and final words were "Christ crucified, dead, and buried," then, Paul writes, "is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain" (1 Cor. 15:14).

As the three neared the village of Emmaus, the Stranger proposed to go farther. He was persuaded, however, to tarry in Emmaus and take meal with the two pilgrims. In a manner reminiscent of the Last Supper, "he took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight" (Luke 24:30-31).

Yet, as he vanished from physical presence, the Stranger became spiritually visible to faith. "Were not our hearts on fire?" For them, the Resurrection meant that the saving presence of God, hidden before, continues in Jesus, despite his earthly death. It means this for us today. The Resurrection means hope. The Resurrection means a new way of life, born of grace, in which God is experienced as the source of all salvation and of all joy.

Since the Resurrection is the sign that suffering will not have the last word, the Resurrection summons Christians to liberating action in the world. It is the call for newer and richer ways of life for all mankind.

Yet, there is a realism that must be recognized. Christianity does not promise the redemption of history on the plane of history. What it does provide, however, is the power to lift the spirit in the assurance that we are forgiven and the victory finally won. The Resurrection means that the power of sin has been broken, that the springs of our nature have been cleansed. From this cleansing of the springs there flows healing waters. The Christian is watchful and available. Jesus' parable of the Good Samaritan tells us what is required of human beings. The Good Samaritan saw someone in need and helped him--no one in particular, no one of high repute or great wealth, simply "a man." Love is simply helping one's neighbor. And one's neighbor is anyone in need whom you happen to encounter. The parable transfixes both selfishness and abstract humanitarianism.

The Resurrection assures us that the final victory is won, but not won in history or in historical terms. In its assurance that death and suffering are not the last word, the Resurrection means that history will end, and its meaning become manifest in the person of Christ, coming "in a cloud with power and great glory." Beyond the vivid imagery, the truth is that in its own terms history stands under God's judgment and that its meaning lies in the eschaton. Nothing of earth is of absolute value or capable of making history meaningful. For history to have meaning, it must end. The ending, however, cannot be the ending of history in history, for that would mean the loss of all historical significance, the loss of all value, the good of humanity thrown into the dark void of annihilation. The ending of history must be beyond history. It must issue into the eternity of God's everlasting companionship with humanity. For this, the Resurrection stands as guarantee.

The Resurrection is the guarantee that time is cradled in eternity, that history is redeemed in transcendence.

The Cross and the Resurrection: these are the great beacons of light and hope.

In the cross of Christ I glory,
Towering o'er the wrecks of time;
All the light of sacred story
Gathers round its head sublime.

John Bowring.

* * * * * * *

Article 4
"PARTAKERS of HIS HOLINESS"
(Heb. 12:10)

The experience of entire sanctification is, without a doubt, "the central idea of Christianity." So highly does God regard the holiness of man, that nothing short of man's creation in His own image was ever considered by Deity when, from the council chambers of eternity, the most Holy One launched the plan of redemption for the human race. But the history of the holiness of man is even more complex than this. God knew that man would fall and lose his holiness, but He so longed for children, like Himself in nature, that before He created man He designed a plan by which His children could be restored to that state from which they fall. In the light of this, it is evident that Jesus died essentially to make men holy. Any lower standard of grace as salvation's moral ultimate is not consistent with Jesus' death nor the will of God for us.

We are becoming too accustomed to "being sanctified," while we do not conceive of what is really involved, doctrinally or practically, in that experience. Much of our so-called sanctification is but a logical procedure, followed by human emotionalism which is mistaken for the witness of the Spirit. We mentally consecrate; mentally acknowledge that "the altar sancti fies the gift," and conclude, therefore, that we are sanctified; but sanctifi cation goes deeper than this, and does deeper things for one. It takes us, in our act of consecration, and fully carries us away in the will of God. It is an experience in which we experience "the exceeding greatness of his power" as that power purges the soul from all sin. It is a Divine reality.

The essential thing that is done in that experience, in which the Holy Ghost comes to abide personally in cleansing power, is stated in the verse under consideration. A correct conception of this Scripture will qualify this experience as to what it is.

