Sanctification Under the Old Testament Theocracy

by Charles A. Clough

Introduction

To understand sanctification prior to the Church age requires consideration of the degrees of continuity and discontinuity between the Old and New Testaments (hereinafter I use the abbreviations OT and NT, respectively). Should we take NT revelation regarding sanctification and project that back into the OT? Or shall we attempt to understand OT sanctification on its own terms? This decision requires consideration of the dynamics of progressive revelation: is the "progress" mainly a progress in understanding God's virtually unchanging work, or is it a sequential progress in that work itself? How one answers this question largely determines how one views OT *positional* sanctification.[1] For example, were OT saints justified and regenerated in the same sense as NT saints, or were those divine acts that occurred earlier in progressive revelation different?

OT *experiential* sanctification involved the continued interaction between God and the believers of earlier times. Since the God of the Bible is a tri-unity and the Holy Spirit, or in OT terms the Spirit of Yahweh, is centrally concerned with sanctification, how does the OT profile of His activity compare with the NT profile? Here the progress in revelation of God's unchanging nature must be carefully distinguished from sanctification history which has been shaped by a sequence of His acts. To differentiate the two we must make reference to the so-called economic Trinity.[2] Were there differences in how the Holy Spirit interacted with OT saints compared to His relationship with NT saints?

Due to limitations of this paper, I will only briefly remark on OT *ultimate* sanctification. Moreover, I will limit the overall discussion of OT sanctification to the eight-century long period between the exodus and the exile, i.e., the time of the theocratic reign of God in history. That was an era when a physical version of God's redemptive kingdom intruded into the human civilization originally established by Noah. It provides us with a veritable laboratory to observe clearly the link between ethical choices and the resultant effects in culture, economics, and nature. As Alva McClain pointed out, this choice-consequence connection:

> "holds good generally in all nations in every age. But its operation has often been obscured to human eyes by the time 'lag' between moral breach and the infliction of the sanction. While it is always true that the nation which has 'sown the wind' shall also certainly 'reap the whirlwind' (Hos. 8:7), the harvest is generally and mercifully long delayed (II Per. 3:9); and for this very reason men often fail to see the causal connection. . . .But in the case of the nation Israel in her Mediatorial Kingdom of history, the moral government of Jehovah was not only declared at Sinai but also was confirmed

[1] This paper follows the convention adopted for all conference papers regarding the three nuances of the term "sanctification," viz., positional, experiential, and ultimate.

[2] The "economic Trinity" is the view of God that looks at the different roles in history performed by the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Theologians distinguish this view from the "ontological Trinity" that views God in His unchanging essence apart from His involvement in the history of His creation.

> spectacularly in the recorded history of that kingdom by means of divine sanctions immediately imposed. And these sanctions were generally supernatural; either by the withdrawal of the promised supernatural protection from the ordinary hazards of human life in a sinful world, or by the positive infliction of supernaturally imposed punishment."[3]

This historical context in which OT believers lived established much of the theology of sanctification used illustratively in the later NT period. It was an era in which God's revelation to man was anchored to a biblical covenant that contained specific stipulations—the law—for every area of life. Old Testament saints were thus confronted with God's will for everything from family relations, diet, community leadership, economics of business and borrowing, military service, and judicial proceedings to worship protocols. The law demanded discrimination against Gentiles whose culture had deteriorated from its original monotheistic form in the Noahic "first family" of present human civilization. Henceforth I refer to this era as the *theocratic period* to distinguish it from the span of Noahic civilization from the flood to the present day that could be called the *anthrocratic period*.[4]

The question, then, of how sanctification under the OT theocracy differed from that of the present Church age revolves around the nature of progressive revelation. What is constant throughout history with regard to God and His revelation and what changes? Those who in recent Church history emphasize continuity tend toward covenant theology which sees a virtually unchanging redemptive program of God throughout all ages. Those who emphasize discontinuity tend toward dispensational theology which sees a sequence not only of God's words but also His acts from age to age.[5] Behind these two approaches lie different meta-hermeneutical backgrounds that involve differently-integrated networks of beliefs about God, language and Scripture.[6] Our discussion begins with the progressive self-revelation of the Trinity.

---

[3] Alva J. McClain, *The Greatness of the Kingdom: An Inductive Study of the Kingdom of God* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1959 [1968 edition]), p. 86f. As I have suggested elsewhere, Israel's experience of such clearly delineated cause-effect, when its history was spread throughout the world of the 6th and 5th centuries BC by Diaspora Jews, "sanctified" worldwide paganism with unprecedented confidence in the rationality of the world. Within a century at least seven world religions sprung into existence along with the sudden appearance of philosophy in Greece, all of which embodied a new optimism that man could think truthfully about reality rather than yield to magic and myth of ancient priestly traditions (see Parts 2 and 4 of my biblical framework lessons at www.bibleframework.com).

[4] With the call of Abraham and its eventual fruition in the formation of Israel, God abandoned universal special revelation throughout the Noahic family. From that point onward all special revelation has come through His chosen counter-culture (Deut. 4:15-20). Religious *exclusivism* has thus reigned ever since in spite of cultural pluralism's claim that all moral judgments proceed ultimately from man and therefore are of equal value.

[5] For a summary of the variation in views of OT/NT continuity throughout Church history regarding the relationship of the Holy Spirit to believers see the chart in Appendix 1.

[6] I use the term *meta-hermeneutical* to refer to the set of metaphysical, epistemological, and ethical beliefs that support one's view of language and theology. It is to be distinguished from post-modern connotations of the term *preunderstanding* that too often fails to critically evaluate modern linguistic theory in light of Genesis 1. I discuss the differing structures of covenant and dispensational theology in: "A Meta-Hermeneutical Comparison of Covenant and Dispensational Theologies," *Chafer Theological Seminary Journal* (April-June 2001) 7:59-80.

The Progressively Self-Revealing Trinity

That the God of the Bible is a tri-unity is affirmed by all sectors of orthodox Christianity. Most orthodox theologians, however, while readily agreeing that the Trinity is immutable and therefore functioning in the OT, hesitate to claim that God's tri-unity is visible enough to distinguish the Holy Spirit from the First and Second Persons. If the Holy Spirit's sanctifying work in OT saints cannot be distinguished from the OT text, however, then any comparison with His work in NT saints would have to rely on some sort of continuity assumption(s). But by their very nature continuity assumptions erase differences between OT and NT. How, then, can a real comparison be made regarding sanctification if all we have to go on is the retro-projection of the Spirit's NT sanctifying work back into the OT?

There is a way out of this dilemma. If we base inter-testament continuity upon the Trinity's immutability, we then can look into the OT text for divine acts that fit the role of the Third Person's from what we know of that role in the NT. This "job profiling" approach doesn't have to impose continuity on the acts themselves because it has already located the required continuity within the economic Trinity. It thus allows for a variety of acts by the unchanging Spirit.

The Economic Trinity

Of the many models of the Trinity that have been suggested, several have enough merit to use for this discussion. I will use the insightful "communication" model proposed by Vern Poythress that is patterned after human communication with *speaker*, the *message* spoken, and the *effect* of this speech on the receiver.[7] The Father's role is speaker; the Son's role is being the message spoken—the Word; and the Spirit's role is the producer of effects upon the recipients.

