Apostolicity II: How does divine apostolicity affect God's interaction with the world and humanity?

Erwin Samuel Henderson
Fellow, University of Zululand, Kwazulu-Natal, South Africa
Chemin de la Mayre Rousse, 26700 Pierrelatte, France
ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7180-3108
E-mail: erwin@apokatalasso.com

Abstract

Investigating the research question of how divine apostolicity affects God's interaction with the world and humanity, predicates apostolicity as being a divine attribute. The logical extension therefore necessitates consideration of the apostolic attribute as an ontological, Trinitarian and operational characteristic demonstrated in the divine-human inter-relationship. Knowledge was drawn from relevant and authoritative sources: Ancient Near Eastern, Israelite, biblical, Hellenistic, reformation and contemporary theological and scientific. They were examined to accurately articulate diverse academic views, to provide critical appraisal of historical, theological and scientific investigation and theoretical frameworks, axiomatic for current and future research. The research method was of necessity an ontological consideration of the nature of God as a transcendent-immanent and relational reality. Epistemological analysis examines the multiple and developing theories of causation, of divine providence determinist or necessitarian, indeterminist or contingent, or an open participatory view of natural order. Philosophical, theological and scientific paradigms expose the founding theoretical principles confronting positivist-determinist and post-positivist-contingent views, thereafter enabling the proposition of an apostolic paradigm. (Cohen et al., 2018: 3, 5-6, 10, 14, 16, 18, 28, 34). The apostolic paradigm articulates a dynamic relationship to the world and humanity with particular attention to New Testament incarnational Christological and pneumatological parameters that postulate a paradigm change and subsequent rereading of the worldview through apostolic dynamic phases. Herein lies the contribution to the existing body of knowledge and contemporary biblical worldview developments in this field.

Keywords: Apostolicity, Biblical worldview, Providence, Determinism, Causality

Introduction

In response to the research question this article traces significant worldviews, historical axiomatic junctures and pivotal concepts that contribute to the development of diverse perceptions and contemporary understanding. Historical anteriority is found in the 'Ancient Near Eastern' worldview, providing a frame of reference for Yahwistic homogeneity and distinctiveness. Hellenism represents a critical philosophical and theological juncture introducing new paradigms to God-world interrelatedness. The reformation period and modern reformed thought expound the polarisation and subsequent correlation of determinism and contingency in causality that sets the stage for contemporary challenge and recovery of covenant revelation and relationality. The scientific-theological intersection and contribution hypothesizes alternate God paradigms, reciprocated by renewed theological and philosophical investigation. The apostolic view articulates a new covenant and incarnational paradigm and the repercussions to God-world relationality.

Religious observations: Ancient Near East [ANE] – Hebraism - Hellenism
ANE worldview conceptions

The ANE worldview situates within 'cosmos geography' based on observation, experimentation and deduction, in contrast to modern empirical methodology (Walton, 2007).[1] ANE perception of deity is an integrated and intertwined holistic religiosity that provided divine essence to every aspect of life.[2] No polarised or dualist categories, nor spheres of causality, natural law or occurrences existed, (Walton, 2007)[3] providential intervention was therefore irrelevant. "… all duties were to the gods, all events had deity as their cause." The primary interest in the ancient world was metaphysical exploration of the human and divine ontological relationship (Walton, 2007: 87, 181).

Cosmos and creation
ANE distinguishes the precreation or pre-cosmic chaotic state, an unordered, non-functional world from an ordered stable and material world.[4] The causal mechanism by which creation or existence becomes an ordered entity, through the first God and his word, is 'separation', "when no god had come into being and no name had been invented for anything. The first god[5] arises on his own from the primeval waters [separates himself] and then separates into millions" (Walton, 2007: 88, 93).

Anthropomorphism
Anthropomorphistic character traits, rather than resemblances, correlate shared human experiences among the gods, "… the same qualities, good and bad, as humans … they were not better … simply stronger" (Walton, 2007: 103). Capable of the greatest good or evil, "[they] make mistakes and mis-judgments, and even commit crimes … experience uncertainty and confusion" (Walton, 2007: 104).

Ontological Functionality
Decreed functions and roles gave ontological legitimacy and identity to deities rather than personhood, "deity is as deity does" (Walton, 2007: 106). Deities, through specific destinies or jurisdictions administering creation's inherent control attributes or laws [cause], held the cosmos together and maintained order [effect].
ANE teleology seeks all-inclusive coherence and legacy more than historical cognisance, "[the] physicality of the cosmos was instrumentalized by the gods for their purposes" (Walton, 2007: 167).

Cosmic Centrism
ANE philosophy of sacred spaces traversed all eras (Hurowitz cited in Walton, 2007: 119). The conception of every human experience revolving around deity's earthly dwelling and presence, reflected the imperative of order.[6] The temple as deity's earthly residence[7] [micro-cosmos], was symbolic of the heavenly dwelling [macro-cosmos]. This locus represented the economic and moral centre of earthly and cosmic "stability, security, power, control, peace and order" (Walton, 2007: 114, 127-128, 139, 142, 161).[8]

---

[1] ANE methodology predominated till the Copernican revolution. Walton contests empiricism methodology as, deities' involvement in events or outcomes can never be either verified or falsified empirically.

[2] Providing correlation as to origin, association, operation and jurisdiction in spheres of nature, society and governance.

[3] Cosmological considerations were inseparable from the theological or divine. Sacred and secular, natural and supernatural, physical and spiritual … spheres of heaven and earth were intimately interrelated.

[4] The comparison does not refer to the non-material world.

[5] Polytheism fundamentally originates in monotheism.

[6] The system's purpose being the avoidance of chaos.

[7] In the ordered cities too, the cosmos found ultimate expression.

[8] Only in ANE culture does the king play a divine mediatory role with privileged access to the gods and their counsel. His role, maintained order and stability in the cosmos and order in society.

Cultic and Ritual

Cultic and ritual mediated the god's governance. To please and supplicate them produced cosmic and societal stability-order. These rituals were intrinsically egocentric, for one's own benefit[9] "… a mutual meeting of needs by a contented god" (Walton, 2007: 128, 115). What happened in the case of offending the gods? Walton describes, "a fragile symbiosis … [where] high levels of insecurity and anxiety plagued the system" by inherent fear of withdrawal, abandonment in judgment and loss of benefits. There was no certainty about how to appease and please the gods or the king, "they could only adhere to traditions and ride the storm" (Walton, 2007: 144, 131, 137-138, 144-145)[10] regardless of the multiplicity of cultic means available.[11] What was lacking was revelation of the nature of deity, found in Yahwism.

Theodicy and Justice

The ANE response to theodicy, notwithstanding the humanised imperfect nature of the gods, perceived evil more commonly attributed to demons,[12] and injustice to demons, humans and the misfortune of displeasing the gods. Social order was not a moral code of right and wrong [of inner conscience and responsibility], it was a highly regulated ethical system of customs [of external public behavioural codes], social and political governance, creating obligations and sanctions to sustain social order. Connective justice ensures good is recompensed and evil is punished (Walton, 2007).

Divine communication [divination]

Cultic anxiety reflected causality, "all divine action causes material reactions … signs and events …" (Walton, 2007: 249). Lacking knowledge of their gods, understanding, choosing, or avoiding actions in ANE, required the use of magic, omens, incantations, as attempts to coerce communication of the cosmic gods. 'Deductive divination' was crucial as "they had no semiotic system by which to decipher and no hermeneutic of interpretation" (Walton, 2007: 241, 243, 249).[13]

Determinism

Deities' causality accepted, determinism within 'deductive divination' postulates open-contingent, conditional and participatory outcomes. Conditionality and potentiality of forecasting protases [if] and apodoses [then] demonstrate the potential to shape processes. Determinism "… is not inherent in this concept of sign … rather [it] provide[s] divine endorsement or warning …" (Walton, 2007: 268-269).

In conclusion, there are four concepts to classify ANE divine interactions:
1. Intentional, circumstantial or conditional plan.
2. Specific and immutable prediction.
3. Probable identifiable expectations-forecasting-dreams.
4. Knowledge based anticipatory-prophetic prognosis.

Hebrew distinctives and correlations

Analysis of commonality and alterity in Yahwism underscores the uniqueness and incompatibility of deity and divine-human interaction emerging within ANE context and worldview. Four principles explicate these distinctions:

---

[9] Of provision, prosperity, peace, fertility, and justice.
[10] Of wrath, abandonment and exposure to demons.
[11] Divinatory or incantatory customs, ritual offerings, and petitions, were to counter the misfortune that engendered public stigmatisation and estrangement.
[12] The gods' interest was in social order and cultic fidelity.
[13] Deductive divination contrasts with the biblical and warranted inspired or revelatory divination, as by the prophets.

1. Semiotics [contextual perception and sense]: mystical divinatory speculation through phenomena opposes Yahweh's self-revelation, his covenant relationship and purpose.
2. Hermeneutics [interpretation and appropriation]: the speculatory subjective nature of 'deductive divination', contrasts with Yahweh who defines himself, creation, his people, covenant and purpose.
3. Epistemology [knowledge of belief]: a universal pursuit in ANE and Israel.
4. Theology [perception of God]: divination in ANE creates random circumstantial associations whereas covenant conditionality fixes relationship and conduct.

Deity
ANE polytheism concurs with a monotheistic first god, albeit the first of many gods (Walton, 2007: 165-168, 196).[14] Scripture describes an original and unique uncreated Creator of all existence (Clements, 1978).[15] The functional creator fashions order from chaos reducing God to craftsman because of the ANE belief in pre-existent matter. However, from Yahweh proceeds "an absolute beginning of this world," creating being and purpose by the power of His word (Gaebelein, 1979: 291). Yahwism 'de-deifies'[16] the ANE world as humanity enters unmediated relationship with God; the covenant people of God replace god-functionaries, as priestly servants and stewards (Walton, 2007). God revealing His person immediately and supernaturally, His knowability, action and provision substantiate Israel's existential and cultic uniqueness.

Ontology and functionality
The ANE correlation perceived Yahweh functionally, "God brought the cosmos into operation … by assigning roles and functions" (Gaebelein, 1979: 291; Walton, 2017: 183, 190). The Hebrew term ʿbārāʾ' is used uniquely with God as subject, encompassing the original creative act and the formative artisanal act of function, evidenced in the Genesis Creation account (Baker & Carpenter, 2003: 161). In Yahwism functionality proceeds from divine ontology, held in tension without attributing functional precedence nor avoiding correlation.[17]

Covenant
Covenant was a known convention in ANE (Walton, 2007: 92-93; Henderson, 2004: 70-73).[18] Yahweh initiates a theocentric reciprocally responsive and relational covenant community, "… nothing in the ANE … compares to the extent of revelation that Yahweh gives to his people and the depth of relationship that he desires with them" (Walton, 2007: 298).[19] Covenant is an individual, voluntary and responsive, an all of life commitment, which engenders community and responsibility through acceptance of relationship and of binding conditions.[20] It sustains cause-protases [if] and effect-apodoses [then] clauses, "… listening, observing, choosing the path of life, being holy, and obeying" (Walton, 2007: 299). In Kaiser's view, "… promise remained, while the blessing depended on the individual's spiritual condition" (Gaebelein, 1979: 296).

Covenantal self-revelation contextualises transcendence and immanence "… in the temporal reality" (Gaebelein, 1979: 300). God's sovereign freedom to act without constraint or restraint and responsive human freedom co-exist un-contradictorily. Covenant fulfilment occurs through concepts of potentiality, time, conditionality and human responsiveness.

---

[14] Gods function hierarchically according to dwelling places and spheres of jurisdiction in a three-tier conception of the world prevailed: skies, earth, netherworld, corresponding to Rabbinic interpretations.

[15] "I Am who I Am." Ex. 3:14: Eternally existing Creator of all matter in a unique category of being.

[16] The attribution of gods to a function in nature, natural laws and occurrences, is in contrast to a divinised creation.

[17] Yahweh's names reveal his nature [ontology], and specifically his functions [operationality].

[18] Concurring with Akkadian thought. The concept is also found in Hammurabi and Hittite covenants.

[19] "… you will be my people … my treasured belonging … I will be your God ... among you" (Exodus 6:7, 40:34-38; Leviticus 26:12; Psalms 50:7; Isaiah 40:1, 11; Jeremiah 7:23, 30:22; Hosea 11:9; Joel 2:26-27; 2 Corinthians 6:16).

[20] The Pentateuch employs apodictic style of stipulations and sanctions.

Linearity: promises, blessings, and fulfilments

Kaiser contextualises this covenant framework of one overarching plan within the continuum of recurring promises and blessings wherein:

> the linear fulfilments in divine historicity and in humanity [composed] … connected links and divinely appointed [singular] meanings joining … successive series of historical persons and events … to one totalising climatic object, from historical fulfilment to Messianic accomplishment (Gaebelein, 1979: 294, 296, 302).[21]

The risk of over-emphasis of this framework may obscure the primacy of divine self-revelation and action; God in person, real, present, and knowable, the cornerstone for redemptive and historical unity. Clements (1978: 24, 135, 76) advocates "a genuine measure of 'openness'" concerning prophecies that presuppose God's control of nations and creation, as God would give ultimate meaning to his will, "… [a] more open [view] trace[s] [and connects] the broken lines of unity …"

Cultic Ethics and Values

Yahwism contrasts with ANE need-favour ritual care, "the gods had needs, the gods had jobs and the gods had whims" (Walton, 2007: 136, 139-140). Offense and guilt were openly attributed to personal moral conscience, while cultic offerings provide reconciliation, as Yahwism responds to ANE cultic insecurity and indeterminate deductive divination.[22] Israel's institutionalization of covenant, resulted in empty ritualism[23] (Mendenhall, 1975, cited in Walton, 2007).