First: Sanctification is a crisis experience in the life of the saved believer. Men cannot grow sin out of their hearts--it must be taken out. We wish especially to notice here the relation which the chastisement of the Father has to the experience by which we partake of His holiness. Ever and anon you will hear it preached that tribulation comes to make men holy, and it may seem to some that this Scripture teaches this, for it says, "that we might be partakers of his holiness." It

is true that tribulation and chastisement do relate to holiness, but not in a way as to actually produce holiness. Do not be deceived. Holiness is produced only as God actually and directly produces it in the heart.

When the Lord saves a person, He does not stop there, but looks forward to the time when that person shall become sanctified. He therefore dis ciplines His sons, which discipline, though it does not actually produce holiness, relates to holiness. Chastisement is not done for holiness, but for the benefit of the experience by which we are made holy.

In the original Greek there are two methods of expressing purpose. The simple purpose clause denotes that action is carried on to produce a certain result and state. If this method were used here we could well conclude that men were made holy by, and in, chastisement. But this is not the case. The other method used expresses purpose also, not for a simple resultant state, but for the benefit of another verb action, which verb action in turn produces the condition and state.

This passage literally reads, "but he for our profit, that he might get into the act by which we might be partakers of his holiness." (The verb also denotes instant action). Chastisement is not designed to make men holy; it is designed only that God might get into the act of sanctifying.

Second: In that experience, men actually receive the holiness of God. Christian holiness does not consist of mere power, an imputed righteousness, a mere human effort of self-planned dedication, or any such like. It consists of the holiness of God. To have this experience, it is imperative that men bear His image.

In the Greek Testament there are three words which are translated "holiness." Hagiasmos refers to that holiness, or sanctification, which, as an experience to receive and life to live, men are exhorted to follow (see Heb. 12:14). HagiDsun_ refers to that holiness which is an attribute of God's nature and cannot be taken or separated from Him. It is because Jesus had this holiness, that He was resurrected from the dead (see Rom. 1:4). We cannot have this holiness, for it is inseparably attributed to God. Hagiot_s, the word used here, is a holiness which is attributed to God, but declared to exist abstract from Him, though that method of existing does not in any way destroy the fact that it is God's. One's face cannot be separated from him-- it is inseparably his. His image in a mirror is just as much his, but it exists apart from him. The holiness here mentioned is God's, but it is to exist apart from him--in the hearts of His children, the image of Himself. Holiness instantly and definitely wrought, is "the recovery of the lost image of God" (Steele).

Dear reader, the sanctified heart bears and reflects the image of a holy God as does the mirror reflect your image. When God looks into your heart, can He see His holiness?

* * * * * * *

Article 5
THE SANCTIFIER AND THE SANCTIFIED

And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth. -John 17:19

For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren. -Hebrews 2:11

These two texts--the one penned by the disciple who so loved his Lord that he was able to speak of the Savior's innermost heart; the other, written to the Jewish Christians by, perhaps Paul, to reinforce their Christian determination--coalesce in portraying the self-sanctification of Christ for His redemptive work that is to issue in the sanctification of His people. At first glance, it would appear unthinkable--even unimaginable--that there could be such a thing as the union of Christ and His saints in the work and process of sanctification. But the Scriptures assert that this is the case. It is the purpose of this discussion to explore the meaning of this most glorious truth and reality.

There are two meanings of the term "sanctify." The term is hagiazo, which means "not of the earth." The term signifies, first, to consecrate, to set apart from ordinary things and to devote to God. And, second, it signifies to make holy or pure.

Now, the self-sanctification of Christ, recorded in our first text, John 17:19, denotes sanctification in the first sense, that of consecration. Clearly, sanctification in the moral sense of purification is not meant. Christ was holy. He could not by an inward effort make himself holy, for He was that already.

The word "sanctify" is used in the Old Testament. At the time of Israel's deliverance from Egypt, the blood on the lintel of the house protected the eldest son from the plague of death. Consequently, the eldest son was regarded in a special light: as set apart, devoted to the lord, and redeemed. The term used to express this fact is sanctify.