Consider the OT vocabulary of communication between Lady Wisdom and an Israelite student in Proverbs. She addresses him: "Turn at my rebuke; Surely I will pour out my spirit upon you; I will make my words known to you" (Prov 1:23).[8] The speaker is thought to share his (or in this case "her") spirit with another when he communicates ideas to that person.[9] The effect of the message can be described, then, as the receiving mind coming under the spiritual influence of the sending mind.[10] Analogously, verbal revelation involves God directing His Spirit toward those

---

[7] Vern S. Poythress, "Reforming Ontology and Logic in Light of the Trinity: An Application of Van Til's Idea of Analogy," *Westminster Theological Journal* (1995) 57:187-219.

[8] All Scripture citations unless otherwise noted are from the New King James Version.

[9] The concept of "spirit" is manifold in meaning as any biblical lexicon will show. Of particular interest is the ability of one spirit to impart the same idea to a multitude of people (1 Kings 22:22-23).

[10] Modern information theory has made it clear that information does not reside in printed text, spoken sounds, or gestures—the various media used to *convey* information. The receiving mind *imputes* meaning to the media and does so correctly only when it shares the same rules of interpretation possessed by the sending mind. For a popular exposition by an evangelical Christian see Werner Gitt, *In the Beginning Was Information,* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2005). This finding validates the biblical claims that: (1) man as a creature made in God's image can receive information from his Maker; and (2) a certain degree of relational harmony must exist between God the Revealer and man the recipient for understanding of spiritual truths to occur.

addressed (note the similarity between Prov. 1:23 and Joel 2:28-32). The "pouring out" metaphor suggests a flow of water, a formless stream that fills variously shaped crevices. The emphasis is on the flow, not on what it fills. We employ a similar metaphor in our language when we say that someone "poured out their heart to us." We're emphasizing the speaker and his message, not our individual particulars as recipients. Yet we all in spite of our individual differences come under the influence of what someone has just shared with us; in OT terminology we all have received something of his spirit.

Modern speech-act theory may help us appreciate what accompanies an act of speaking. Speech involves at least three actions: (1) the act of uttering a sentence (a "locutionary" act); (2) the act performed in or by the act of uttering a sentence whether intended by the speaker or not (an "illocutionary" act); and (3) the resulting effects of uttering a sentence (a "perlocutionary" act).[11] A biblical example is Exodus 32:10 where God expresses his anger over the quick defection of Israel while Moses has been on Mt. Sinai receiving the law: "Now therefore, let Me alone, that My wrath may burn hot against them and I may consume them. And I will make of you a great nation." God uttered this message, a threat that would have undone His sovereign promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—that is the *locutionary* act. But the message was intended to challenge Moses to function as a priest for the nation—would he yield to this dramatic proposal to start a new nation, or would he intercede for the existing nation—that is the *illocutionary* act. And we read in 32:11-13 Moses chose to intercede—that is the result of the challenge, the *perlocutionary* act. By analogy the Father's speech with its accompanying actions inevitably causes His Spirit to interact with the spirit of a human recipient regardless of the era in which it occurs.

The role of the Third Person—distinguished from that of the First Person—is therefore involved in every effect of the Father's speech not only upon man's immaterial being but also upon all of material reality. These effects include the creation itself when God directly spoke the universe into existence independently of so-called natural causes (Gen. 1; Ps. 33:6,9; Heb. 11:3). They include phenomena that fit into the redemptive/sanctification category as well as those that are purely doxological and non-redemptive.[12] Since God's actions are manifold from creation to consummation, it follows that the role of the Holy Spirit in the OT must also have been manifold. We need to be prepared, then, to discover in biblical history a wide variety of actions in His "job profile" from age to age without fearing irrational inter-testament discontinuity.

To see just how wide this variety was, consider His relationship with the Second Person. The Second Person of the Trinity—the Word—the message of the Father, while always being the revelation of God, underwent dramatic change at the Incarnation. That He had always been the content of revelation Jesus stated clearly in John 5:37,39,45 and 46:

---

[11] "Philosophy of Language," *Encyclopedia Britannica* (online edition available at http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/754957/philosophy-of-language/257842/Speech-acts?anchor=ref924155, accessed 22 Feb 2011).

[12] Here is another difference in perspective between traditional Reformed covenant theology and dispensationalism. Traditional dispensationalist spokesmen emphasize a more comprehensive doxological view of God's work than focusing exclusively upon His redemption. See Charles C. Ryrie, *Dispensationalism* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1995 revised and expanded edition), 40, 93-95.

> "And the Father Himself, who sent Me, has testified of Me. You have neither heard His voice at any time, nor seen His form. . . .You search the Scriptures, for in them you think you have eternal life; and these are they which testify of Me. . . .Do not think that I shall accuse you to the Father; there is one who accuses you—Moses, in whom you trust. For if you believed Moses, you would believe Me, for he wrote about Me."

In John 8:56 Jesus said, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day and he saw it and was glad."[13] This Son-centered revelation underwent a major change.

Throughout OT history there appeared two emphases regarding God and man. On one hand a steady stream of revelation indicated that God's Presence ultimately would be with man (e.g., the enthronement psalms—Pss 47, 93, 97-99). On the other hand a parallel stream of revelation indicated that a member of the Davidic dynasty would reign forever (e.g., Isa. 11:1-10; Ezk. 34:23-24; 37:24-25). That these two streams—one divine and one human—would converge in one person was hinted at in Psalms 2, 110; and Proverbs 30:4. Such a convergence, however, was not yet a historical reality. Therefore, OT saints, while possessing fragments of information about the Second Person, had to live out their relationship to Him within the then current revelation of Him.

The Apostle John, who alone among New Testament authors emphasized eternal life as a present reality rather than a future inherited reality, makes an interesting claim in 1 John 1: 2: "the life was manifested, and we have seen, and bear witness, and declare to you that eternal life which was with the Father and was manifested to us". Note the phrase "which was with the Father." Before it was manifested to the apostles, it was with the Father.[14] Does this statement not imply a significance difference, a *discontinuity* if you will, in the revelation of the Second Person

---

[13] See the extensive research on the unity/plurality issue in John B. Metzger, *Discovering the Mystery of the Unity of God: A Theological Study on the Plurality and Tri-unity of God in the Hebrew Scriptures* (San Antonio, TX: Ariel Ministries, 2010). He summarizes on page 666: "When we understand that the Second Person. . .was the one who became visual to mankind and that He is the one who spoke to Moses, the Judges, and to both the writing and non-writing prophets, we begin to see which member of the Godhead was active in the lives of patriarchs, Moses and the prophets."