Distinctively, the integrity of God's person and character was source of Israel's internal moral behaviour.[24] Divine relationality required the integration of justice and uprightness as the means to, and product of, peaceful relating. While ethical-moral purpose was shared, the mode of exteriorisation and politicisation was incompatible with covenant interiorisation.[25]

Clements (1978: 197, 76, 62) anticipates personal and cultic implications of Yahwistic morality becoming an ontological and universal existential concern, "a supra-national reality."

Transcendency and immanence (anthropomorphism)

Immanence, in a revelatory and covenantal context, portrayed a relatable, personified, sensorial individual. God's most powerful expressions were demonstrated through anthropomorphisms,[26] a plethora of expressions, of degrees and forms of intervention. Any analogy must originate in divine personhood to avoid the humanising of God.[27] Clements observes a mutation towards conceptualised, spiritualised and moralised forms of universal and transcendent religious understanding and operation (Clements, 1978: 59).[28] The process caused,

> … a growing loss of faith in the power of the visual and spatial symbolism … [a] progressive rejection of symbolism and its replacement by … theological concepts, was related to the entire rejection by Israel of the use of any image of Yahweh (Clements, 1978: 69).

A doctrine of divine incorporeality, of God's uncreated, transcendent nature resulted (Clements, 1978). Later Haggadah and Rabbinic traditions banished anthropomorphisms "on

---

[21] Kaiser does not accept fragmented multiple meanings and interpretations.
[22] Distinct from ANE cultic magic, images, idols, sexual and ritual immortality.
[23] Summarised from Mendenhall's comparison of Covenant and Law.
[24] "Be holy for I am holy" Leviticus 19:2.
[25] Deuteronomy 6:4-9, 8:2, 10:12, 16.
[26] God planning, willing, relenting, speaking, acting, feeling, etc.
[27] Animal or gender-sexual representations are generally shunned or considered antagonistic.
[28] The Septuagint translation significantly contributed to this, although the personal nature of God required continuity.

objective-theological and dogmatic [grounds]" (Edersheim, 1993: 19), considered "… for the debased mind … [and] only due to the evil of man's heart" (Redford, 1885: 208).

Two historical reasons provide explanation. Firstly, the Babylonian exile and Roman expulsion from the Jerusalem epicentre, caused a re-emphasis of the Abrahamic covenant, "a more subjectively rational and ethical perspective" (Clements, 1978: 102, 45-46). Cultic symbols mutated from immanent experience of divine presence in space and time to transcendent, spiritual-mystical and universal conceptions. Secondly, post-exilic hopes renewed and heightened through eschatological and futurist expectations of unfulfilled prophecies[29] produced a new literary genre, 'apocalypticism' (Emmet, 1918; Edersheim, 1993; Gundry, 1994). Multiple futuristic fulfilment interpretations raised the issue of God's providential control of history. A highly determinist view resulted combined with the longings after the glorious divine immanency of the past (Clements, 1978).[30]

Determinism

Yahweh, cause of original creation and every effect, assigned control attributes, destined by decree, maintained the cosmos, and shaped events, as expressions of his sovereignty. Subsequently, Israel's historiography was self-conscious truth-telling literature, transcendent in perspective and covenant focused, God acting in history, making sense of past-present-future, articulating a meta-history paradigm (Halpern, 1978, cited in Walton, 2007: 233).

Centrism

ANE centrism of deity's earthly dwelling correlates to the Judaic vision of Jerusalem city and temple, a centre for national and religious unification and preservation, from where the nations were directed.

> Without their religion they had no history and without their history no religion … patriotism, religion and hope alike pointed to Jerusalem and the Temple as the centre of Israel's unity … the deepest of all convictions was … their commonality, a creed, a life, a centre, a restorative hope, a scripture, a prayer, a liturgy, the synagogue bond of union worldwide (Edersheim, 1993: 3, 51-52, 58).

In conclusion, Israel's borrowing from ANE traditions requires transformation, reinterpretation, or new alternative concepts in order to respect the analysis of her distinctiveness and Yahweh's uniqueness (Clements 1978; Edersheim, 1993).[31]

Hellenistic continuity-discontinuity

The Hellenist period presented the uncomfortable meeting of Greek philosophy and Judaic religion (Edersheim, 1993)[32] in a struggle for primacy in which Judaic isolationism (Redford, 1885; Edersheim, 1993)[33] and Hellenist ascendant universalism (Edersheim, 1993; Gundry, 1994) were mutually antagonistic. Cicero argues, "… a race distinguished for its contempt of the gods … without any visible symbol, conjoined with an utter rejection of every other form of

---

[29] A hermeneutic concerning both Jewish and Christian interpreters.

[30] Clements suggests a perspective foreign to Hebrew conceptions.

[31] These developments may have enabled the survival of Judaism.

[32] The Midrash includes the Tôrâh and the Mishnah volumes of explication and interpretation. The *Halakh*ah [The Rule of the Spiritual Road] held greater authority than the Old Testament according to Edersheim, to the attainment of perfect righteousness; the Haggadah contained Rabbinic teachers' personal dictums, "ideas, conjectures, or fancies … the miraculous merging into the ridiculous or the revolting …" while holding no authority theologically, was extremely populist.

[33] The worship of the letter of the Law; the self-righteousness, the pride of ascent, of knowledge, of the absolute antagonism to the claims of a Messiah, operated under strict separatism and exclusivism regulated by the Ezrahite seat in Jerusalem and throughout the diaspora, particularly for Alexandrian Jews.

religion … and the refusal even to pay the customary Divine honor to the Caesars" (Edersheim, 1993: 45). Eastern Jews "groping into the past" (Edersheim, 1993: 12) for significance, western Hellenising Jews, contemptuous of the Graeco-Roman ways, yet attracted by the refinement and philosophical thinking, "…yield[ing] themselves … to the spell of Greek speculation," while holding to scriptural authority. The nature of God-world relationality was redefined by the convergence of Hebraic divine revelation with Hellenist philosophies (Hart, 1904: 79; Edersheim, 1993).

Hermeneutics

If Judaic understanding and belief was divinely originated revelation, was not Hellenist philosophical comprehension too if "All truth was of God"? (Edersheim, 1993: 15). Philo's response was 'incorporation', the Law of Moses as synonymous with Law of Nature. Two sources of wisdom, divine and natural, which authenticated Moses as the "teacher … of all Greek philosophers and lawgivers" par excellence and the Pentateuch as "the summit of philosophy" (Philo, cited in Hillar, n.d.).from which they borrowed and integrated its distinctives (Redford, 1885; Hart, 1904).[34]

Firstly, Greek speculation led to the mutation from literal-historical interpretation to allegorical methodology, "ideas … derived from the speculations of heathen philosophers,"[35] deprived … of "real and personal implications because of the concern to universalise … a universal truth communicated to men in every age and every nation" (Redford, 1885: 205, 74, 78, 196-99, 209). Historicity of God's actions was lost through a decultured and denationalised idealisation of "abstract ideas and realities, true to all time and to all nations" (Gundry, 1984: 15, 73).
Secondly, Old Testament scripture underwent a radical rereading, through a deeper mystical, symbolic, allegorical and typological hermeneutic, (Hart, 1904; Gundry, 1984) "everything became symbolical in [Philo's] hands, if it suited his purpose …" (Edersheim, 1993: 19). This hermeneutic reinterpreted "anything unworthy of the Deity, anything unmeaning, impossible, or contrary to reason …" (Redford, 1885: 208; Gundry, 1994: 29). The underlying argument is that the truths of nature cannot contradict the truths of revelation (Edersheim, 1993: 30).
Thirdly, *incorporation* encompassed an admixture of Platonic rational ontology and Stoic moral philosophy. Platonism made every effort to remove inconsistencies with Hellenistic conceptions of deity (Edersheim, 1993), as Greek philosophers hypothesized about the cosmic order [transcendency] rather than providential intervention [immanency] (Frede & Laks, 2002).

Platonism

Plato's first principle was a divinely originated cosmos-world ordered and sustained in an intelligent harmony by divine reason, "the absolute first cause 'self-mover'" (House, 1992: 13-14; Frede & Laks, 2002: 86),[36] analogous with good moral order in human affairs. Humans assumed full freedom and decisional responsibility, limiting or absolving divine responsibility for human misfortune. Divine justice ensured ethical code and moral behaviour by retributive reward or punishment.
The gods care for their property reflected determinate and interventionist providence through omniscient control of human affairs. Plato's 'world-mind' perceived humanity integrated into the whole "a natural world-citizenship"[37] (Frede & Laks, 2002: 93-95).

Stoicism

Stoicism as ethical code was considered compatible with Eastern Judaism (Edersheim, 1993). It retains the ANE and Platonic global rational worldview ordered by god[s] of superior power and higher perfection.[38] Cicero reasoned that the gods' existence and worship on earth

---

[34] For example, Pythagoras and Plato and Aristotle and Zeno.
[35] Redford correlates Hellenization with Eastern theosophy and Persian sources commingled with Christianity, that produced Gnostic heresy.
[36] Reference to Aristotle's Metaphysics 1071-1075, of which Thomas Aquinas was also a proponent.
[37] Social and personal wellbeing are drawn from participation in the whole.
[38] Unlike the ANE humanised and ethically imperfect gods.

required they influence and care for humanity. Providential care or intervention was inherent within nature, "the deification of natural powers and phenomena … an immanent principle in all things" (Frede & Laks, 2002: 112-113).

Humans were integral to the whole, "in a self-administered organic unity" (Frede & Laks, 2002: 101-102, 104-105). Human reason originated from, and reflected divine reason and moral code, manifested through free and intelligent good use of nature's resources.[39]
Determinate providence established patterns of human predictability and rational trajectories. The infinite variables of human freedom were written into "the script of nature … fixed for eternity … [and] providence … unfolding a fixed [all-sufficient] provision …" (Frede & Laks, 2002: 114-115). There is no possibility of someone supervising or saving from self or one's choices.
Plato's from a distance and indirect transcendent providence contrasts with Stoicism's direct and immediate natural immanence. The variable or indeterminist worldview and personal immanent relationality to Deity of Christianity superseded the pessimism of these worldviews (Frede & Laks, 2002; Fox, 2005).

Philo

Within this context, current analysis considers Philo's[40] critical contribution to the God-world inter-relation. His philosophical system hinges upon his doctrine of the Logos, his interpretation of divine existence, nature and action (Hillar, n.d.).

Deity: existence of God.
Philo hypothesizes[41] a transcendent principle of divine unknowability, necessitating the absolute separation between God and matter, a radical departure from Yahwistic conceptions. God exists out with space and time, "his essence, void of definition or genre, beyond human experience, cognition … [or] attribute applicable to the sensible world" (Hillar n.d.: 21.7), "… cognisable only by His indirect manifestations"[42] (Edersheim, 1993: 31). God is therefore estranged, unrelated, and unimplicated, "the God of Philo … was not the God of Israel …" (Edersheim, 1993: 30).

Creation, Sovereignty and Providence.
God is the active cause of the world; matter is perceived as passive and impotent. Providence is God the 'Mind' governing all things (Hart, 1904; Edersheim, 1993). Conceived in the 'Mind',[43] God is conceptual architect of an invisible and eternal archetypal world of unshaped pre-existent matter (Hart 1904; Philo cited in Hillar n.d.: 23.9, 21.7, 25.11).[44] God's estrangement required mediatory 'Potencies' to shape pre-existent matter, forming order from disorder (Redford, 1885; Edersheim, 1993; Hillar, n.d.). Philo's hypothesis failed to recognise the direct original creative act of a good corporeal creation and subsequent relationality.

Anthropomorphisms
Qualitative attributions, of human or divine pathos, character or names, were insubstantial (Edersheim, 1993). God was **"without qualities and unchangeable"** (Redford, 1885: 209; Hart, 1904: 98). Hellenists rejected anthropomorphisms "on subjective-philosophical and apologetic-

---

[39] Stoicism's panentheistic providence provided no grounds for particular or exceptional interventions.
[40] Philo of Alexandria c. 20 B.C.E.—40 C.E.
[41] An amalgamation of Judaic and Hellenist concepts.
[42] Neither Eastern mystical Judaism, the Kabbalah, nor Philo's philosophy could entertain direct contact between God and creation.
[43] Having perceived in the world in his Mind, God made it perceptible only to the intellect, from which proceeded a visible tangible world, the latter created through the Logos-Potency.
[44] The primordial elements being water, air, wind, and fire.

grounds"[45] (Clements, 1978; Edersheim, 1993: 19), justifying Philonic impassibility.[46] Man's end [was] to live in accordance with nature-that is according to his own and that of the universe" (Hart 1904: 82; Philo cited in Hillar n.d.: 19.5).

Potencies
Philo borrows divine qualities and "names" (Redford, 1885: 212; Edersheim, 1993: 31; Hillar, n.d.: 22.8)[47] to theorize six "Potencies" (Hart, 1904: 104; Edersheim, 1993: 32; Hillar, n.d.: 25.11)[48] in two categories, 'creative' divine Logos-Goodness and 'ruling-royal' Authority (Redford, 1885: 212; Edersheim, 1993: 31-32; Hillar, n.d.: 22.8). Only these 'motions' or 'independent beings', engage with matter, and therein define immanence (Edersheim, 1993).