This word is also found in Exodus 29:44, in connection with consecration of the tabernacle and the priesthood: "And I will sanctify [qadash] the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar: I will sanctify also both Aaron and his sons, to minister to me in the priest's office."

The sacrificial idea is uppermost in the self-sanctification of Christ. His self-sanctification is His consecration to the redemptive work to which His Father has consecrated Him. Christ is hallowing Himself, to the point of death, in service to the will of the Father. The Savior is both Priest and Victim, dedicating Himself in self-sacrificial love at the climax of His consecrated life in behalf of His disciples and all those who would follow His way in an unborn future. His prayer is that they might share in this sanctification, that they, too, might dedicate themselves in sacrificial service to the good of others. This is the union of the Sanctifier and the sanctified. Their sanctification means that they drink of His cup and are baptized with His baptism, that they are crucified with Him and rise again with Him in the new life of renewal and service.

The English translation of John 17:19 may be somewhat misleading. The second clause, "that they also might be sanctified through the truth," suggests that the two sanctifications, that of the Sanctifier and that of the sanctified, are the same. Both are sanctified through the truth.

Now, indeed, there is an identity of sanctifications here. But it is not the identity of sanctifications in the subjective, or moral, sense of purification or cleansing. For, as we earlier observed, Christ was not in need of this element of sanctification.

In two verses above, i.e., John 17:17, Jesus prays: "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth." The expression, "through thy truth," is "in the truth" (en te aletheia). The presence of the definite article, "the" (te) indicates that the truth is the agency of sanctification. Then, continuing His prayer, Jesus says: "thy word is truth." In this clause, the definite article is absent before "truth" (aletheia). "Thy word is" not only true, but "truth." The Word is the Word of the Father. The Word of the Father is "the Word" (the Logos) of John 1:1: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." To Thomas Jesus declared: "I am . . . the truth" (John 14:6). Thus Christ Himself, through His Spirit, is the truth that sanctifies.

Thus our sanctification "through the truth," as it reads in John 17:19, and which we are to share with Christ, is not sanctification in the sense of purification. We do not share in the divine agency of sanctification, as such. Our share in our receiving cleansing is our consecration. But we are to share in Christ's self-sanctification in this sense of consecration. The consecration effected in us is to correspond with Christ's consecration in self-sacrificial love. As was He, so must we be sanctified, or consecrated, "verily and indeed." That this is the meaning in John 17:19, where we are united with Christ in sanctification, is indicated by, now, the absence of the article before the expression, "in truth" (en aletheia) . The language is: "that they also might be sanctified in truth," i.e., sanctified truly, "verily and indeed."

Nevertheless, our sanctification, as self-consecration in correspondence with Christ's self-consecration, requires for us something additional. We cannot participate in Christ's self-sanctification of John 17:19 unless we become sanctified in its aspect of purification, of cleansing. We cannot share in the sacrificial import of Christ's self-sanctification, His high devotion to the spiritual, unless we find the cleansing of the inner springs of our lives. Christ's self-sanctification, then, has for its ultimate effect our sanctification as purification.

Hebrews 2:11 carries forward this thought of the unity of the Sanctifier and the sanctified: "For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one."

Hebrews 2:10, speaks of two parties: the "Captain" and the "sons." The Captain is the Archegos, the Leader, the one who goes in advance. The sons are those who are led by the Captain. Further, the Captain is described as "the captain of . . . salvation;" and the sons, as those whom the Captain leads "unto glory."

In verse 11, these subjects are resumed under different designations. The "Captain of salvation" is now referred to as "he that sanctifieth" and "the sons led to glory" are now referred to as "they that are sanctified." The sons are led to glory by being sanctified, and he that leads them to glory does so by Himself sanctifying them.

The expressions, "he that sanctifieth" and "they who are sanctified," are present participles having the definite article. They therefore become substantives, stressing the individuality of the parties and designating them according to their relative positions.

Now, in this passage, as in all other passages in Hebrews, the verb sanctify has its fundamental meaning of consecration. It denotes a state opposite to that of common, i.e., a state befitting the nature of God, to be for God's service. The "Captain of salvation" is thus the Sanctifier as consecrated to His sacrificial work of redemption. "For their sakes I sanctify myself" (John 17:19). The "sons that are led to glory" are they who are set apart for God and His service. They are those who are brought into a new relation to God, "hallowed for glory" through redemption.