[14] That the apostle speaks of this life as located *prior* to the Incarnation *within* the eternal Trinity carries astounding implications about just what constitutes "life." The Trinity, unlike the solitary monotheism of post-biblical Judaism, Islam, and various Christian heresies, allows us to speak intelligently of a personal loving God. Solitary monotheists by contrast have to struggle to explain how a solitary deity could have the attribute of love without necessarily having to create an external personal object for that love to function. Any employment of the idea of necessity then would deny the self-sufficiency of the deity. It is precisely this eternal, intra-Trinity personal relationship that was manifested historically by the Incarnation. The communication between the Son and the Father was actually heard and seen for the *first time in human history*. What, therefore, we call "life" in the human created realm with its social and personal dimension is actually a finite and dim material derivation of the eternally-existing, intra-Trinity relationship. What a difference from the neo-Darwinian "molecules-in-motion" view of life! Furthermore, the Apostle's claim that his readers could share eternal life means that NT believers in some fashion enter into the personal relationship that eternally existed within the Trinity—an astounding claim!

between OT and NT? Which such a dramatic change in the Second Person, the Father's message, should we not expect an equally momentous change in the actions of the Holy Spirit?[15]

The Nature of Progressive Revelation

Contrary to Enlightenment thought emanating largely from Immanuel Kant that constitutes the core of much theology and hermeneutical theory, biblical revelation is *the transfer of actual information from God's mind to the creation*. At creation design information was embedded into physical reality. When Israel received the Ten Commandments at Mt. Sinai, the text declares that the revelation was heard by the multitude in their language (Ex. 20:1-17; Deut 5:4-22) just as God's voice was publicly heard in human language at Jesus' baptism (Matt. 3:17) and at the Mt. of Transfiguration (Matt. 17:5). Because the Sinai theophany so scared the fallen multitude, they begged for an intermediary to stand between them and God. This request for less direct communication led to the line of prophets from Moses to Jesus but in no way compromised the transfer of verbally-expressed information from God to man (Deut. 18:15-19). Biblical revelation thus involves God as Speaker with a content-full message progressively addressed to man.

Since biblical revelation is self revelation of the personal Trinity in human language to man, it necessarily provokes a response in man—rejection, indifferent suppression, welcome reception, etc. The Father's speech has intent and His Spirit carries out that intent in each recipient. One can no more claim neutrality after being addressed by God than he can do so after interaction with other humans. Again we see that the Holy Spirit is always involved in all revelation in every age whether He is restraining sin (Gen. 6:3), convincing unbelievers (Matt. 12:31-32; John 16:8-11), managing prophetic speech (1 Pet. 1:11; 2 Pet. 1:21), or illuminating truth to believers (1 John 2:27).

Although the Third Person always has some relationship with recipients of revelation and therefore with all OT saints, that relationship was *conditioned* by what revelation had occurred up their moment of history—revelation consisting of both God's words and His works. As Nelson Darby put it when criticizing a Bible commentator for his minimizing of progressive revelation:

> "Differences of dispensation are the displays of God's glory. . . .And therefore the whole [believer's] life, in its working, in its recognition of God, is formed on this dispensational display. . . .Thus, if God reveals Himself to Abraham as Almighty, Abraham is to live and walk in the power of that name. . . .Israel is to dwell in the land as the redeemed people of the Lord—their affections, ways, responsibility, and happiness flowing from what God was to them as having placed them there."[16]

---

[15] Of interest in discussing sanctification is this question: if the Holy Spirit enabled Jesus' unfallen humanity during His trials, is the need for sanctification necessarily due to the sin nature? Was, then, this work of the Holy Spirit redemptive or doxological?

[16] J. N. Darby, "An Examination of the Statements Made in the 'Thoughts on the Apocalypse,' by B. W. Newton; and An Enquiry How Far They Accord with Scripture,'" *The Collected Writings of J. N. Darby*, 34 vols. (n.d.; repr., Winschoten, Netherlands: H. L. Heijkoop, 1971), vol. 8: 26.

When we read of God prophesying to OT saints of things to come, for example, we must distinguish the content of the promises from what is not yet then in existence. In such cases His words preceded His works. The inter-testament continuity, then, is a continuity in Speaker, Word, and Spirit; it is not necessarily a continuity in the details of the resulting relationship with believers. That relationship changed with the progress in the Trinity's self-revelation.

Revelation Via Covenants and Sacred Spaces in the Theocracy

To discover the particulars in the Holy Spirit's relationship with OT saints we ought to go to the OT text rather than automatically projecting backwards His relationship with NT saints. Thankfully, during the theocratic period we have detailed revelation concerning God's relationship with Israel and His indwelling presence there. His relationship with Israel was formalized in at least three covenants with information-filled stipulations. He also had a continuous, localized, physical presence in Israel which allows us to see what "indwelling" accomplishes.

Implications of a Biblical Covenant

That the God of the universe would come down to our human level on this planet and enter into a covenant with us ought to provoke great wonderment. Unfortunately because the word "covenant" has become a much-used title for doctrinal controversy by theological specialists, the wonderment in ordinary Bible readers is too-often missed.[17] It might be better translated as "contract" since it refers to a formal agreement between two parties (e.g., Abraham made a business contract with Abimelech in Gen. 21:22-34). What is stunning about this term in the Bible is that it refers to contracts between God and man. In his discussion of the term, Albright wrote: "Contracts and treaties were common everywhere, but only the Hebrews, so far as we know, made covenants with their gods or God."[18]

Several important implications follow from this unique form of revelation. First, it reinforces the point that the transcendent Triune God condescends to come down to man's level to bargain (Gen. 18), to argue (Job 38-41), and, yes, to commit Himself to defined behavior for the duration of such contracts.[19] After all specification of future behavior by parties to a contract is the very

[17] "Covenant" occurs over 300 times in the English Bible generally translating the Hebrew *berith* and the Greek *diatheke*.

[18] He noted the provisional nature of his claim, but his discussion of the cultural milieu clearly shows the ordinary commercial meaning of the term *berith*: "Being prevailingly caravaneers and so ethno-political intruders in the West, the early Hebrews were in constant need of contractual and treaty protection." William F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan: A Historical Analysis of Two Contrasting Faiths* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1968), 106-108. Of course, we biblicists would insist that it was God that made the contracts with man, not the other way around.

[19] In his thorough discussion of such condescension Oliphint points out that this Old Testament "coming down" is preparation for the ultimate "coming down" in the Incarnation. See K. Scott Oliphint, Reasons for Faith: Philosophy in the Service of Theology (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 2006), 232-255. God's condescension also answers the challenge of "open theology" concerning passages like Genesis 18 that depict God involved in "fact-finding" conversations with man. It also sharply contrasts with Islam's Allah. Condescension by such a transcendent deity in binding himself to any contract with man is seen by Muslim theologians as an

reason for contracts. Second, it presupposes *positional* sanctification since there must exist righteousness on the part of man adequate to enter into a personal relationship with the God of absolute righteousness.[20] Third, it establishes the legitimacy of a literal hermeneutic since all contracts necessarily are interpreted in terms of ordinary language for validation of the parties' behaviors. Finally, it assumes that the meaning of the contract terminology must be conserved throughout the duration of the contract. Terms cannot be reinterpreted later in the relationship.[21]

The contractual form of revelation, therefore, sharply distinguishes the Creator-creature relationship from the casual concept of relationship in pagan unbelieving society.[22] God doesn't enter relationships casually. And the specific nature of His contractual stipulations demands that each contract stand on its own. Dispensational theology has therefore resisted the theological synthesizing of covenant theology in this regard. Instead of locating continuity at the level of a generic redemptive covenant synthesized from later New Testament revelation and read back into the Old Testament, dispensational theology prefers instead to locate continuity in God's immutable character behind each biblical contract and maintain the integrity of each contract's terminology. Because God has revealed Himself in specific formal contracts, this discussion concentrates on a *contract perspective* of Old Testament sanctification.