Logos.
Though Platonism spoke of an 'Archetypal Idea', Stoicism of universal impregnating 'Reason', Talmudic Rabbis of 'Hokmah' wisdom and 'Shekinah' divine Spirit, and the Targumim of 'Memra', a hypostasis of God's self-revealing (Redford, 1885: 212, 214; Edersheim, 1993: 33-34),[49] Philo incorporates metaphysical concepts from pantheistic Stoicism[50] to his 'Logos', "God's reason personified"(Redford, 1885: 201, 214; Hillar, n.d.: 21.7, 23.9). The Idea of Ideas, the Form of all Forms, the Word and Deed, the agency and design of all creation, "… [who] converted unqualified, unshaped pre-existent matter, from disorder and confusion …" (Philo cited in Hillar, n.d.: 23.9, 21.7, 25.11), who mediates separateness of God, an instrument of God towards creation, uniting the world.

Philo's ambiguity as to the nature and function of "Logos" (Edersheim, 1993: 31; Hillar, n.d.: 25.11)[51] served to preserve divine impassibility, absolute transcendency and unknowability, "[he] transforms the Stoic impersonal and immanent Logos into a being, neither eternal like God nor created like creatures, but begotten from eternity," a second individual, "a hypostatization of God's Creative Power – Wisdom. The supreme being is God and the next is Wisdom or the Logos of God" (Hillar, n.d.: 25.11).

Divine providential intervention
The world was the sphere of potencies[52] particularly the Logos (Philo cited in Hillar, n.d.);[53] the power by which God made and ordered all things. The 'νοῦς' pervaded the universe, as the human soul, "that nothing either exceeds or is robbed of its due, all being arbitrated by the laws of equality through which things continue eternally" (Hillar, n.d.: 25.11).

> The divine Logos … orders the shifting fates of nations … that the whole world like one city may keep that best of all forms of government, Democracy. Let us have done then with mortal things and strive to have our inward judge - our conscience - favourable, as we may if we never seek to reverse any of his decisions (Hart, 1904: 102-103).

---

[45] Compared to Judaism's rejection on objective-theological and dogmatic grounds.

[46] Covenantal historic Judaism could not completely eliminate anthropomorphic expressions of immanence.

[47] Elohim of Justice, Yahweh of Mercy and Grace.

[48] Edersheim does not enumerate the potencies, however, Hart relates these to human nature on the basis of Philo's interpretation of Noahic texts, "In us there are six things which wage unceasing war, the five senses and the spoken word but the seventh power is that of Mind, which overcomes the others …" In Moses - Shepherd of Israel, Philo refers to human nature as synonymous with the mind and seven other natures: the five senses, the power of speaking and generation. Hillar identifies the Merciful and Legislative.

[49] 'Memra' is distinct from a permanent or substantial manifestation of presence or personhood.

[50] Logos as an extension of the transcendental divinity and anthropomorphic personification of a hypostatised 'Hokmah', of God's activity in Judaism.

[51] Logos described as: of God, the unreal shadow, the man of God, the immanence of God an uncertain reference to eternal generation.

[52] Creative power-Goodness and Royal or Ruling power-authority.

[53] Forming into four primordial elements.

Immanency of the Logos was expressed determinately as a law preventing unbounded dissolution, by binding and joining harmoniously together opposites, reaching to the world's extremities (Philo cited in Hillar, n.d., 25:11).

God-Humanity-Theodicy

The impassible, incorporeal image of God, origin of good, is found uniquely in the archetypal pre-existent or eternal rational soul, the bodiless man comparable only to the Creator, a heavenly man, void of evil corporeality, quality and form[54] (Edersheim, 1993; Hillar, n.d.). True men of God reject earthly corporeality (Philo cited in Hillar n.d.: 18.4),[55] preferring the transcendent archetypal world of incorruptible and bodiless ideas of the 'Uncreated' (Hart, 1904: 96-97, 107-108; Philo cited in Hillar, n.d.: 25.11).[56] Divine Immanence is replaced by the pursuit of a disincarnate reason-soul (Edersheim, 1993; Hillar n.d.). Only through the Logos, which the rational soul of mankind shares, could they know and perceive God (Philo cited in Hillar, n.d.). God being without sin or evil, requires other beings-potencies[57] to bear the imputation of these contrary actions (Redford, 1885; Hart, 1904). Freewill is defined and contained by right reason and rational emotions, "void of the irrational and passional," reflecting divine impassibility (Hillar, n.d.: 30.6, 25.11). This substantiates human responsibility for their own evil [culpability], their own good [laudability] (Hart, 1904). Resembling Logos, the rational soul is to maintain balance between the unbounded-destructive and the powerful-salutary (Hillar, n.d.).[58]

> Man is prone to err in his free choice between good and evil, and the way toward evil in the rational soul must not be created by God through himself. So, God is the cause of all good and of no evil at all; the evil is allotted to his angels or Powers [potencies], which work under his supervision (Hart, 1904: 122-123).

Reformation dialectic

For Edersheim (1993: 39), without a successor, Philo's Hellenism, its message and mission had completed its cycle. However, these core suppositions would prevail, as the reformation era demonstrates through Jacobus Arminius' and Jean Calvin's works.

'Providence', in Calvin's (1599: 127, 132) view,[59] advocates God: Creator, Governor, and Preserver, actively operating continual control or overruling of all creation[60] according to his will, "… his Providence being a Law immutable" (Augustine cited in Calvin, 1599: 136).

Arminius responds to the absolute decree of election (Arminius, 1854)[61] and foreordainment, of God as author of original sin, and man's impossibility to resistance God's salvation, on the basis of a gospel call, the promise of full salvation[62] in Christ,[63] and His good pleasure (Arminius, 1853: 217, 222). Wisdom, the perfection and efficacy of the cross, God's just position and response to unjust man, establish the divine intention of salvation and goodness, contrary to the preordained will, as "the greatest evil" (Arminius, 1853: 222-223). The early church fathers and confessions substantiate his antithesis:

---

[54] Upon death the eternal soul lives liberated from evil matter and a dead body according to its own distinctive life.

[55] Summarizes Philo's disdain of the material world and physical body, wicked by nature and a plotter against the soul. Philo does not advocate abnegation from life, he accepts a necessary evil, advocating the practical obligations toward men and the use of mundane possessions for praiseworthy works.

[56] Philo refers to the Triad of God in the centre and his two potencies, to his left and right.

[57] The 'we' and 'us' text of the creation of man (Genesis 1, 2), the tower of Babel (Genesis 11), Abraham's encounter (Genesis 18) are identified with other beings, Potencies, agencies, messengers, servants.

[58] The likeness to Logos consists in reflecting 'goodness' and 'governance' potencies that hold the universe together in balance.

[59] Calvin against evolutionary, fortuity, or random suppositions.

[60] Both naturally-generally and supernaturally-specifically.

[61] Some elected to salvation and some to perdition, disjoint from righteousness or sin, obedience or disobedience, denying the possibility and capacity of grace to salvation.

[62] Such as justice, righteousness, repentance and forgiveness, of grace, faith and belief, of power, of God.

[63] Saviour, Head and Foundation.

> This doctrine was never admitted, decreed or approved in any
> Council, either general or particular for the first six hundred years
> after Christ … it neither agrees nor corresponds with the harmony
> of the … [Geneva] Confessions ... in the name of the Reformed
> and Protestant Churches … (Arminius, 1853: 218-219).

The church fathers perceived predestination, as God's "continued activity in the world for the realization of His plan" (Berkhof, 1958: 167). Absolute determinism in knowledge and will, contained in decrees [originating in omniscience and wisdom] revoke the Arminian omnipotent [to execute and act freely according to his will] conception (Calvin, 1599: 132).[64]

Predestination

Predestination is anchored in God and his eternity having for cause, the good pleasure of his will, for purpose, his glory and grace, and for agency, the salvific regeneration in Christ. The reprobation decree from eternity is the divine decision to fix the destiny of unbelievers, rather than a predetermined destiny. Arminius identifies four absolute decrees as, "cause of all good and of our salvation"[65] (Arminius, 1853: 247-250):
1. Jesus-Christ: Son, Saviour, Priest, King to end sin in his death and resurrection.
2. Those received in Christ through repentance and faith to salvation and eternal life, and the unbelieving delivered to their own sin, aliens to Christ.
3. God's sufficient grace, means for choosing His salvation and life.
4. God knows or foreknows those believing and unbelieving.

Providence

Providence according to Arminius is determinist, it "preserves, regulates, governs and directs all things," including the free-will and actions of rational man, "nothing can be done without the will of God," it is however, conform to "… their own essence, qualities, actions, and passions, in a manner … worthy of Himself and … them" (Arminius, 1853: 251).
In Calvin's absolute providence, God by decree and promise inclusively favours one, while excluding others[66] (Calvin, 1599: 44, 128, 198, 203, 208).

Causality and determinism

Arminius (1853: 289-292) argues for a holistic and coexistent efficacious understanding of first and second causes identifying two unified entities,[67] "when all these causes were together appointed, it was impossible for that thing to hinder itself from being produced, and from being brought into existence." Divine decrees bind cause and agency together, in God's internal free action, employing his all-powerfulness to bring into existence [absolute necessity], or by measured agency [contingent necessity], to produce the desired effect (Arminius, 1853: 292-294). God's existence and internal self is absolute necessity, all else is contingent. "God freely decreed to form the world … all things are done contingently in respect to the Divine decree; because no necessity exists why the decree of God should be appointed, since it proceeds from his own … unconstrained will" (Arminius, 1853: 295).

Calvin's absolutism denies temporal contingency[68] in favour of determinist decrees where humans concede passively and subjectively. There are no second causes only a First Cause, "nothing will happen which the Lord has not provided … that which God has determined, …

---

[64] The counsel and will of men are governed so as to take the course of action God has destined.
[65] Of creation, of eternal death and life, of grace and freedom, the person and work of Christ and of man, cause of his own sin and damnation.
[66] Certain ones destined to grace, provision, obedience, perseverance, justification, etc., others destined to deprivation, poverty, disobedience, severity, condemnation.
[67] The academic context of absolute necessity and hypothetical necessity, where necessity [absolute] and contingency [possible] cannot coexist.
[68] Past, present or future.

must come to pass …" [69] (Calvin, 1599: 133). Causal interrelation is core to determinism. If God acts providentially by absolutist determination, "[in] perfect independence, or complete freedom of action", the neutralisation of human innate freedom and power to operate, qualifies as insanity (Arminius, 1853: 524, 296-298). Human freedom can only be explicated from necessity, sin's reign, and misery. Arminius offers a determinism whereby,

> [God] conducts all things in such a manner that when he is pleased to employ his creatures in the execution of his decrees, he does not take away from them their nature … and properties or use … but allows them to perform and complete their own proper motions (Arminius, 1853: 297).

Anthropology
Determinism calls for care of entrusted and subservient life, "if he did not will it, we could not do it … [if] the Lord willed it, it must therefore be borne … the whole comes to this" (Calvin, 1599: 137-138, 140-141). Under providential care, God provides means and abilities as "legitimate instruments of Divine Providence" (Calvin, 1599: 141), while action may be voluntary it cannot be free choosing.[70] Any power, ability or character trait towards good is derived from divine grace rather than natural abilities.
Elect humankind's passivity denies concurrency, it is affected uniquely by the internal Spirit, regenerating, directing, governing and conforming, and the external exhortation of the Word (Calvin, 1599). Arminius, regards human conscious collaboration through uncontradictory contingencies, equally dependent upon divine grace, "the free will of man … has no powers whatever except such as are excited by Divine grace" (Arminius, 1853: 525).

Depravity
The anthropological argument stands upon the universal depravity of man, at variance with divine will, subject to sin's domination, endorsing inescapability, "the whole blame of the rebellion lies in human depravity" (Calvin, 1599: 198, 203-204). Through degeneracy of the original nature in the divine image,

> by his own fault he is stripped of the ornaments in which the Lord at first attired him ... the mind of man is so entirely alienated from the righteousness of God that he cannot conceive, desire, or design anything but what is wicked, distorted, foul, impure, and iniquitous; that his heart is so thoroughly envenomed by sin that it can breathe out nothing but corruption and rottenness (Calvin, 1599: 209-210).

While original innocence did not restrain or hinder man from being moved, impotency to perform good hallmarks the dominion of sin. Only through continuous regeneration in the Spirit, is this image restored to capability and cooperation in, through and with Christ. "Take away free will, and nothing will be left to be saved. Take away grace, and nothing will be left … as the source of salvation …" (Arminius, 1853: 531). Calvin's position however, implies a limited effect of regeneration breaking sin's dominion. Arminius affirms on the grounds of the ministry of Christ and the Spirit, "[man-woman] made a partaker of this regeneration … is delivered from sin … capable of thinking, willing and doing that which is good, but yet not without the continued aid of Divine Grace" (Arminius, 1853: 252-253).

---

[69] That which God has determined, though it must come to pass, is not, however, precisely, or in its own nature, necessary. Calvin seems to concede some contingency albeit ambiguous and interpreted within First Cause determinism.
[70] Calvin correlates free will to merit, contrary to divine grace.

Theodicy

Arminius (1853: 251-252) argues vigorously against God as author of sin. Man's freedom and responsibility therefore concede the permissive will of God, "He only freely permits those which are evil." Divine fore-determination infers God as the author of sin, the first sinner. Absolute determinism renders necessary the sin of man in order to manifest justice, mercy and grace.