The key term here is glory, for glory pertains to both the Captain who, as the Sanctifier, leads and the sons who, as the sanctified, are led.

Verse 8 of Hebrews 2 indicates that glory for humanity means preeminence in creation. Now, this preeminence requires an absolutely universal subjection, so that everything obstructive to that glory is subdued. This means, finally, that death itself must be overcome; it must no longer tyrannize over humanity's estate, the birthright of divine creation. In the end, humanity must be set apart, consecrated, sanctified, hallowed for glory!

And there is a certain glory that pertains to the Captain, the Leader, the Arch gos. For He is now, as was created humanity, "crowned with glory and honour." He is crowned with glory. But what is this crown of glory with which the Captain of salvation is crowned by the Father?

Verse 9 says that there are two actions that pertain to Jesus, the "Captain of salvation." They concern the same time-frame in His life. He is "made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death" and he is "crowned with glory and honour." The crown of glory that He wears is not the crown of His heavenly state. It is the crown of His cross!--"that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." He is crowned in order to taste death. This crown He willingly accepts from the Father. To this He sanctifies, consecrates Himself. Precisely this is His self-sanctification, which he voiced in His magnificent valedictory prayer of John 17:19. And it is precisely this self-sanctification that issues into the authentic sanctification of those whom He leads. He is set apart, crowned with a glory that enables Him to die a death redemptive of those who through that death are now set apart, consecrated, hallowed to a glory that saves from both the fear of death and, in the end, from the fact of death.

We now see that the unity of the Sanctifier and the sanctified involves a contrasting interplay of glory. The crown of glory that enables the Savior to die a redeeming death is exchanged for the grown of glory that enables humanity to recover its lost estate of freedom from servitude--even servitude to death itself. No other transaction--in time or eternity--is of such magnitude or significance.

The transaction is creative of a beloved community--the beloved community of Sanctifier and sanctified.

Hebrews 2:10 amplifies the theme of the solidarity of the Sanctifier with the sanctified. The verse speaks of the common fatherhood of God. He is He "for whom are all things, and by whom are all things." This being the case, why was it necessary for the Father to crown the Son

with the crown of death? Why was it necessary for the Son to sanctify Himself to the point of death, in order to lead the many sons to Glory? How can such a thing be fitting to the God who is sovereign of "all things?"

But, the verse asserts, it was fitting that God should "make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings," in order to bring "many sons unto glory." But why was this appropriate, why did it "become him?"

The answer is, because the Sanctifier and the sanctified "are all of one." This expression, all of one (ex henos pantes) signifies, first, that the Son by eternal generation and the sons by creation are of one Divine Father. This original unity is the ground of the incarnation. However, this is not the unity to which the passage explicitly speaks. Hebrews does not refer to Christ with reference to His eternal being, but only with reference to His incarnation. And human beings are not regarded as sons until they are made so by redemption. It was fitting--appropriate to Deity--to perfect the Archegos through sufferings, because if the lost glory is to be restored to humanity, the Restorer must Himself be subject to the conditions of that lost glory. Suffering and death are the lot of the sons; He that is made the Captain or Leader of many sons to glory can be made complete only by suffering what they suffer. For this reason it became him, the Father, "to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings." So the Father is now positioned together with the Sanctifier and the sanctified within the consecrated circle of redemption. And within that sacred circle, in the embrace of which the Sanctifier and the sanctified are united together, the Sanctifier "is not ashamed to call them brethren." Redeemer and redeemed are "all of one"--of the Father, the Father of the Redeemer and the redeemed.

This redemptive unity of the Sanctifier and the sanctified, embraced in the love of the Father, cannot but entail the fuller, completer sanctification of the redeemed. For it is only as we are pure in heart and affection that we can fully realize the glory of our membership in the City of God and the glory of our restored estate.

And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure. --1 John 3:3

* * * * * * *

THE END