Biblical Covenants of the Theocracy

Noahic and Abrahamic contracts. God administered the theocracy with the Mosaic contract created at Mt. Sinai. Only the Jewish tribes were parties to it, not Gentiles.[23] But two other contracts also functioned during the theocracy: the ecological Noahic and the redemptive Abrahamic. The Noahic contract provided the basis for civil authority to use lethal force to execute some of God's judgments (Gen. 9:5-6); it defined the variability limits of the geophysical environment (Isa. 54:9-10); and it laid out the biological relationship between man and animal life (Gen. 8:22-9:4; 9:8-17). It was *preservative*, but *not redemptive*. In sharp contrast the Abrahamic contract defined God's plan of *redemption* through His promise of progeny to Abraham, His land allotment to that progeny, and His exclusive selection of that

---

impossible contraction. The price paid for denying such condescension is a deity that can never be known personally. Thus biblical contracts by revealing God's interest in personal relationships can play a key role in Muslim evangelism.

[20] Note the occurrence of sacrifices with biblical contracts: the ecological Noahic contract (Gen. 8:20-9:17), the land-seed-global blessing Abrahamic contract (Gen. 15), the theocratic Mosaic contract (Ex. 24:1-8); and the New contract (Matt. 26:26-29). It is precisely with the first redemptive contract that revelation of justification based upon imputed righteousness occurs which the Apostle Paul so carefully later expounds (Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:1-8). Modern contract law faintly reflects this truth in the doctrine of "legal capacity" which requires that all parties to a contract must be legally competent to enter into such a relationship.

[21] Imagine, for example, that after a tornado destroyed your house (but allowed you and your family to survive), your insurance company read back a "deeper meaning" into your homeowners policy that the term "house" really meant "family."

[22] In his analysis of pagan society Paul characterized it as *asunthetous*, translated in modern Bibles as "untrustworthy" but more insightfully translated in the King James Bible as "covenant-breaking" (Rom. 1:31). Today it can be readily observed in government policy departure from the Constitution, corporate contract-breaking, and cohabitating couples lacking the social maturity and trust in each other to enter a marriage contract.

[23] Gentiles could join the covenant community if they agreed to its authority over them and lived in the land under it as resident aliens (*ger*).

progeny as the means of blessing all humanity (Gen. 12:1-3). Its land provisions were later unfolded in the so-called Palestinian contract (Deut. 29:1-30:10); its progeny provisions were later revealed to include an everlasting Davidic dynasty (2 Sam. 7:4-16; Ps. 89:3-4, 28-29, 34-37); and its global blessing provisions became clear with the New Covenant (Isa. 59:20-21; Jer. 31:31-34; 50:4-5; Ezk. 34:25-30; 37:21-28).

The Mosaic contract. Unlike the Noahic and Abrahamic contracts the Mosaic contract was neither preservative nor redemptive; it was an offer for a kingdom relationship with God and therefore provisional. Merrill puts it well:

> "The Mosaic [covenant] is subservient to the Abrahamic, a special arrangement with Abraham's seed to put it in a position to become the means of blessing which the Lord had promised to his descendants. . . .For Israel to be a holy nation called for a deportment that would cause the peoples of the earth to see in Israel's behavior a reflection of the God they professed to serve. . . .Theirs would be an inestimable privilege, but at the same time the commitment they made would entail enormous responsibility. Should they refuse God's gracious overtures, he surely would work out his redemptive program by some other means, the nature of which defies human imagination.[24]

It challenged Abraham's progeny to bring into existence the Kingdom of God on earth. As such it spelled out the details of what loving God and neighbor actually should have looked like in the second millennium BC. Thus it forms a template of what *experiential* sanctification on a national scale was supposed to have produced.

Although the Mosaic contract contained many "statutes and judgments," it was not an impersonal legal document like corresponding pagan documents (e.g., Code of Hammurabi). Intermingled with statutes and case laws was *personal address*—the hallmark of biblical revelation. It can be seen in Moses' Deuteronomic rhetoric. Table 1 shows how in speaking of education and holy war, Moses reminds Israel of their relationship to Yahweh in the midst of telling them specific "how-to" procedures. His discourse here has a "sandwich" structure that consists of relationship matters ensconced between procedural matters.[25]

Moses' Discourse Structure	**Deuteronomy 6: Living in the Word**	**Deuteronomy 7: Joining in Yahweh's War**
"How to" procedures	6:6-9, 20-25	7:1-5, 17-26
Contractual relationship with Yahweh	6:10-19	7:6-16

Table 1.—An example from Moses' discourse structure that includes relationship in the midst of specific, executable procedures.

[24] Eugene H. Merrill, *Everlasting Dominion: A Theology of the Old Testament* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2006), 327, 271f.

[25] This example is a great teaching model for pastors. People need both detailed instructions on how practically to implement the divine viewpoint of Scripture in everyday life, but they also need reminding about why those "how to's" are important to their relationship with the Lord. Over-emphasis on the first leads to a mechanical approach; over-emphasis on the second leaves emotional impact with no constructive outlet.

Through the Mosaic contract King Yahweh personally called to believing and unbelieving Jew alike to submit to His Kingdom rule. The King demanded a total-heart loyalty throughout the Mosaic contract (e.g., Ex. 25:2; Deut. 7:17; 8:17; 12:20-21; 14:26; 15:9-10, etc.). Like all biblical revelation His speech unavoidably triggered personal responses—positive or negative—in the heart where redemption and sanctification occur. In citing the tenth commandment Paul reminds us that this was no mere legal code enforceable by civil authority (Rom. 7:7); it went far deeper. And we infer from the economic Trinity that the Holy Spirit was involved in all these heart transactions.

The Mosaic contract-induced heart crisis. Because Yahweh's call for submission to His Kingdom rule pierced to the fallen hearts of unbelievers, it brought out into the open the need for repentance and a heart change. From the beginning Yahweh expressed the problem: "Oh, that they had such a heart in them that they would fear Me and always keep all My commandments" (Deut. 5:29). No sooner had the contract been ratified on Mt. Sinai than the nation reverted to pagan idolatry (Ex. 32-34; Deut. 9-10). Having watched the exodus generation fail to properly respond to Yahweh, Moses, in his address to the second generation just prior to the conquest, reiterated the need for them to *internalize* the ritual of circumcision: "Circumcise the foreskin of your heart, and be stiff-necked no longer" (Deut. 10:16).

To understand what Moses meant we have to reflect upon the ritual of circumcision. Circumcision was the sign of the redemptive Abrahamic contract which promised numerous natural descendents, including a special spiritual progeny. Circumcision demonstrated that natural human propagation—specifically the male seed—was somehow flawed and needed a corrective action to be capable of producing the promised progeny.[26] Circumcision said in effect: "God has promised to produce a special line of children within the Abrahamic family, but those children won't come by natural reproduction using your male seed." In calling for spiritual circumcision of the heart Moses implied that the natural state of the heart was incapable of fulfilling the Kingdom imperatives of Yahweh; surgery was needed to correct the problem.