In Calvin's determinism the Lord instrumentalizes Satan, evil forces, and evil behaviours "[as] instruments of Divine Providence … employed to execute the Judgments … the legitimate use of their wickedness …" (Calvin, 1599: 138, 148). In God's permissive will, they are governed and serve as his agents "[they] are even forced to do him service … God arms the devil, as well as all the wicked, for conflict, and sits as umpire, that he may exercise our patience" (Calvin, 1599: 140, 142, 145-46). Calvin counters theodicy by distinguishing the permissive will from the decreed precept, thereby attributing justice to God and holding mankind responsible and culpable, "… the same act at once betrays the guilt of man, and manifests the righteousness of God" (Calvin, 1599: 150).[71]

Contemporary orientations

The polarisation in perspectives from this period, finds critical theological and scientific challenges to Hellenist-Reformation determinism, absolutism, causality and contingency, including Yahwistic concepts.

Reformation theological developments

Berkhof (1958: 165-170), in the modern era, postures defence against randomisation,[72] natural law,[73] human self-determination,[74] and pantheistic immanence[75] articulating providence in a determinate interventionist framework,

> God's control of the [whole] universe … special providence, His care for each part of it, [for] those who stand in the special relationship of sonship to God, … in relation to the whole … special combinations in the order of events … in which grace and help come in critical circumstances; preservation … [being the] continuous work of God maintain[ing] the things which he created, together with the properties and powers with which He endowed them … direct[ing] all things to their appointed end (Berkhof, 1958: 165, 168, 170).

Berkhof's (1958: 166-167) theory composes three axes: preservation [ontology], concurrence [operation-economy], and government [teleology].

Deity

All created entities are distinct from and dependent on God for 'preservation' of being, active and passive properties and operation[76] (Berkhof, 1958). Gore, suggests God's ontological self-determination and freedom to operate are key to resolving the Hellenist determinist-indeterminist tension (Gore, 1997: 75, 79).

Causality

Theism generally perceives God as the universal First Cause that determines all human actions (Atkinson & Field, 1995: 395-396). Causal articulation remains undefined, founded

---

[71] The examples given to justify are: God and Judas' role in Christ's betrayal and crucifixion.
[72] Epicurean and Nominalist ideas of chance and the Stoics notions of fate.
[73] Pelagianism's natural life, compounded by Deism's theory of divinely independent absolutist natural laws.
[74] Socinian and Arminian principles of human self-determination.
[75] Liberal theology's pantheistic interpretation of God's immanence by incorporation or absorption into nature.
[76] Distinct from independent self-subsistence and self-sustenance.

upon foreknowledge and decree, rather than the Person of God. The Westminster Confession accords latitude to secondary causes,

> In relation to the foreknowledge and decree of God, the first cause, all things come to pass immutably and infallibly, yet, by the same providence, he ordereth them to fall out according to the nature of second causes, either necessarily, freely, or contingently. God, in his ordinary providence, maketh use of means, yet is free to work without, above, and against them, at his pleasure (Westminister Confession, 1643: 9.V.2-3).

Berkhof advocates, God's operative power in every act 'concurrent' with the creatures' inherent capacity; an egress, avoiding polarisations: active-passive, divine-human mutual independence or pretentions of absolute sovereignty, postulating divine will and power as first cause, "God causes everything in nature to work and to move in the direction of a predetermined end … there is not a single moment that the creature works independently … of God" (Berkhof, 1958: 172-173).[77]

Human causal properties and capacities establish freedom and responsibility, operate collaboratively, not contrarily, with the First Cause. The multiplicity of divine contingencies distinguishes God's immediate and mediate operations, supportive of the genuine determinate nature of a person's actions, "… the operation is the product of both causes. Man is … the real subject of the action" (Berkhof, 1958: 173, 170-171).[78] Gore (1997: 75-79) emphasises unrestrained agency and legitimacy of human action within God's decretive will.[79]

Providential Operation

Divine 'government', is the immediate and mediate universal rule through divine kingship,[80] mediately through: natural laws governing creation, laws of the rational mind governing the rational world, and immediately and morally by the Spirit (Berkhof, 1958). The communicable will refers to believers as co-administrators or stewards, "living and making decisions even as God Himself" (Gore, 1997: 77).[81]

Berkhof (1958: 176) suggests two categories of providential operations, although three distinctions exist: 'ordinary',[82] 'extraordinary',[83] and 'supernatural' providence.[84] He revokes Augustine's assertion that extraordinary and supernatural are laws of nature unknown to human reason, (Ritchie, 2017) on the grounds of supernatural means in redemption.

Theodicy

Berkhof maintains, solely through the 'permissive will' *can* sin not be attributed to God, though he restrains and overrules. Gore (1997: 78-79), revokes permissive legitimacy on determinate and decretal grounds,[85] "… there is no room for permission. God who ordains all things,

---

[77] Berkhof subtly seeks to reconcile the polarisation of Calvin's divine volition and Arminius' divine omnipotence from the preceding section.

[78] Berkhof distinguishes human causality in reformed thought distinct from Calvinism in that God is first cause and man, second; similarly, the acceptance of contingencies.

[79] Gore elaborates seven dimensions of the divine will: 1. Decretive, 2. Preceptive, 3. Permissive, 4. Moral, 5. Communicable, 6. Secret, 7. Revealed.

[80] In reference to King and Kingdom.

[81] Preceptive and moral will originate in God as absolute good, requiring the responsive obedience to moral and covenantal responsibilities, made possible through the restored image of God, obedience to the written word and the operation of the Holy Spirit.

[82] Congruent with the second causes of nature.

[83] An immediate work utilizing the forces in nature to extraordinary effects.

[84] The direct operation of the power of God emanating freely from Himself, wherein the laws of nature or humankind are superseded rather than violated.

[85] Decrees [secret or revealed] originate in the counsel of God requiring execution, through God in space and time.

including the permissive [and certain] activities of men…" (1997: 79).[86] The ontological and theological dilemma of God, or the regenerate believer, being author and practitioner of sin[87] contradicts the determinate theory. Herein lies the dilemma of Calvin's determinism and of Arminius' requirement on the contingent grounds of human responsibility.

Anthropological considerations

Karl Rahner's contemporary theological and anthropological contribution to God's interaction with humanity, correlates implicitly free will to human nature in the image of God (Ouiedo, 2019: 67),[88] as a presupposition to providence, foreknowledge and free-will. Amalgamating transcendental and anthropological concepts in an experiential framework, human endeavour[89] renders accessible an encounter between infinite 'Mystery' and the finite. A divinely activated gift, the origin of non-coerced human freedom, capable of acceptance or rejection. Determination in divine causality corresponds to the willing exercise of that freedom. When the primacy of God's love is preeminent, human responsibility is exalted, "it becomes freedom from God and towards God … a freedom to love God" (Oviedo, 2019: 69-71). Rahner's vision has a universalist prism, whereas soteriological and redemptive criteria of the person and work of God in Christ, deviate from this hypothesis (Ferguson & Wright, 1988). The complexity of the human freedom hypotheses rests upon Rahners, "freedom as a mystery," (Ouiedo, 2019: 74)[90] probability, and the strength of belief.

The Openness of God View

This view constitutes a significant theological and philosophical development, confronting critically the incorporation of Hellenist religious-philosophical assumptions read into the biblical metanarrative (Pinnock et al.,1994).[91] The Open view conjectures two founding axes: divine relational ontology[92] and dynamic responsive relationship to the world and humanity[93] (Pinnock et al., 1994: 69, 15, 19).

Deity

Ontological intra and extra Trinitarian relationships, set the sovereign freedom of God, out from determinate governance (Pinnock et al.,1994),[94] as the means to reveal intentions, "… out of the abundance of his rich inner life … free to create and respond to the world ... to establish communion with creatures and to exist in openness to the unfolding world" (Pinnock, et al, 1994: 108, 110-111, 113). God as creator supports his preoccupation outside himself ((Pinnock et al.,1994)[95] in a direct intentional relationship, countering the Hellenistic hypotheses of a self-focussed alienated [immutable and impassible] God, "unaware of the existence of anything but himself" (Pinnock et al, 1994: 66) denying the implications of time, change and interaction,[96] with matter[97] (Pinnock et al, 1994).

Time and eternity suggest that God is in direct relationship to and interacts with temporality, "God's eternity embraces time and takes temporal events into the divine life" (Pinnock et al.,

---

[86] Gore attributes six qualities: universal inclusivism, opposed to the generic and general descriptive; eternal and preordained, distinct from the being of God; unchangeable and void of frustration; unconditional whereby human actions find value and meaning, and plausible cause and effect correlations in execution, in the pursuit of one realised unified plan

[87] Hebrews 9:26; Romans 5:21, 8:2; 1 Corinthians 15:34; 1 John 1:7, 3:5-9, 5:18.

[88] In reference to Arminius' good of original creation and Calvin's utter depravation of the Fall.

[89] In reference to knowledge and activity rather than merit.

[90] Analogous with Berkhof's profession of theodicy as mystery.

[91] In Historical Considerations, Sanders synthetic overview covers: Parmenides, Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, Philo, and some church fathers: Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Augustine.

[92] Based on the primacy of God's love.

[93] In response to absolute providential determinism.

[94] A counter reference of "not-all-determining" to sovereignty as power domination or control.

[95] The τέλος is not the Person of God Himself, as in Aristotle, but humanity and the world in Christ (Col.1:15-20).

[96] Aristotle's search for the causality of change, leads him to "… an unmoved Mover," absolutely transcendent to alienation in order to preserve from change, relationship with the changeable, corrupt matter.

[97] Forcing a hypothetical eternal creation and alienated God.

1994: 121), contrary to Parmenides who concludes, a perfect, self-sufficient, immutable and eternal uncreated One, beyond time and space.

Dynamic responsiveness

Human history is perceived as the interaction between divine and human that extracts contingency from determinism, the corollary for God being receptive and flexible, "we see the universe as a context in which there are real choices, alternatives and surprises … God [who] is open to the changing realities of history" (Pinnock et al., 1994: 103). Divine covenantal and personal relationship argue against Augustinian divine immunity (Pinnock et al., 1994: 85, 80).[98]

Covenant relationality

Conditionality is evident in covenantal relationship, advocating that God's [re]action and responsive engagement do depend on human decision and responsiveness. The Old Testament witnesses "that God genuinely interacts with human beings, demonstrating transition, development and variation" in a central active role actualising history. (Pinnock et al., 1994: 22, 25).

Transcendence and immanence

Dynamic responsiveness reconciles transcendence to immanence. The immanent experientiality of God finds grounds on the New Testament basis of the incarnation of Christ-God, "God express[ing] his innermost reality." This correlation of human and divine experience affirms transcendency in nature, while postulating positively "divine sensitivity" and affectation (Pinnock et al., 1994: 39, 42-43). "God is so transcendent that he creates room for others to exist and maintains a relationship with them … that God is so stable and secure as to … risk suffering and change" (Pinnock et al., 1994: 105).

Anthropomorphic concepts

Anthropomorphic concepts correlate with Yahwism and Clement's reminder of divine pathos. Argued metaphorically, human pathos "bear[s] a stronger resemblance to the divine reality … closer … to the tended object …" (Pinnock et al., 1994: 17). Divine pathos is an expression of self-revelation, the disclosure of God's inner personal and invested reality in love[99] and pathos reactivity (Pinnock et al., 1994).[100]

Providence and foreknowledge
Divine intentions

Absolute decrees of providence and foreknowledge *are* reinterpreted as 'intentions', within this model whereby the inevitability of divine will is replaced by 'possibility' and 'responsiveness'. Against the totalization effect of exhaustive foreknowledge, in defence of genuine divine-human relations, responsive freedom and conditionality, which envision an open future (Pinnock et al., 1994).

The argument against immutability and impassibility based on the divine decision to give or withhold repentance, suggests change; that God could, suggests that he can. Change then, concerns humanity, circumstances, and God, His "… essential nature [ontology] and ultimate purpose [teleology]…" do not change, immediate intentions do change and evolve [operationality], contrary to absolutism and invariability of the Augustinian and historical view of complete foreknowledge (Berkhof, 1958: 166-167; Pinnock et al., 1994: 28-29, 20).[101]

---

[98] Augustine's Neo-Platonic premise "God's immunity to time, change, and responsiveness to his creatures."
[99] ἀγαπάω love represents the origin and impulse towards the object; as divinely manifested clearly determines an emotional self-giving of God unconditionally to the objects foundational to all other attributes.
[100] God's inner pathos reflected in human emotions, free-will, decision and determination. Divine and normative human pathos are contrary to uncontrolled passions.
[101] Supporting biblical evidence: Genesis 6:6; 1 Samuel 15:35; Jonah 3:4; Exodus 32:12, 14, 32, 34; Genesis 18.

Omnipotence is demonstrated as indeterminate in contrast to absolute omniscience.[102] That is, God's potentiality to deal situationally as he operates a "flexible out-working of God's [creational and redemptive] purposes in history … whose outcome he does not wholly decide" (Pinnock et al., 1994: 113, 116).

Divine integrity
Divine integrity is reliability "that God never says one thing while fully intending to do something else" (Pinnock et al., 1994: 33). While God's existence and nature are changeless, divine experience, knowledge and action are changeable. God is collaborative and conditional, "… completely reliable … as both changeless and changeable" (Pinnock et al., 1994: 47-48, 105).

Modes of divine action
The Philonic archetypal model and absolutism are countered by an immanent direct and flexible involvement in humanity and history, through five recognizable modes of divine action (Pinnock et al., 1994: 38, 55-56):
1. God's unilateral unique initiative and means.[103]
2. Cooperation with human agency.
3. Overcoming human opposition.
4. Oppositional employed to accomplishment.
5. Human opposition thwarting divine intention.