Unfortunately, the subsequent historical record of theocratic Israel, i.e., the contract performance data, demonstrated the failure of both the people and their leaders to circumcise their hearts. Jeremiah and Ezekiel gave a last-minute exhortations: "Circumcise yourselves to the LORD, and take away the foreskins of your hearts" (Jer. 4:4); "Cast away from you all the transgressions which you have committed, and get yourselves a new heart and a new spirit" (Ezek. 18:31). In spite of all the warnings to respond positively, the cursings provision of the Mosaic contract had

[26] The Ishmael-Isaac narrative illustrated that supernatural action was needed to produce the true covenant-carrying progeny—the seed of promise—as Paul discusses in Romans 9:6-13. Since God's revelation utilizes physical objects, we shouldn't be surprised to discover that there are physiological and medical implications of circumcision. Canadian physiologist Arthur C. Custance details the effects of the fall on the male sperm vs. the female ovum: "The seed of the woman is the only remnant that has retained the original immortality possessed by our first parents. By contrast, the seed of man and the body cells of both the man and the woman have been mortalized." *The Seed of the Woman* (Brockville, Ontario: Doorway Publications, 1981), 227. Medical doctor S. I. McMillen years ago pointed out that women married to circumcised men have a significantly lower incidence of cervical cancer due to greater cleanliness of the male organ. *None of These Diseases* (Westwood, NewJersey: Fleming H.Revell Co., 1963), 19-21. The point here is that spiritual truths relate to physical design because God created both. Physical objects used in biblical illustrations aren't arbitrarily chosen.

to be applied to the nation and into exile it went (Lev. 26:14-39; Deut. 28:15-68). The Mosaic contract did not redeem because it could not by itself bring about the inner transformation in the people that was needed for its blessings provisions to be applied.[27] Nevertheless, some individuals did show a circumcised heart of loyalty to Yahweh's commands (e.g., Pss. 19:7-11; 37:31; 40:8; 119:11,36,111-112; Isa. 51:7).

Since the Mosaic contract assumed the civil authority of the Noahic contract and demanded from Abraham's descendents what Merrill has called an "appropriate deportment," one can conclude that God simultaneously worked His theocratic rule through all three contracts. To circumcise their hearts and to participate in any of the promised Abrahamic blessings, Israelites had to believe like their father Abraham; they had to join the special line within his natural progeny.[28] Few did, so the exile ended the theocracy.

The heart crisis resolved by the New contract. The exile event posed a dilemma. How would the prophetic promises of the Abrahamic contract and their unfolding details via the Palestinian and Davidic contracts come to pass if the nation could not meet the prerequisite for blessing? Moses had foreseen the dilemma and prophesied that "God will circumcise your heart and the heart of your descendants" (Deut. 30:6). As the time of the exile drew close God revealed through His prophets that He would initiate a new contract to replace the Mosaic and to provide the proper heart condition for the nation (Jer. 30-31; Ezek. 36:24-32). McClain explains:

> "The moral problem posed by the failure of the Mosaic Covenant will under the New Covenant be met by God's own sovereign grace and power. . . .the benefits of the Mosaic Covenant will be attained, and at the same time its moral requirements will be secured. . . .The New Covenant, therefore, is in the gracious spirit of the earlier Abrahamic Covenant. . . .[It] is not on the basis of any surviving rights in the broken Covenant of Sinai but simply because Jehovah remembers His earlier 'covenant with Jacob, . . .with Isaac, and . . .with Abraham' (Lev. 26:42)."[29]

Three elements of this New contract are important for the present discussion of sanctification: (1) the contract assured that one day circumcised hearts would characterize the entire nation, not just a remnant; (2) it was to be made with the nation Israel in the future, not with as yet non-existent Church; and (3) it flowed out of the Abrahamic contract, not out of the Mosaic. Jeremiah declared that the New contract's purpose was "that they may fear Me forever" (Jer. 32:39). It thus carries implications for the *ultimate* sanctification of Old Testament saints.

---

[27] Here is the historic proof that all attempts to convert civil authority into a redemptive agency—Marxist-Communism, Euro-spawned "Christian Socialism," and Islamic Shariah—fail. They violate God's design of man and as mere external legalisms lack spiritually transforming power.

[28] Here is why Chafer's statement that during the theocracy "no provision for enablement was ever made" is confusing. Did he mean "no provision was available" at all, or did he mean that "no *new* provision through the law beyond that implicit in the Abrahamic contract was made"? Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Systematic Theology* (Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1948), 6:123. Showers states the matter more carefully: "To Old Testament saints God's holy precepts were. . .administered internally even while the old covenant was in effect. . . .But these saints obtained this internal administration of God's precepts through some means other than the old covenant. The old covenant itself provided only the external administration." Renald E. Showers, *The New Nature* (available from the author and from Friends of Israel, 1986), 142f.

[29] McClain, 158.

Pertinent to the present discussion of OT sanctification is the question of whether the New covenant promised future conditions for the entire nation that were already present in the faithful remnant, or did it look forward to some conditions not yet present at all? Clearly heart circumcision and the law-in-the-heart of individual OT saints predated the New contract. However, were the promises of future *national* indwelling of the law (Jer. 31:33) and indwelling Holy Spirit (Ezek. 36:27) phenomena already familiar from the remnant's prior *individual* experience? How one answers this question determines the degree of continuity between OT and NT sanctification that one concludes. Is OT contract terminology definitive enough to infer differences between OT and NT sanctification, or are we left only with reading NT conditions back into the OT? Recently James Hamilton has taken an approach similar to this paper in arguing that the New contract's terminology is definitive enough at least to conclude that the Holy Spirit did not universally indwell OT believers.[30] To see that the New contract specified national conditions for Israel that went beyond those previously experienced by individual OT saints, we need to examine the meaning of the concept of "indwelling" as it appears in Jeremiah 31:33 and Ezekiel 36:27.

Sacred Spaces in the Theocracy

Spaces made sacred by God's indwelling. The Mosaic contract copies (tablets of stone) were deposited in the Ark upon which lay the throne and mercy seat of Yahweh (Ex. 25:10-22). The Ark most of the time was located within the tabernacle (earlier) and the temple (later) both of which were indwelt by God's glory. This juxtaposition of contract and indwelling moves our discussion from the biblical contract form of revelation to the concept of "sacred space" and God's indwelling of such a space.

God is without spatial and temporal limit, yet just as He condescends to bind Himself to contractual obligations with groups of men, He condescends to meet with them in space and time. Since the garden in Eden He has chosen specific locations for personal "face-to-face" meetings with man. Pre-theocratic patriarchs sensing the significance of such places marked them off with stones (e.g., Jacob at Bethel, Gen. 28:11-19). Mt. Sinai was such a place. So, too, were the tabernacle and the temple. During the theocracy, therefore, God had a continuous, localized, physical presence in Israel which allows us to see what "indwelling" accomplishes.

The garden in Eden, Bethel, Sinai and the other locations were sacred spaces—holy properties—with boundaries, the access into which, was strictly limited by God.[31] Adam and Eve were permanently ejected from His garden property. Moses was to take off his sandals in order to walk into Yahweh's sacred space on Mt. Sinai (Ex. 3:5). Both tabernacle and temple had strict protocols for priestly approach because in them stood the Ark *of the Mosaic contract* which served both as the throne of the Lord and the place of atonement. Yahweh's holy throne could only be approached by fallen man via an acceptable sacrifice. Just what was acceptable is given by detailed procedures in the book of Leviticus. "Israelites must meet [Yahweh] on his terms, not

[30] See the published version of his PhD dissertation which also provides the chart in Appendix 1 of this paper. James M. Hamilton, Jr., *God's Indwelling Presence: the Holy Spirit in the Old & New Testaments* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 2006).
[31] See the discussion on sacred space in Merrill, 281-292, 351-59, 452-454.

theirs, and approach his holy presence according to proper protocol and preconditions."[32] In the future the new universe will be the final sacred space from which "dogs and sorcerers and sexually immoral and murderers and idolaters, and whoever loves and practices a lie" will be excluded (Rev. 22:15). Biblically, then, a space becomes sacred (off-limits to the unauthorized) because God dwells in it. And during the theocracy He dwelt in the location of the Mosaic contract because that was where he met with Israel to carry out His contractual relationship with the nation.

The Indwelling of the Holy Spirit in Israel. With the inauguration of the Mosaic contract Yahweh introduced the indwelling concept with His words to Moses: "let them make Me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them"(Ex. 25:8). He would dwell "among" the people by dwelling "in" the tabernacle. When the Israelite construction workers finished the tabernacle His glory descended and indwelt it (Ex. 40:34-35). Theologically, exactly what did such indwelling accomplish? Plainly it accomplished a *doxological* purpose in revealing the nature of God to the nation and through the nation to the Gentile travelers visiting it. Hamilton notes that it also accomplished a *sanctifying* purpose:

> "Yahweh's residence among His people in the tabernacle not only provided them with access to His presence, it also sanctified them. God's presence among His people necessitates—and creates—clean and holy living, for, as He declares, 'I am Yahweh who sanctifies you' (Exod 31:13)."[33]

The sanctifying work consisted of conditioning Israel's physical environment according to their faith (Lev. 26:9-13) and of expressing His commands for the nation to rest or to move (Num. 9:15-23). This work is said to emanate directly out from the site of His indwelling, the tabernacle, rather than from general providence.

What was true of the tabernacle was also true of the temple. When Solomon dedicated the Temple, he was clearly aware of the difference between God's spatial unlimitedness and His localized presence in the Temple: "The heaven of heavens cannot contain You. How much less this temple which I have built. . . .Yet. . .may Your eyes be open toward this temple night and day, toward the place of which You said, 'My name shall be there'"(1 Kings 8:27-29). Repeatedly Solomon mentions prayers of petition and confession as being directed toward or in the Temple location, yet he simultaneously speaks of God hearing from heaven, His dwelling place (8:30-53). After Solomon ended his dedicatory prayer, "fire came down from heaven. . .and the glory of the Lord filled the temple. And the priests could not enter the house of the LORD, because the glory of the LORD had filled the LORD'S house" (2 Chron. 7:1-2).

This dwelling within the temple's sacred space of Yahweh's Name, His eyes, and His heart (1 Kings 9:3) was contingent on Israel's historic performance of the Mosaic contract (1 Kings 9:4-9; 2 Chron. 7:12-22). Years later at the time of the exile and end of the theocracy Ezekiel witnessed in a vision the departure of Yahweh's Glory from the temple. First the Glory moved from between the cherubim to the temple threshold (Ezek. 9:3), then to the outer courtyard (10:4), and finally eastward out of the city altogether (11:23). We know from our earlier discussion of the economic Trinity that the Third Person was intimately involved with this

[32] Ibid., 354.
[33] Hamilton, 36.

departure from the temple. The Holy Spirit had been "among" the Lord's people by being "in" the chosen sacred space from the completion of the tabernacle to the desecration of the temple.

Indwelling and the New contract. Now that we have some clarification of what divine indwelling looked like during the theocracy, we return to Jeremiah 31:33 and Ezekiel 36:27. How would the original recipients of that revelation have understood it? First, look at Jeremiah's terminology:

> "This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the LORD: I will put My law in their minds, and write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people. No more shall every man teach his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, 'Know the LORD,' for they all shall know Me, from the least of them to the greatest of them, says the LORD. For I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin I will remember no more" (Jer. 31:33-34).

As Hamilton notes, there is imagery here of the physical media of the Mosaic contract. The book of the law was kept next to the Ark (Deut. 31:26). The priests were its custodians. When a king obeyed the injunction to study diligently the law he had to make his copy from that kept by the priests (Deut. 17:18). The imagery of Yahweh writing His law would certainly conjure up the stone tablets on Mt. Sinai (Exod 32:15–16; 34:1, 28; Deut 4:13; 5:22; 9:10). Jeremiah's readers would have this imagery in mind, not that of post-Pentecostal history. They would have sensed the radical implications of this New contract language. Writes Hamilton:

> "The Torah will no longer reside in the ark in the temple. Yahweh promises that the Torah will have a new medium—no longer written on tablets but on hearts, and a new home—no longer residing in the ark in the temple but in God's people. . . .Since the responsibility of the priesthood was to teach Torah, this verse implies that the new covenant will render this function of the priests unnecessary. No longer will the limited availability of copies of the Torah prohibit access to God's word."[34]

Jeremiah's prophecy of the New contract speaks of a major new act of God in progressive revelation that will fundamentally alter Israel's worship protocols.

Ezekiel's rendition of the New contract states that: "I will put My spirit within you and cause you to walk in My statutes, and you will keep My judgments and do them" (Ezek. 36:27). Hamilton points out that the Hebrew phrase "in your [plural] midst" (*beqirbekem*—translated in the NKJV as "within you") would probably:

> "have been understood against the vision of God's glory leaving the temple in Ezekiel 8-11. Not only does this interpretation fit contextually, it also has grammatical probability on its side. Each time this term, which is the equivalent of 'in the midst of you all,' occurs in the Old Testament, it signifies something that is in the midst of the community collectively rather than something that is in the midst of each individual in the community. It would be remarkable if the uses of the form in Ezek. 36:26 and 27 were the lone exceptions to this pattern of usage in the Old Testament."[35]

[34] Ibid., 43.
[35] Ibid., 49.

Although the New contract certainly included God's actions in the hearts of individual OT believers (e.g., spiritual circumcision), it also included a doctrine of indwelling that has to be understood against the background of His prior theocratic indwelling. That prior indwelling involved a sacred space, a specific location of His presence, for a specific eight-century long period of history that was distinct from His work in individual hearts. Prophecies of the New contract, therefore, speak of a new act that involved the Holy Spirit beyond His "normal," i.e., continuous, revelatory tasks through OT and NT.

God's Sanctifying Work in OT Theocratic Saints

Looking at the Trinity's progressive revelation from the contract perspective establishes the context for the sanctification of OT saints during the theocratic period. This group of individuals belonged to what is called the "remnant" since they constituted the believing subset of the nation which encompassed both believers and unbelievers. As believers they had a redemptive relationship with Yahweh via the Abrahamic contract provisions while having a kingship relationship with Him via the Mosaic contract.[36] We now look at their sanctification strictly from the standpoint of the OT text without projecting backward from the NT.