Theodicy
In contrast to the unresolved reformed supposition that evil is explained permissively and sovereignly as integral to God's plan, conditional covenantal relationship addresses theodicy. Sin is clearly attributed to Israel as the result of her own moral conduct rather than imposed by divine power "… our rebellion as sinners … the fall into sin against God's will ... evils that happen … that grieve God … proves … that God does not exercise total control" (Pinnock et al., 1994: 115, 31-32).

Pentecostal theological perspectives

Pneumatological paradigms
A contemporary Pentecostal worldview establishes an experiential and relational narrative framework of the Spirit's immanent presence and operation in the world. The experiential praxis is a "subjective encounter and intersubjective engagement with the world" (Vondey, 2017: 159-160), formulating a subjective-experiential theology of the Spirit and a theory of pneumatological imagination[104] (Yong, 2000: 170, 173-174, 186-187). Cosmologically, "human life and experience are [universally] dependent only on the [immanent] prevenient presence and activity of God through the Holy Spirit"[105] (Yong, 2000: 174, 186). Relationality with the world and soteriological activity of the Spirit are defined by cosmic spheres of God's activity: 1. divine, 2. human, 3. natural world, 4. evil realm (Vondey, 2017: 158-159). Pentecost demarcates a new relationality whereby creation-redemption dualism concedes to a vision of "a single activity of the Spirit" (Vondey, 2017: 164-165, 157, 277).[106]

---

[102] Particularly of Augustine and Calvin, in contrast to Arminius use of omnipotence – divine potentiality.

[103] Foreknowledge does not transform unilateralism into absolutism or determinism.

[104] Pneumatological imagination is a way of seeing God, self, and world that is inspired by the [Pentecostal and Charismatic] experience of the Spirit … 'imagination' refers to the synthetic processes of world-making that bridge elemental perception and cognition in human experience. The imagination is what operates at the border of the finite and the infinite, and forms the possibilities for both human worldviews and for our being-in-the-world … open to insights and correction from the many perspectives that derive from humankind's historical encounter with the divine Spirit.

[105] The doctrine of common grace is the a priori for universal and particular knowledge, experience and praxis.

[106] Both perceived as 'outpourings' the former being creational-cosmic and the latter soteriological-eschatological.

Causality, transcendence and immanence

A Trinitarian perspective envisions transcendency as "dynamic and open to creation" (Vondey, 2017: 159), God operating within creation and causal relationship to the cosmos…is 'pneumatological metaphysics' (Yong, 2000: 180; Vondey). Revelation and experience of the Spirit, embodying the Father and Son in immanence, resolves the transcendence-immanence tension within redemptive activity towards creation. For the Son or Spirit to lose transcendency denies the perfection, eternity, resurrection, exaltation and reign. Vondey (2017) admits some difficulty correlating transcendent-impassibility and immanent-divine pathos.[107]

Anthropologic perspectives

Participation in the Pentecost experience and empowerment of the Spirit sets the paradigm for God's transcendent and immanent interrelationship. Redemption invites ontological participation in the Spirit, a divine-human collaboration of empowerment and transformation within the creation-cosmos paradigm. "Pentecostal theology of creation affirms the integrative significance of human agency enabled by the power of the Spirit on behalf of the transformation of the world" (Vondey, 2017: 156, 164, 166, 170-171, 255, 258). The mystery that God became man, perfect humanity and perfect divinity in one perfect person, is in view. That Christ was sinless and became sin, blessing yet became curse in redemption; the necessity of expiation and propitiation and perfect deliverance from sin, law and death to perfect fullness of life, does not find sufficient cogency in the difficulty reconciling divine pathos with transcendency nor immanence, in defence of the Pentecostal dynamic incarnate view, to safeguard sovereignty, immutability, passibility. Trinitarian relationality remains unaltered, while experiences are distinguished without detraction (Vondey, 2017).[108]

Kingdom, time and space

Christ's inaugurated kingdom, increasing and intensifying by the Spirit, is God's transcendence and immanence, [power and presence] in the world towards perfection at Christ's 'παρουσία'; an "apocalyptic reconstruction of time and space by the Spirit of Christ … as the experience of the eternal reign of God ..." (Vondey, 2017: 277).

This view correlates with the openness of God view in terms of dynamic responsive relationality and the transcendence-immanence tension held by the indwelling Spirit of enablement and transformation, thereby restoring immanence. The concept of kingdom joins Berkhof's 'governance' axis although, it is reign from within and throughout rather than sovereign determinism.

Scientific -Theological Intersection

Implications of contemporary theories

Philosophical and scientific dynamics of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are critical antithetical factors to contextualize the convergence of modern and contemporary divine worldview engagement.

Sociological Dynamics

Social science (Atkinson & Field, 1995: 804-805)[109] became the antithesis to the predominant religious construct in an era of demystification, "a policy of dechristianisation" (Weber cited in Bayly, 2004: 362, 326-27; Wikipedia, Sociology of Religion, 2022).[110] Non-religious academics would determine the nature of religion within a secularized and rational-scientific metanarrative

---

[107] 2 Corinthians 5:21; Galatians 3:12; Hebrews 4:15; 5:9; 7:16, 28; 10:12-14; Ephesians 1:19-23; 4:13; Colossians 2:9-11.

[109] Precursors such as Henri de Saint Simon (1760-1825), Auguste Comte (1798-1857), followed by the three pioneer expositors such as Karl Marx (1818-1883), Emile Durkheim (1858-1917), Max Weber (1865-1920).

[110] Partisans sought polarisation attested by the language of illusion [Durkheim, Weber, and Marx]; mental deficiency, technical impotency [Ernest Gellner]; extinction, institutional separation and removal of superstition and backwardness. Also, Bryan Wilson and John Stuart Mill.

(Atkinson & Field, 1995: 804). Marx[79] affirmed religion as a man-made, inverted world,[111] pleading the abolition of illusion [religion], "the opium of the people" who lack a sense of true conscious reality[112] (Marx, 2002: 171).

The societal contribution of non-rational religious belief and practice served "social order and social stability" (Wikipedia, Sociology of Religion, 2022).[113] Wilson critiques this paradigm as "… impotent [and] evidence of the decline of religion," advocating rational-scientific principles of control and regulation[114] (Wikipedia, Sociology of Religion, 2022).[115]

Historical period perspective

C.A. Bayly's (2004) extensive global analysis[116] provides a reliably historical witness to substantiate this worldview. Contrary to the mythical secularised trajectory, the nineteenth century witnessed the global resurgence and expansion of major world religions.[117] The response of global religions and the causation of exponential growth was sharpened and clarified identities in community transculturally (Bayly, 2004: 325, 327, 330, 332, 338, 341). "Hindu, Buddhist and Confucian reformers [of Asia] … emphasized the rational and philosophical elements in their religious inheritance, condemning superstition, mindless priestcraft, and magical beliefs … they brought to bear many Western-derived liberal sensibilities …" (Bayly, 2004: 325, 327, 330, 337-338).[118] This historical witness contradicts the secularist myth (Wikipedia, Weber, 2022), "if this was an era of demystification … it can only have been so in a very specialized sense … [historians] … have come to realize … how deeply religion influenced the supposedly secular ideologies and sciences of the nineteenth century" (Bayly, 2004: 363).

Theological scientific reflections
Causal reflexions

How has the social-scientific responded to the religious worldview narratives according to determinist, indeterminist and self-determinist categories? (Atkinson & Field, 1995). Science, by observing recurring "patterns of interdependence" (Atkinson & Field, 1995: 195), inevitability and predictability has established determinist universal laws, consequently freewill is perceived as incompatible or illusory.

Causality is conceptualized as: uncaused,[119] self-caused,[120] or extra-caused,[121] which necessitate coherent responses to constitute a cogent worldview (Atkinson & Field, 1995).

Secular scientific determinism

The scientific paradigm demonstrates bi-polarised forms of determinism. McGrath, (2015) focuses on God's activity, responding to the scientific interrogations as to "whether the notion of divine action remained meaningful and defensible …" (McGrath, 2015: 3).[122] The precedent analysis concurs with McGrath's examination of 'The Immanent Frame' as an anthropocentric, self-contained, self-sufficient, self-fulfilling humanist construct upon impersonal determinate, immutable and causal governance through natural laws and ethical rules (McGrath, 2015).[123]

---

[111] Marx refers to a man-centred world.

[112] Marx's point is the avoidance of social, economic injustices, and real-worldly suffering.

[113] Weber also correlates rational capitalism with rational Calvinistic beliefs and Protestant work ethic.

[114] Ernest André Gellner serving as example.

[115] Weber, Gellner, and Foucault shared the same perspective conceding the pre-modern knowledge as providing "prescriptions for living," and principles of good and evil.

[116] The Birth of the Modern World 1780-1914. *Global Connections and Comparisons*.

[117] Christianity, Islam, Judaism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Confucianism.

[118] Similar patterns occur in the Arab-Muslim world, and global Christianity.

[119] Randomisation replaces contingency.

[120] Humans are first causes of free actions.

[121] An external founding rational principle.

[122] McGrath proposes five categories of reflection: 1. general divine action; 2. special divine action; 3. culture; 4. natural sciences; 5. Christian theology. His article focuses on themes three to five.

[123] John Newton and William Payne are cited as proponents.

Acceptability[124] of the secularist antithetical theory lacks legitimacy, concluding determinism, only without God. 'Closed World Structures' [CWS] relegate God to an alienated transcendent originator, restrained moraliser, or to the subjectivism of individual stories.[125] Divine providence and immanence are inadmissible, divine transcendency and sovereignty become 'embedded cultural narrative' (McGrath, 2015: 8). These theological correlations are counterintuitive, inconceivable, extraneous to the socio-scientific metanarrative (McGrath, 2015).

McGrath draws from, 'The Scientific Perspectives on Divine Action' [DAP][126] which considers multiple interpretations of the law(s) of nature, and the definition of divine action in the world, but seems to adopt an allergenic posture to open, interventionist and determinist theological interpretations. However, descriptive or narrative, general and regular[127] concepts of governance lead to alternate plausible interpretations, "the validity of most laws … is compatible with the existence of exceptional situations" (McGrath, 2015: 13-14).

Three scientific theories are hypothesised. Ritchie considers 'quantum', 'complex' and 'chaos' theories inadequate to "frame the entire divine action conversation" and misconceive the basic relationship (Ritchie, 2017: 361-362), preferring metaphysical categories of 'non-interventionism', 'necessitarianism'[128] and 'incompatibilism' to provide causal joint hypotheses (Ritchie, 2017: 362, 364, 366-367, 370, 373, 375-377). Yong (2008: 966) proposes three conceptions of naturalism: 'necessitarianism', 'regularism' and 'antirealism'.

1. Quantum Theory stands analogical of a determinist God-world-nature causal joint, where rational order and divine control [will][129] result in immutable decrees; a mechanical-law governed universe of regularised functions (Yong, 2008: 965). Ritchie's non-interventionism[130] requires an Philonic immutable transcendent God. Concurrently, God's action is found in indeterminate microprocess gaps that eventually repercuss in the macro-world (McGrath, 2015; Ritchie, 2017). Quantum mechanics hypothesis explains the divine-nature correlation indeterminately, characterising realities as potentialities, possibilities, or probabilities. There is evident incoherence between macroscopic determinism and microscopic indeterminism[131] (Yong, 2008: 965-966).

2. In complexity approaches, God purposefully governs and intervenes 'top down' without altering the laws of nature. Ontological necessitarian laws are determinist: prescriptive, universal, and governing independently in nature, and give grounds to the predictive (Yong, 2008). In CWS, God exercising sovereign-free or providential action[132] is synonymous with disorder, disruption or anarchism and therefore impossible to reconcile with nature's determined laws without denaturing God (McGrath, 2015; Ritchie, 2017). The counter argument of 'regularists' and 'antirealists' postulates that the multiple empirical variables that risk violating or transgressing the determinate natural laws, invalidate the fixed constants of metaphysical universal claims (Yong, 2008).[133]

The 'regularist'[134] position, proscribes descriptive, contingent, and nonbinding empirically determined principles, distinct from "higher and lower causal laws."[135] If law is causal joint, the CWS system prevails (Ritchie, 2017: 365). Yong's (2008: 968) 'regularist' model refers to the

---

[124] Compromission through: cultural compliance and acceptability, worldview and social commonality, of the closed world system. As Ouiedo observed.

[125] The former are Philonic and Stoic reflections, while the latter risks Open-Pentecostal subjectivism.

[126] *Scientific Perspectives on Divine Action. Twenty Years of Challenge and Progress.*

[127] In contrast to prescriptive or necessary concepts, but shared with the Pentecostal experiential paradigm.

[128] The laws of nature.

[129] The doctrine of divine simplicity rests upon the union of divine reason and will.

[130] The supposition of independent fixed physical mechanisms.

[131] Heisenberg's uncertainty principle suggests it is impossible to simultaneously measure both the position and momentum of quantum particles.

[132] God's intervention is contextualised in the ordinary of natural laws, not his nature, nor the extraordinary or supernatural.

[133] These irregular concepts would not be ascribed to divine providential intervention.

[134] Or 'instrumentalist' or 'approximative' positions.