Positional Sanctification

Justification. As partakers of the benefits of the Abrahamic contract, Old Testament saints had to have shared the same imputed righteousness that Abraham had been given when he believed (i.e., they were *justified*).[37] Just how these saints were led to faith and what revelational content they believed is a matter of speculation. We've seen above that God called them to be "spiritually circumcised" which implies a *contract-centered* faith that focused upon their becoming the spiritual progeny of Abraham in addition to being his natural progeny. Only by so doing could they help the nation secure the blessing promised through Moses.

By the time of the theocracy progressive revelation had advanced beyond that available to Abraham and his immediate family. It included a new awareness of Yahweh's supremacy over all pagan deities (via the exodus and conquest), His stringent adherence to blessing/cursing sanctions (via experiences of immediate discipline for disobedience), and the barriers to entry of His sacred space (tabernacle and temple protocols). This revelational content constituted the "message"—the Second Person of the Trinity then known—spoken by the Father and revealed by the Holy Spirit to the theocratic saints. It did *not* include awareness of God's presence on earth one day in a son of Judah or of the eternally existing intra-Trinity life yet to be manifested. Nor did it contain resolution of the apparent logical conflict in an ongoing personal (biblical understood as contractually-based) relationship between sinful man and holy Yahweh (Ps. 143:3). Theocratic saints, therefore, were justified by faith like Church age believers in a formal

[36] See discussion of the remnant in Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum, *Israelology: The Missing Link in Systematic Theology* (San Antonio, TX: Ariel Ministries, 2001 edition), 601-604.

[37] Refer to previous discussion of the implications of biblical contracts, pages 7-8. Chafer wrote that no Old Testament saints except Abraham had the righteousness of God imputed to them (Chafer, 74). It would have been clearer had he said they *shared* Abraham's imputed righteousness when they became his spiritual seed through heart circumcision.

sense, but their imputed righteousness did not yet exist. That righteousness was contingent upon a future work of the yet un-incarnated Son of God in bringing into existence the righteousness imputed to Abraham.[38] What they believed when justified thus differed in content from today's gospel.[39]

Regeneration. Another topic of positional sanctification besides justification is *regeneration*. Most writers argue that Old Testament saints were regenerated using a NT understanding of that term. Some like McCabe, for example, argue theologically:

> "There is only one way to overcome spiritual death, whether one lived in the Old Testament period or the New Testament era, and this is by God giving a dead sinner spiritual life. Thus, it would seem that it was theologically necessary for the Spirit to regenerate people in the Old Testament economy."[40]

Others like Showers argue both exegetically and theologically:

> "That Old Testament saints were regenerated is evident for several reasons. Firstly, Jesus told Nicodemus that the only way into the kingdom of God is through regeneration (John 3:3,5), and yet Jesus said that Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the prophets belong to the kingdom of God (Luke 13:28-29). It is obvious from this that [all of these] Old Testament saints were regenerated. Secondly, the acts of faith performed by such Old Testament saints. . .indicate that these men were spiritually alive. But spiritual life comes only as a result of regeneration."[41]

Stallard, citing Walter Kaiser who maximizes continuity between the testaments, agrees:

> "Jesus 'thought it was altogether reasonable for a person to experience. . .being born again. . .as judged by the writings of the Old Testament—especially since the New Testament had not yet been written and Christ had not yet gone to the cross and been raised from the dead.' Jesus forced such a conclusion [that Old Testament saints were regenerated] with his critical question to Nicodemus. . .in John 3:10."[42]

Leon Wood and James Hamilton though differing regarding Holy Spirit indwelling agree that regeneration occurred in the OT.[43]

Some dispensationalists have objected to seeing regeneration in the Old Testament for a variety of reasons based upon progressive revelation. Darby set out a fundamental caveat in questioning the assumption that the created spiritual life of the Old Testament saint was identical to that of

---

[38] Thus Paul speaks of sins that God passed over (Greek: *paraesis*) prior to the atoning work of Christ. God had not yet demonstrated that He could be just at the same time while He was justifying sinners (Rom. 3:25-26).

[39] Here the dispensational and covenant theological approaches diverge. Dispensationalism emphasizes the conservation of meaning in biblical covenant terminology whereas covenant theology emphasizes the reading of New Testament content back into the Old Testament text. See Ryrie, 113-117. See also, Clough, 70, and Appendix 1.

[40] Robert V. McCabe, "Were Old Testament Saints Indwelt by the Holy Spirit?" *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 9 (2004) 246

[41] Renald E. Showers, *The New Nature* (private printing available from Friends of Israel, 1986) 138.

[42] Michael Stallard, *The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament* (available from his website http://faculty.bbc.edu/mstallard/wp-content/uploads/2009/10/HolySpiritOT.pdf), 14. Stallard here cites Walter Kaiser, Jr., "The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament" in *Pentecostalism in Context: Essay in Honor of William W. Menzies* edited by Wonsuk Ma and Robert P. Menzies, (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997). 38f.

[43] Leon J. Wood, *The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1998), 64-68; and Hamilton, 47-54

the New Testament saint. He criticized a commentary writer who had called the differences in spiritual life unessential, a mere "official difference." Darby's response pointed to the doxological importance of dispensational differences.

> "To say that the breaking down the middle wall of partition, and the accomplishment of the glorious work by which it was effected produced only an official difference, because man had life, and man was forgiven, or forborne with in view of it, is to say that the display of God's glory was an unessential thing: the display of all His glorious wisdom, power, and love, in that mighty work which stands alone in heaven and earth, the object of angels' research. Was it unessential to them. . .to see Him who had created them, nailed to the tree in that mighty and solitary hour which stands aloof from all before or after? . . . .

Turning from the doxological matters of God and angels to the redemption of men, Darby continued to point to dispensational changes. Abraham had to live and walk according to the revelation given to him; Israel, to theirs; and we Christians, to ours:

> "So to us—the presence of the Holy Ghost Himself being the great distinguishing fact, with the knowledge He affords. Because all this is what we are to act upon. . .Hence the Lord does not hesitate to say, 'This is life eternal, to know Thee, the only True God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent. *That could not have been the life of those before.* Had they then not life? Nay, but it could not be stated that way—*their life was not that.*"[44] [Emphasis supplied]

Chafer also objected: "It cannot be demonstrated that this spiritual renewal known to the Old Testament, whatever its character may have been, resulted in the impartation of the divine nature, in an actual sonship, a joint heirship with Christ, or a placing in the household and family of God."[45] The apparently easy argument that the bestowal of a disposition to obey God has been the same from age to age seems clean and neat until one asks how a regeneration of Old Testament saints could then have included all the aspects of union with Christ revealed in the New Testament. If it did not, then in what sense has regeneration so defined been changeless?

The John 3 Nicodemus dialog is a crux passage. Nicodemus was an educated Jewish leader who was acquainted with the Old Testament idea of the coming Messianic kingdom. This kingdom was being offered to Israel in his day by Jesus and his prophet-forerunner, John the Baptizer. It was to have a righteous character as well as the more popular political dimension according to stipulations in the Mosaic and New contracts. Jesus held Nicodemus responsible to know that from the existing OT revelation. Jesus' metaphor of the "new birth / birth-from-above" somehow must be implied, then, in that revelation.