[135] An argument used by Philo and Augustine to justify the supernatural as a yet unknown law of nature.

laws of nature as abstract approximate expressions, "laws are regularities operating according to a dynamic and inter-relational manner that do not necessarily impose hard-and-fast constraints on the way the world is or should be."[136]
3. Chaos theory predicates a metaphysical openness within nature, a heightened "sensitivity of chaotic systems to their initial conditions … "(McGrath, 2015: 10-11).[137] Consequently, normative divine action creating and sustaining the world is legitimised, including nature's laws, "… as continuous with natural processes" (Ritchie, 2017: 366). The framework for integrating general and special effective divine action[138] is firstly intuitive. The immanent extraordinary and supernatural could equate to empirical observation, the normative and phenomenal, distinct yet inseparable (McGrath, 2015). Richie's search for causality, advocates 'double agency' to describe God as source of first and second instrumental causes, under scientific arbitrage (Ritchie, 2017). Empirical observation of the Antirealist view correlates with the descriptive view of nature's laws. 'Capacities' as multiple powers, dispositions and tendencies, form a more dynamic and inter-relational interpretation which facilitates "developing a theology of miraculous divine action" Yong, 2008: 970).[139] This view, ontologically and metaphysically, fulfils the natural laws paradigm of "... how, when, or where laws work" (Yong, 2008: 968-969). Where a scientific view of nature constrains divine action, a theistic view perceives God as creator of the world and its laws to fulfil his purposes therefore, "he is free to supersede, alleviate or interact with such laws as befits God's purposes"[140] (Yong, 2008: 973- 974).

The theological turn
Within this contemporary response to scientific theory theology primes in the metaphysical hypothesis, advocating that nature "exists causally in fundamental relationship with God," in his immanent and active presence (Ritchie, 2017: 367). Three visions emerge:

1. Thomist ontology[141] of nature has God as first, active and present cause, and his operation is "in, through and under the laws of nature" (Ritchie, 2017: 368-369). This responsive view rejects the causal joint theory as to how transcendent and immanent God interrelates to nature.
2. Panentheistic naturalism (Knight cited in Ritchie, 2017),[142] postulates that the natural world exists in God and God in nature, "everything is therefore causal joint" (Ritchie, 2017: 373), without distinction. Nature's relational participative responsiveness to God may change the way divine action is understood in natural processes, although, necessitarian higher and lower natural laws naturalize the extraordinary and supernatural (Knight cited in Ritchie, 2017).[143] The absence of relational and causal distinctions finds an ontological response in the difference between *divine essence* and *divine energies*; affirming "radical immanence and radical transcendence" (Ritchie, 2017: 371-374).[144]
3. Pneumatological naturalism proponents,[145] affirm the natural world as involved in a relational responsive dynamic with the immanent Spirit and his activity, "… true nature always exists in dynamic, active relationship with God" (Ritchie, 2017: 374-375, 377). The double agency and causation in scientific-metaphysical theories and Thomism, mutates to human responsive openness. The causal joint of natural laws [matter] only exists because of divine natural or

---

[136] Yong suggests the descriptive does not define how the world should work, reflecting Ritchie's search for causal joint.
[137] McGrath additions Pentecostal pneumatological interpretation and Thomism, of which elements are found in Rahner, as valid alternative considerations.
[138] Specifically, ordinary, extraordinary, supernatural providential acts affecting the world and humanity.
[139] Yong underscores the need to define whether natural laws are external or internal to natural entities.
[140] See Westminster Confession of Faith.
[141] In response to the quantum non-interventionist theory.
[142] Panentheistic naturalism, analogous to the ANE and Pantheistic views developed by Christopher C. Knight, Eastern Orthodox scholar.
[143] Knight challenges natural and supernatural, interventionist and noninterventionist, general and special divine action categories.
[144] Knight's theistic naturalism terminology distinguishes divine substance from divine power or vital life, to avoid pantheism.
[145] Panentheistic naturalism - the world in God inversed.

supernatural [immaterial] involvement. Reflecting Vondey's concern, Ritchie asserts this form of Spirit participation undermines divine transcendency, whereby God becomes physical (Ritchie, 2017). Ritchie, like McGrath, observes 'the theological turn' theories contesting the DAP scientific theories, in favour of a theological paradigm for divine action. They remove the scientific need for causal joint to articulate divine interaction in nature, favouring a naturalist vision of divine agency (Ritchie, 2017).[146] Ritchie contends that if God is transcendent and immanent, the latter setting the theoretical-theological grounds for the theological turn, the former requires ontological interconnectivity articulation of causal joint,[147] admitting the inevitability of divine mystery and alterity (Ritchie, 2017).

Pentecostal pneumatology and science

Yong's synopsis sets out Pentecostalism's perspective as supernaturalist and interventionist,[148] where God who is sovereign and transcendent also acts immanently and providentially. Effective natural laws [transcendency] are an essential framework that accentuates divine supernatural interventionism [immanence],[149] "… without this all-encompassing framework, divine signs, wonders, and miracles would not stand out ..." From within a theistic worldview, the miraculous requires meaning (Yong, 2008: 964).

Pierce's metaphysical hypothesis and Yong's theological theory

Yong draws three concepts from Pierce's metaphysical hypothesis, "Firstness,[150] Secondness[151] and Thirdness."[152] Three active ontological and sequential propensities beginning with 'random'[153] forming 'laws',[154] producing 'habit-taking' (Pierce, 1997, cited in Yong, 2008).[155] Yong (2008: 977-978) introduces a divinely invested teleological final cause[156] whereby, laws and habituation enable final causes to be "creative, unpredictable and irreducible." Yong's supernatural interventionist paradigm integrates Pierce's hypothesis to form a pneumatic-charismatic and eschatological approach in which "the Holy Spirit [works] … in and through nature and its laws but also proleptically and continually transforming in anticipation of the coming kingdom" (Yong, 2008: 979).

God's covenant relationships: divine proposition - human responsiveness - God's counter-response, is consistent with a non-determinist,[157] open and eschatologically oriented collaboration[158] towards final realization (Yong, 2008: 981-982). The Incarnation and Pentecost introduce "new laws that constitute the ways of the world to come"[159] (Russell, 2006a, cited in Yong, 2008: 979). They constitute a new paradigm for divine-human interaction, reconciling "a theology of miraculous divine action that is consistent with the laws of nature as understood by modern science" (Yong, 2008: 982).

---

[146] Referring to Thomism's double agency, Panentheism's divine atemporality and pneumatology's ontological relationship of Spirit-natural world.

[147] Causal joint that respects the creator, [uncreated] – creature [created] distinction.

[148] Contrasted with cessationist fundamentalism and liberalist naturalism. The New Testament contrasts paganism rather than naturalism.

[149] For Yong, believers are minor participants within this perspective.

[150] Quality, immediacy, or potentiality.

[151] Fact, opposition/resistance, or actuality.

[152] Law, intelligibility, or possibility.

[153] Conceptualised as diversity, indeterminate, irregularity, or possibility.

[154] Approximative general pathways conform to preceding descriptive, narrative criteria.

[155] Expressed as uniformity, regularity and habit, likened to the antirealists.

[156] In contrast to Pierce's evolutionary, indeterminate teleological final end.

[157] As opposed to predeterminate necessities.

[158] Habitual, dynamic, general and real tendencies and possibilities, contrary to predetermined actualities.

[159] The basis for the response to the necessitarian premise.

Apostolic construct

This hypothesis perceives the God-world relationship apostolically and seeks to respond to preceding assertions of determinism, causality, dynamism and potentiality by developing the apostolic hypothesis.
Scripture witnesses,

> [By] faith we comprehend to have been apostolically fashioned, arranged and completed, these worlds or eras, to have become [by] the oral word of God, not originated from [that] being tangibly or demonstrably seen, these being physically seen with your eyes (Transliteration [TLT], Hebrews 11:3).

If God creates, orders and sustains apostolically, by the power of his spoken word then, apostolicity is integral to God's ontological and operational interrelating.

Hermeneutic

In contrast to: ANE's lacking interpretive framework, Yahwism's transcendent and covenant axes, Philo's Hellenist-allegorical hermeneutic, the apostle Paul's Christo-centricity portrays a transcultural ontological Christ constituting a 'third way'.[160]

Etymology

If apostolicity originates in Trinity ontologically and relationally, expressing procession out from God's person, three terms describe intra and extra-relationality and operationality (Henderson, 2021).

'Πέμπω' **r**eveals intra and extra-Trinity relationality,[161] "the meaning *of* accompaniment … advocates a continual actualised sending consciousness" (Henderson, 2021), distinct from those holding to "synonymity" of πέμπω and ἀποστέλλω (Brown, 1975: 127-128; Kittel & Friedrich, 1985: @87; Zodhaites, 1993).

'Ἀποστέλλω'[162] composed of the preposition 'ἀπο' meaning source, "apostolic attribute originate[s] in God's nature, what proceeds from Him in word and in action permeates divine apostolicity" (Henderson, 2021: 8); 'ϳτέλλω' encompasses seven specific actions, to: prepare, repair or restore, equip, assemble or gather together, put in order or arrange, liberate, and send[163] (New American Standard Greek Lexicon, [NASGL] 1981: @649; Online Bible Greek Lexicon, [OBGL], 2017: @649). The 'office-task-function' focus (Brown, 1975: 127-128)[164] obscures the nature of these seven dynamic phases,(Henderson, 2021)[165] which provide an accurate paradigm for the apostolic God-world relationship.

'Καταρτίζω'**[166]** synonymous with ἀποστέλλω,[167] adjoins to perfect thoroughly[168] (Green, 1794: 96; Reinecker 1976: 531; NASGL 1981: @2675; Zodhaites, 1992: 842-843; Strong's Greek

---

[160] Paul distinguishes the Christological worldview [t*he third way*] from Judaism and Hellenism, and any other subsequent paradigms and worldviews: 1 Corinthians 2:22-25, 30; Galatians 3:25-27, 6:15; Colossians 3:9-11; 1:15-16, 2:20, 23; 3:1-5; Acts 17:17-18, 22-23; Romans 3:30; Galatians 2:19-20; Philippians 2:9-11.

[161] Πέμπω apostolic accompaniment sending concerns Christ, the Spirit and the believer.

[162] Where the verb ἀποστέλλω is referred to, implicit reference to the diminutive is tacit: ἀπόστολος, ἀποστολή.

[163] Green (1794: 20) holds the traditional functional commissioned stance with the exception of the notions: to liberate and to send [away].

[164] Eicken and Linder suggest the authorization to fulfil a particular function or task, limited in scope and duration by a definite commission rather than institutional appointment to an office.

[165] Christ employs the terms to emphasise the origin and nature of the sender and sent one in 'mutual' relationship. The mandate or message is defined upon that primary basis, and whose purpose demonstrates the former.

[166] Where the verb καταρτίζω – Matthew 4:21, 21:16; Mark 1:19; Luke 6:40; Romans 9:22; 1 Corinthians 1:10; 2 Corinthians 13:11; Galatians 6:1; 1 Thessalonians 3:10; Hebrews 10:5, 11:3, 13:21; 1 Peter 5:10 is referred to, an implicit reference to the diminutives is tacit; κατάρτισις – 2 Corinthians 13:9; καταρτισμός – Ephesians 4:11.

[167] Καταρτίζω emphasizes: to prepare, to restore or repair, to equip, to make ready or to set in order.

[168] Zodhaites distinguishes the connotation of κατάρτισις as denot[ing] the process in progress while καταρτισμός suggests a completed process. Green emphasizes adjustment to a perfect, complete state from the former, and qualifying completeness in the latter case. Reinecker suggests, a dynamic act by which persons or objects are appropriately conditioned.

Lexicon 1996: @2675; OBGL 2017: @2675), inherent to the seven apostolic dynamic phases paradigm.

Covenant considerations

The new covenant in Christ and in the Spirit, creates a new theological paradigm (Pinnock et al., 1994: 39; Yong, 2008: 979; Vondey, 2017: 262, 265). Divine nature and relationality with humanity and the people of God articulates continuity, while the apostolic sending-coming of Christ and the Spirit expresses discontinuity, incarnation being the new ontological mode of existence. The death and resurrection of Christ substantiate the end and τέλος of an old alliance, to inaugurate the new eternal ontological covenant.[169]

Redemptive Paradigm

If 'ἀποκαταλλάσσω',[170] sets the New Testament metanarrative, then all things have not always been according to God's original intentions. Christ's apostolic coming restores redemptively the cosmos-creation and church. The redemptive paradigm, necessarily contingent, incorporates a non-determinate correlation between God's intentions and human freedom, possibility and responsibility. While inherently salvific, redemption is a mode of interaction,[171] of restoratively picking up the pieces.[172]

Teleologically, the apostolic dynamic phases[173] provide a framework of divine operation for the incarnate collaborative reality and directional teleological impulse leading to a determined kingdom.

Transcendency and immanence revisited

Incarnation constitutes a degree of immanence hitherto unknown,[174] the permanent indwelling of Christ, the Father and the Spirit;[175] God's response to Hellenist suppositions.[176] Christ as corporeal incarnate man contradicts the evil matter hypothesis.[177] Dissimilar to ANE and Stoic Panentheism, apostolicity perceives creation bearing the imprint of divine creatorship, distinct from God and the believer's unique incarnate experience.[178]

Apostolicity postulates that causal joint is found in the incarnate God-man Christ, according to scripture and the Nicaean creed (Bettenson, 1967: 26).[179] The transcendent and immanent, uncreated and created, immaterial and material, spiritual and physical, objective and subjective, converge unified and inseparable in His person.[180] While the ontological nature of God does not alter, the mode that articulates revelation, demonstration and relationality with

---

[169] Luke 24:44; Romans 7:1-6; Hebrews 8:6-13, 9:15-17.

[170] Ephesians 2 :13-17; Colossians 1:19-23; [TLT] "God restoring all things to his original intentions in Christ."

[171] Christ is ontologically Redeemer and redemption: Isaiah 49:6; 1 Corinthians 1:30; Romans 3:24.

[172] The Fall (Genesis.3 Adamic covenant); covenant preservation and renewal (Exodus 33:1-34:10); apostolic renewal and teleological purpose (Numbers 14:13-24); replacement of divine kingship, redeemed in David (1 Samuel 8:7-9, 19-22; 16:1, 7, 12-13; 2 Samuel 7:8-9, 11b-16); apostolic exile to Babylon and return (Isaiah 43:14; Jeremiah 25:3-7; Isaiah 48:6-22); Jesus redemptive ministry (Isaiah 61; Luke 4:17-21; John 4); lost things (Luke 15); tears over Jerusalem's choice (Matthew 23:37-39; Luke 13:34-35); apostolic redemptive thought: (1 Corinthians 6:9-11; Galatians 4:19; Ephesians 4:4-7; 1 Peter 2:9-10).

[173] Of preparing, transforming, equipping, putting in order and perfecting, gathering, liberating, sending.

[174] 2 Corinthians 3:3, 10-11.

[175] Father: John 14:23; 1 John 2:4-6, 8; 4:13, 15, 16, 24; Christ: John 14:20, 23, 15:4; Spirit: John 14:16-17, 16:13-16; 1 John 3:24.

[176] Referring to post-exilic and apocalyptic Judaism, to Philonic doctrine of God, disincarnate humanity and similar reformed implicit conceptions of νοῦς.

[177] Likewise of the Spirit who indwells and animates human mortal bodies, (Romans 8:11).

[178] Romans 1:20; 8:19-22; John 6:57; 14:19-20.

[179] Perfectly God and human: The Creed of Nicaea: of the substance of the Father [distinct in existence] … came down and was made flesh, and became man [taking on himself all that makes man man]. (John 1:1-3, 14-18; Colossians 1:19, 2:9-10; Hebrews 2:14, 4:15; 2 Corinthians 5:21).

[180] Likewise, the ordinary, extra-ordinary and supernatural categories find unifying coherence.

humanity is recast (Pinnock et al., 1994: 27-29, 19-20, 56, 103, 33).[181] The revelatory and operational mode necessitates 'μέτρον' or 'gᵉbuwl', measured and progressive, in contrast to absolutist and determinist. Omniscience or omnipotence in Christ's ministry evidence measures of veiling and disclosing.[182] All-powerfulness in absolute form only occurs in the resurrection of Christ by the Spirit and the Father,[183] otherwise the indwelt believer is the principal object of God's enabling.[184]

Anthropological considerations

The scope of regeneration[185] on incarnational grounds, defines a substantive transformation of the believer's nature.[186] Christ's reciprocally indwelling, introduces the believer into Trinity's sphere of existence, consequently the believer experiences conjointly causal joint,[187] as a normative mode of being and operation.[188]

Theodicy

The apostolic view, insists upon perfectly good divine intentions (Brown et al., 1987).[189] Judaism purports two propensities created in mankind, towards good and evil, the latter from birth; mankind is able to attain [self]-righteousness. Philo professes an innate state of sensuous impulses engendering spiritual insensitivity, only reason and discipline of a naturally good disposition could overcome (Edersheim, 1993: 36-37). Jesus situates 'κακός' and 'ἀγαθός' natures,[190] within the heart's propensities.[191] Paul counters total depravity by the insufficiency of 'ἀγαθός' or 'κακῶς' propensities, human 'σάρξ', and will.[192] The fatality of 'κακῶς' self-destructing 'σάρξ' obverses regeneration (Henderson 2019). Rupture and incompatibility with law, sin and death in Christ and the Spirit[193] instigates a collaborative cooperation with the divine source and agency towards perfectibility,[194] "the spiritual man-woman no longer finds

---

[181] Immutability, passibility and foreknowledge are reconceptualised in the openness view as integrity and reliability, divine pathos and intentionality.

[182] Christ's revelatory perception or experience concurs: John 6:64, 61; 13:1; Matthew 9:4; 12:25; John 2 :24; 16:19.

[183] Ephesians 1:19 contains the four concepts of power in the Greek New Testament. In no other NT text does this occur.

[184] Ephesians 3:6, 20, 4:15, 6:10; 1 Corinthians 12:6, 10-11; Philippians 4:10-13.

[185] In contrast to Calvin's view of depravity, Arminius' view of the state of original good, that circumscribe the ontological significance of Christ's redemptive and regenerative work.

[186] The new man-woman in Christ: Ephesians 2:1-5, 13-16; Romans 6:8-11; 2 Peter 1:3-4; 1 Corinthians 6:9-11; Colossians 3:5-11.

[187] John 17:21; Colossians 3:1-3; Ephesians 2:5-7.

[188] The New Covenant anticipates an incarnation expression of the Word [Christ Logos] and the Spirit (Isaiah 42:6, 49:8, 59:21; Jeremiah 31:31-33; Ezekiel 11:19-20, 36:25-29a). The Spirit in the Old Testament remains selective, sporadic, temporal, measured, and task specific with sporadic precursory expressions of the incarnate paradigm (Exodus 31:1; Ezekiel 2:2, 24; 37:8-14; Daniel 4:18; Luke 1:13-15). These do not express the universality of Joel's accomplished prophecy (Joel 2:28-29; Acts 2:16-17), nor the permanent indwelling of the New Covenant of Christ (Colossians 1:16-20; John 15:4-5) and the Spirit (2 Corinthians 3:6; John 14:16; Romans 8:11).

[189] ''Ṭôḇ' good in nature, in excellence – value and quality.

[190] 'Κακός' as evil nature and 'ἀγαθός' as good nature: Luke 6:45, 8:8, 11:13; Matthew 7:17-18; Mark 7:18-23; Romans 5:7.

[191] Reflected in Yahwism: Isaiah 64:7, 65:2 (ESV) "There is no one who calls upon your name, who rouses himself to take hold of you; for you have hidden your face from us, and have made us melt in the hand of our iniquities … I spread out my hands all the day, to a rebellious people, who walk in a way that is not good, following their own devices…"

[192] Romans 7:13-14.

[193] John 1:29; Romans 8:2, 10, 5:21, 6:12, 18; Hebrews 9:26; 1 Corinthians 15:34, 56; 2 Corinthians 5:21.

[194] Paul uniformly places perfecting in the present-continuous towards realisation εις παρουσία of Christ. 1 Corinthians 1:7; Philippians 1:6, 10; Colossians 1:22, 28; 2 Corinthians 10:5, 13:9; 1 Thessalonians 3:13; 1 Timothy 6:13-14. See also 2 Peter 3:10-11; Jude 1:24; and through ministry in Christ: Ephesians 4:11-13; Colossians 2:6-10; 2 Corinthians 13:9; 1 Peter 5:10.

the origin for his being and existence in any other 'state' than in the Spirit and in Christ" [195] (Henderson, 2019: 305).[196]

Time and Eternity

Etymologically, 'αἰών' is measured, perpetual time. 'Αἰώνιος'[197] means infinity, without beginning nor end, out of measure (Thayer & Wilke, 1886) - ontological existence or life in its purest form.[198] Christ's apostolic coming and the Spirit's presence and operations, contextualise and actualise the convergence of divine time in 'χρόνος'[199] and 'καιρός' relatedness,[200] contrary to divine unknowability or atemporality.

A Paradigm shift: Sovereign-Providential-Circumstantial

Determinist theological or scientific necessitarian assumptions are confronted by the new covenant ontological and incarnate mode of existence and relationality. Absolute or sovereign determinism is uniquely applicable to creation and Christ's 'παρουσία'.[201]
Calvin's determinist election cannot escape etymological scrutiny of a reciprocal-responsive interpretation.

> It is erroneous to suggest that as God chooses, it is a sovereign act on his part. The use of the verb 'ἐκλέγομαι' … is consistently in the middle voice. By definition the middle voice requires a collaborative, or responsive participation in order for choice to be effectively experienced and demonstrated (Henderson, 2019: 351).

Paradigmatically, God is present, enabling and operating interdependently 'in' and 'through' rather than independently 'over'. The New Testament demonstrates God's sovereign-free operations coalescent with providential incarnate-collaboration and circumstantial complexity and potentiality (Berkhof, 1958; Gore, 1997; Walton, 2008),[202] the three inextricably interwoven (Henderson, 2009).[203]
The apostolic proposition maintains the freedom of God to intervene determinately, transcendentally and concurrently within the new covenant apostolic and ontological reality.[204] Existence and participation therein converge divine purpose determinately, collaboratively and potentially, as normative Christian experience.[205]

---

[195] John 3:6, 6:63; Romans 8:9-11; 1 John 3:5, 9.

[196] The apostolic phases constitute God's operations in new covenant purpose, particularly of restoration, regenerative transformation, putting in order, liberating, and perfectioning.

[197] 'Αἰώνιος' is principally applied to the nature of life incarnate in the believer in Christ; sixty-nine times in the New Testament.

[198] Luke 18:30; John 4:14, 10:28; Titus 1:2.

[199] Acts 3:21, 7:17; Galatians 4:4.

[200] Galatians 4:4; Ephesians 1:10; John 7:6, 33; Matthew 13:30, 26:18; Mark 1:15; Luke 1:20; Acts 1:7, 17:26; Romans 3:26, 5:6; 2 Corinthians 6:2; 1 Timothy 6:15.

[201] Of which no one knows the day nor hour. Matthew 24:42, 44; 25:13; Acts 2:19-20; 2 Thessalonians 2:8; Revelation 1:7. Παρουσία infers the Kingdom reign.

[202] A categorisation that finds correlation: ordinary [circumstantial], extraordinary [providential] and supernatural [free divine working] workings of God in, through and with believers.

[203] Critical examples recognising that order is not homogenous to interconnectivity: Sovereign - Acts 8:15, 10:44-46; 9:1-19; 18:9-11; 13:1-5. Providential - Acts. 2:37-38; 9:32; 8:1-4, 11:9; 18:21, 19:21, 20:16-24. Circumstantial - Acts 6:1-6; 15:32-16:6; 16:32-32; 28:31.

[204] While apostolically the incarnate reality postulates the normative mode of new covenant divine action, it is essential to distinguish the qualities of God [origin-infinite-uncreated], the believer's incarnate 'κοινωνός' and 'μέτρον' of divine qualities, and creational qualities [beneficiary-limited-created].

[205] Adversely possible, although paradoxical with the apostolic incarnate view is opposition to and from God and believers.

Apostolic phases[206]

The apostolic worldview postulates God's inter-relationality and operationality consistent scripturally within the seven dynamic phases,[207] [appendix A].[208] The emphasis on Trinitarian source, means and raison d'être, Christocentric pedagogical equipping,[209] gathering around encounter, and outpouring, propels into transformational liberation to the anti-retainment apostolic expansive movement of God.[210] Apostolic causality binds intimately together divine initiatory-revelatory and transformative operations with the collaborative and responsive, in contrast to determinate passivity and indeterminate randomisation.

Conclusion

This article has responded to the research question, how does divine apostolicity affect God's interaction with the world and humanity. Considered analysis of the complexities and significant paradigm markers enabled articulation of the development of worldview hypotheses. The significance of the apostolic worldview interaction explicates the apostolic paradigm Christologically, it elaborates causally an incarnational relationality and operationality, and sets out seven dynamic apostolic phases to describe God's movement in the world.

References

Anonymous. (1643). *Westminster Confession of Faith* [PDF]. [Available online at http://www.ccel.org/ccel/anonymous/westminster3.html].

Arminius, J. (1853). *The works of James Arminius* (J. Nicholls & W. R. Bagnall, Trans.) (3 Vols.) [PDF]. Derby, Miller and Orton. [Available online at https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_KRO-rAOkcjYC]. (Retrieved 31 May 2019).

Atkinson, D. J., Field, D. H. & Holmes, A. F. (Eds.). (1995). *New dictionary of Christian ethics and pastoral theology*. Inter-Varsity Press.

Baker, W. & Carpenter, E. E. (2003). *The complete word study dictionary: Old Testament. Word study series*. AMG Publishers.

Bayly, C. A. (2004). *The birth of the modern world: 1780-1914 / global connections and comparisons. The Blackwell history of the world*. Blackwell Publishing.

Berkhof, L. (1958). *Systematic theology*. The Banner of Truth Trust.

Bettenson, H. S. (Ed.). (1963). *Oxford paperbacks: Vol. 125. Documents of the Christian Church* (Second Edition). Oxford University Press.

Brown, C. (Ed.). (1975,1978). *The New international dictionary of New Testament theology*. Paternoster press.

---

[206] Henderson, E.S., (2019: 548-559), A Biblical Examination of an Ontological reading of Theology, in Trinity, in the [Christian] Believer and in Church. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17613/g8jy-ds77.

[207] Appendix A substantiates the apostolic worldview exemplifying the seven dynamic phases: the Trinity, the divine word, of creation to τέλος, of OT Israel, of NT Church. Consistent with individual trajectories.

[208] The macroscopic reflects the homogeneity of God's apostolic dealings with significant biblical figures [microscopic], such as the Patriarchs, Moses; the prophets such as Elijah; the NT believers, Paul, etc.

[209] 2 Corinthians 3:5; Colossians 2:9-10; John 14:16-17, 26; 1 Corinthians 2:10-13.

[210] Acts 13:1-4; 15:30, 33; 26:32; Hebrews 13:23.

Brown, F., Driver, S. R. & Briggs, C. A. (Eds.). (2007). *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English lexicon: With an appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic / coded with the numbering system from Strong's Exhaustive concordance of the Bible*. Hendrickson Publishers.

Calvin, J. (1599). *The Institutes of Christian Religion* (H. Beveridge, Trans.) [PDF]. Christian Classics Ethereal Library. [Available online at http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/institutes.html]. (Retrieved 18 February 2019).

Clements, R. E. (1978). *Old Testament theology*. Marshall Morgan & Scott.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (Eighth edition). Routledge. [Available online at https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315456539]. (Retrieved, 19 April 2022).

Crossway Bibles. (2007). *The Holy Bible, English Standard Version*. Good News Publishers.

Douglas, J. D. (Ed.). (1982). *New Bible dictionary* (2nd edition completely revised and reset). Inter-Varsity Press - Tyndale House.

Edersheim, A. (2000, 1993). *The life and times of Jesus the Messiah* (New updated ed.). Hendrickson.

Emmet, C. W. (1918). *The 3rd and 4th Books of Maccabees. Translations of Early Documents Series II Hellenistic-Jewish Texts: II* [PDF]. The MacMillan Co. [Available online https://ia801801.us.archive.org/11/items/3rd4thbooksofmac0000unse/3rd4thbooksofmac0000unse.pdf]. (Retreived 31 January 2023)

Ferguson, S. B., Packer, J. I. & Wright, D. F. (1998). *New dictionary of theology* [Nachdr.]. *The master reference collection*. IVP Academic.

Friede, D. & Laks, A. (Eds.). (2002). *Philosophia antiqua: Vol. 89. Traditions of theology: Studies in Hellenistic theology, its background and aftermath*. Brill. (Retrieved 31 October 2022).

Gaebelein, F. E. (1979). *The expositor's Bible commentary: With the New International Version of the Holy Bible*. Pickering & Inglis.

Gore, R. J. (1997). *Outline of Systematic Theology*. Trinity Theological Seminary.

Green, T. S. (1794). *A Greek-(English Lexicon to the New Testament* (26th Edition). Samuel Bagster & Sons Ltd.

Gundry, R. H. (1994). *A survey of the New Testament* (3rd ed.). Zondervan Pub. House.

Hart, H. A. (1904). Philo of Alexandria. *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 17(5), 78-122. [Available online at https://archive.org/details/sim_jewish-quarterly-review_1904-10_17]. (Retrieved 31 October 2022).

Henderson, E. S. (2004). *Ruth: Une réflexion biblique et pratique* (3nd edition).

Henderson, E. S. (2009). *Une Conception de « Dunamis » aux Actes [Unpublished manuscript PDF].* France. pp. 1-7.

Henderson, E. S. (2019). *A Biblical Examination of an Ontological Reading of Theology in Trinity, in the Believer and in Church* [PhD in Theology, Atlantic Coast Theological Seminary, USA]. DataCite. https://doi.org/10.17613/g8jy-ds77

Henderson, E. S. (2021). Apostolicity as Divine Attribute in Trinitarian Relationship: the origin and nature of apostolicity and how it is demonstrated. *Pharos Journal of Theology*, 102, Article 20. [Available online at https://doi.org/10.46222/pharosjot.102.020]. (Retrieved 19 July 2021).

Hillar, M. *Philo of Alexandria (c. 20 B.C.E.—40 C.E.).* Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy and its Authors. https://iep.utm.edu/philo/ (Retrieved 8 November 2022).

House, H. W. (1992). *Charts of Christian theology and doctrine*. Zondervan.

Kittel, G. & Friedrich, G. (1985). *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament: Abridged in one volume* [Online Bible Program]. W.B. Eerdmans.

Lane Fox, R. (2006). *The classical world: An epic history from Greece and Rome*. Penguin.

Marx, K. & Raines, J. C. (2002). *Marx on religion*. Temple University Press. [Available online https://archive.org/search.php?query=externalidentifier%3A%22urn%3Alcp%3Amarxonreligio n0000marx%3Alcpdf%3A3747b145-99ab-49f0-b637-c9cbb888fa2a%22]. (Retrieved 18 May 2023).

McGrath, A. E. (2015). Hesitations about Special Divine Action: Reflections on Some Scientific, Cultural and Theological Concerns. *European Journal for Philosophy of Religion*, 7(4), 3-22. [Available online at https://www.academia.edu/52264541/Hesitations_About_Special_Divine_Action_Reflections _on_Some_Scientific_Cultural_and_Theological_Concerns?sm=b]. (Retrieved 30 November 2022)

Oviedo, L. (2019). Dealing with Free Will in Contemporary Theology: is It Still a Question? *Studia Humana Quarterly Journal*, 8(1), 67-74. [Available online at https://www.academia.edu/38612382/Dealing_with_Free_Will_in_Contemporary_Theology_i s_It_Still_a_Question?sm=b]. (Retrieved 1 December 2022).

Pierce, L. (2017). *Online Bible Greek Lexicon*. Online Bible Program.

Pinnock, C. H. (Ed.). (20]06). *The openness of God: A biblical challenge to the traditional understanding of God* (14 [print]. InterVarsity Press [u.a.].

Redford, R. A. (1885). *Four Centuries of Silence*. From Malachi to Christ [PDF]. James Nisbet and Company. [Available online at https://archive.org/details/fourcenturiesofs00redf/page/n3/mode/2up?q=four+centuries+of+sil ence]. (Retrieved 31 October 2022).

Rienecker, F. (1995). *A linguistic key to the Greek New Testament* [15. impr.]. Zondervan Publ. House.

Ritchie, S. L. (2017). dancing around the causal joint:: challenging the theological turn in divine action theories. *Www.Zygonjournal.Org*, 52(2), 361-377. [Available online at https://www.academia.edu/33275228/dancing_around_the_causal_joint_challenging_the_the ological_turn_in_divine_action_theories?sm=b (Retrieved 30 November 2022)].

Strong, J. (1996). *The New Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible.* (Budget Edition) [Online Bible Program 2012, 2017]. T. Nelson.

Thayer, J. H. (1886, 1889). *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti* [Online Bible Program]. American Book Company.

Thomas, R. L. (1981). *New American standard exhaustive concordance of the Bible: [including] Hebrew-Aramaic and Greek dictionaries.* A. J. Holman.

Vondey, W. (2017). *Pentecostal theology: Living the full gospel* (1 edition) [PDF]. Bloomsbury Bloomsbury T&T Clark An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc. (Retrieved 14 April 2021).

Walton, J. H. (2007). *Ancient Near Eastern thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the conceptual world of the Hebrew Bible.* Apollos.

Wikipedia. *Sociology of religion.* https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sociology_of_religion (Retrieved 17 January 2023).

Yong, A. (2000). On Divine Presence and Divine Agency Towards a Foundational Pneumatology. *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies*, 3(2),167-188. https://www.academia.edu/64153585/Amos_Yong_On_Divine_Presence_and_Divine_Agency_Toward_a_Foundational_Pneumatology_pp._167-188 (Retrieved 30 November 2022).

Yong, A. (2008). Natural Laws and Divine Intervention:: What difference does being Pentecostal or Charismatic make? *Www.Zygonjournal.Org, 43*(4), 961-989. https://www.academia.edu/27425481/Natural_Laws_and_Divine_Intervention_What_Difference_Does_Being_Pentecostal_or_Charismatic_Make?sm=b (Retrieved 30 November 2022).

Zodhiates, S. (1994). *The complete word study dictionary: New Testament.* AMG Publishers.

Appendix A

Synthesis of Seven Dynamic Ἀποστέλλω Phases	
Ἀποστέλλω : to prepare, restore, equip and perfect, assemble, put in order, liberate and send.	
Father	Prepare: *chosen in Christ* (Ephesians 1:4; 1 Corinthians 2:9) Prepared and Restored and equipped: to resemblance Christ (Romans 8:29, 12:2; Ephesians 4:22-24)*,* Assemble: gather in Christ (Ephesians 1:10)*;* Put in order, Liberate and Send: of the Spirit (Joel 1:28; John 14:26), of Jesus (John 8:42; Acts 9:15; 26:16-18; Romans 1:5, 8:3; Galatians 4:4), of God (Acts 10:20) Perfect: apostolic equipping, putting in order, perfecting (1 Peter 5:10; 2 Corinthians 13:11).
Christ	Prepare: called, chosen by Father (Matthew 12:18; 1 Peter 2:4) call to Himself (Matthew 10:1; Mark 8:34; Luke 6:13) Called, Put in order and Sent: (John 15:16; 16:12-13), to Christ and his discipleship (Mark 6:7), Paul called, transformed, equipped, liberated and sent (Acts 9:15); Restore: (Isaiah 61; Luke 4:18-21; 2 Corinthians 3:18; Galatians 4:19); Gathering: (Mark 13:27, Matthew 13:30, 23:37, 24:31, John 11:52); in παρουσία (Matthew 24:30); Liberate and Send:

	(Matthew 10:16-20; 2 Corinthians 3:18); expansion movement (Matthew 9:35-38; Mark.1:21-28; 38-39; 2:13-14; Luke.4:14; Acts 15:40). Equipping, Liberating and Sending: disciples (Matthew 1:1; Luke 6:40, 8, 9, 10; John 17:18, 20:21) *Sending*/coming from eternity (John 12:44-46), in ministry and *gathering* (Matthew 4:23-25) in παρουσία (Matthew 24:30); Perfecting: (Hebrews 5:9, 7:25, 13:20; Ephesians 4:11-13; Luke 6:40)
Spirit	Prepare, Restore, Equipping, putting in order: (2 Corinthians 3:18, John 14:26; Titus 3:5) regenerate, renewed, transformed from glory to glory Assemble, Liberate and Send: (Acts 2:1-11, 8:1, 11:19, 13:1-4; Luke 4:18). sending Christ, (2 Corinthians 3:18). Perfect: (2 Corinthians 7:1; Galatians 3:3; Hebrews 12:23).
Divine Word	Prepare: Genesis 1; Psalms 33:6 creative word, Restore: (James 1:18; 1 Peter 1:23) regenerating word, (Isaiah 44:24-28; Ezekiel 37:1-14). Equip: Assemble: Put in order: (Hebrews 1:3) sustain creation; (John 14:23) guard the word engages indwelling of the Father and Son; (Isaiah 49:5, 50:4-5; Jer.1:5, 9; 1 Samuel 3:1, 7, 31); ordering (1Kings 17:1-7, 19:3, 8-16). Liberate and Send, Perfect: (Isaiah 55:11, 45:23, 46:10, Acts 13:26; 28:28; 6:7); (Mark 1:10) Gospel to all nations; word sent to accomplish, to order, to succeed its purpose; (1 John 2:5) words perfectioning in love. Words of Jesus ministry fulfil the seven apostolic phases. Ontologically and teleologically Jesus is the apostolic Word and its fulfilment: John 1:14 Luke 21:33; Matthew 5:17-18; Revelation 19:13.
Creation	Prepare, Equipping, Ordering, Sending: Hebrews 11:3; Deuteronomy 10:22 ('suwm'), Jeremiah 25:25; Colossians 1:16 apostolic relationship to creation. Restore, Put in order: *Genesis 1:16 luminaries' rule* Equip-function: Psalm 8:3 ('kuwn') to make and fix, (Zechariah 12:1); Restore, Liberate: from bondage: (Romans 8:19-22) creation transformed and redeemed; Assemble: (Isaiah 48:13, 66:18; Ephesians 1:9-10). Perfect and Send: creation act perfected (Genesis 2:1; Isaiah 65:17-18; 1 Corinthians 15:40-42; Revelation 21:1) restoration of intended perfection heavens and earth.
Israel	Prepare: created (Isaiah 43:1; Deuteronomy 4:36). Equipped and Put in order: *training of the desert years; Restore: Assemble:* (Isaiah 43:6-9; 49:5; 66:18, 20, 23) Gathering: Israel, nations gathered to God. (Isaiah 11:12, Micah 2:12, 4:6; Isaiah 45:20; Ezekiel 11:17; Joel 3:11; Zephaniah 3:20). Liberate and Send: from Egyptian slavery to Desert priestly life, into the promised land (Exodus 3:7-10, 12:40-41; Numbers 13:2; Isaiah 49:22; 2:3; Micah 4:2; Psalms 50:2) Perfect: (Psalms 18:30-32, 101:6, 138:8; Ezekiel 16:14; Exodus 19:6; Leviticus 19:2).
Church	Prepare: (Ephesians 4:16) Church originates, is created in and emerges from Christ, (Ephesians 4:15-16; Colossians 1:18-19; 1 Peter 2:9) chosen precious people Assemble: *held together in the Head*, (Colossians 2:19; Matthew 13:31-32, 47-48) Restore: (Ephesians 2:15-16; Galatians 4:19; Ephesians 5:26-27). Equip: Put in order: (1 Thessalonians 2:13-14; 1 Peter 5:10; Acts 2:42; Ephesians 2:20-22). Liberate and Send: (Ephesians 3:9-11; 1 Thessalonians 1:7-8; Galatians 5:1, 7; Acts 4:28-31). Perfect: (Ephesians 4:11-13; Colossians 1:26-27; Ephesians 5:26-27).

Bayly (2008) 18th & 19th Century Apostolic analysis of world religions exponential growth [particularly Christianity]	Prepare and Restore: to reform and consolidation internally Equip, Put in order: the ability to create or gather into practising faith communities: Religious autonomy brought normalisation to belief and praxis. Centralisation tension [normativity] did not diminish the emphasis on local centres, reinforcing homogeneity in belief and practice Liberate and Send: to expand outwardly or missionally and penetrate deeply. The expulsion of religious leaders from spheres of government did not result in the demise of religious ethos, rather new freedom Technology harnessed to serve religious expansion. Perfect: opposition strengthening identity, beliefs and purpose. (Bayly, 2004: 325, 330, 332, 333, 335, 336, 338, 340, 343, 345, 349, 351, 354, 355, 356, 359).