Whereas most commentators on John 3 insist that Jesus' vocabulary ("water" and "spirit") refers to human birth or the baptism of John the Baptizer, McClain saw a much more straightforward connection with New contract terminology:

---

[44] J. N. Darby, "An Examination of the Statements Made in the 'Thoughts on the Apocalypse,' by B. W. Newton; and An Enquiry How Far They Accord with Scripture,'" *The Collected Writings of J. N. Darby*, (n.d.; repr., Winschoten, Netherlands: H. L. Heijkoop, 1971), 8: 26–27. My thanks to Dr. Tommy Ice for this reference.

[45] Chafer, 6:73. Chafer even denied that Old Testament saints were justified (except Abraham), presumably because the righteousness to impute was not yet available (see 6:74).

> "A comparison of John 3:5 with Ezekiel 36:25-27 demonstrates beyond dispute the Old Testament derivation of our Lord's doctrine of regeneration. In John 3:5 there are three things: a new birth, and the two indispensable factors with produce it: i.e., "water" and "spirit." In Ezekiel's prophecy we find the same three ideas: the "new heart" which then is related to "clean water" and God's "spirit."[46]

We've already seen above, however, that the New contract terminology describes both individual sanctification and major changes in the Spirit's indwelling of Israel. I would therefore adjust McClain's view to seeing Jesus' "water" and "spirit" referring to solely to Ezekiel 36:25-26—divine acts that had already been going on throughout the OT. The Holy Spirit's future indwelling of the nation mentioned in Ezekiel 36:27 would not have applied to an individual like Nicodemus since it was a future act not yet having taken place.

The divine acts going on throughout the OT regarding individuals centered upon spiritual circumcision. Spiritual circumcision envisioned the sign of the Abrahamic contract that pointed to the need for a supernaturally-generated progeny among Abraham's natural progeny. How fitting, then, for Jesus to introduce the new birth terminology to describe what must happen for every OT person to become a spiritual child of Abraham. The theological term "regeneration" is an updated way of expressing Old Testament spiritual circumcision or the new heart for the kingdom age Jesus was offering to Israel. Interestingly, in writing of the spiritual position of Church age believers, Paul includes the term "spiritual circumcision" on three occasions (Rom. 2:29; Phil. 3:3; Col. 2:11). In each context he seems to be discussing Jewish concerns which suggests that the term was particularly useful in pointing out to Hebrew Christians a vital positional truth: their present relation with God was rooted in the redemptive Abrahamic contract that had given their believing ancestors the potential to fulfill the requirements of Old Testament law.

By arguing directly on the basis of contract terminology rather than by theological deduction we support the majority view that Old Testament saints were regenerated. However, at the same time we respect the limitations of progressive revelation. We honor the concerns of Darby, Chafer and other dispensationalists by qualifying the term regeneration by narrowing its meaning to what would have been understood prior to Pentecost. Old Testament regeneration thus understood does *not* include all of the theological truths retroactively stuffed into the term by theologians reading New Testament conditions back into it. Regeneration of Old Testament saints is much like their justification: it was contingent upon the final work of the yet unincarnated Son of God. Eternal life, revealed for the first time in the Incarnation, did not yet exist during the theocracy. What spiritual life that was given by spiritual circumcision certainly gave empowerment to fulfill Mosaic imperatives and a hope for a "city which has foundations" (Heb. 11:10), but it knew nothing of a historically-accomplished resurrection nor a union side-by-side with Gentiles with the ascended God-man.[47]

---

[46] McClain, 287.

[47] McCabe ridicules Chafer's opposition to full-fledged New Testament regeneration in the Old Testament period: "If Chafer and others are correct that there is some type of renewal. . .and it is not regeneration as revealed in the New Testament, one wonders what type of renewal a person living in the Old Testament experienced? Was it some sort of intermediate state between being spiritually dead and spiritually alive, some sort of "half-life" category? The only way this "half-life" can work is if Old Testament sinners were only "partially depraved," rather than totally depraved." McCabe, 246f. Here we observe the influence of Reformed covenant theology on this dispensational

Old Testament *positional* sanctification, then, differed from its New Testament counterpart. It could be referred to by the terms justification and regeneration *if those terms are qualified according to their earlier position in the revelation of the Triune God*. But what of Old Testament saints' *experiential* sanctification? To that we now turn.

Experiential Sanctification.

Were theocratic saints universally indwelt by the Holy Spirit? Did indwelling of the Holy Spirit in individual believers exist in the Old Testament as it does in the New Testament? If indwelling is just another term for experiential enablement of the new heart or disposition, then obviously it did exist back then. Debate over indwelling of the Holy Spirit in OT believers follows a pattern similar to that just discussed under regeneration.[48]

Those who advocate an OT indwelling of believers link it to regeneration, enablement, and sealing. Wood, for example, holds that the NT phenomena of indwelling, sealing, even filling by the Holy Spirit "were experienced by Old Testament saints. They did not call their experiences by these names, . . .but their existence is witnessed in the lives of the true believers."[49] Snoeberger even argues that breaking the link between regeneration and indwelling leads to "second blessing" sanctification theology. He claims that 19th century second-blessing teaching that chronologically separated regeneration from indwelling of the Spirit came into dispensational circles through Chafer:

> "Disjunction of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit from regeneration and sanctification . . .was common among early Dallas dispensationalists such as Lewis Sperry Chafer, John F. Walvoord, and Charles C. Ryrie. For these, indwelling was a new ministry of the Holy Spirit in the dispensation of grace (cf. John 14:17), and thus not essential to regeneration or sanctification. Instead, these must be accomplished by other means. Chafer, founder and longtime president of Dallas Seminary. . . embraced the second work of the Holy Spirit from the beginning, but not as a part of his dispensational system. His "second work" view arose from his Oberlin training, his itinerant evangelism, and the influence of Moody and Scofield on him, not from his dispensational theology."[50]

Snoeberger apparently ignores Chafer's opposition to such a chronologically second work of the Spirit in the very chapter of his Systematic Theology on the indwelling of the Holy Spirit:

> "The failure to discern that the Holy Spirit indwells every believer was the common and all but universal error of men two generations ago. That error was promoted in the early Keswick conferences . . .However, American expositors of the last two generations have

---

writer: continuity of spiritual life as manifest in the New Testament *after* the Incarnation implies its previous existence in the Old Testament *prior* to the Incarnation; there is thus in this view no real progress in God's speech and acts.

[48]McCabe states it well: "Those who see a consistent continuity between the Old Testament and New Testament, most covenant theologians, affirm that Old Testament believers were indwelt, while those who see a fundamental discontinuity between the testaments, many dispensational theologians, affirm that they were not indwelt." 216.

[49] Wood, 7.

[50]Mark. A. Snoeberger, "Second Blessing Models of Sanctification and Early Dallas Dispensationalism," *Masters Seminary Journal* (2004) 15: 93.

> done much to recover this important doctrine. . . .The notion that the Holy Spirit is received as a second work of grace in now defended only by extreme holiness groups."[51]

Snoeberger evidently confuses a *functional* disjunction with a *chronological* disjunction. The former does not imply the latter.

McCabe's major paper on the subject holds "that the Spirit's gracious indwelling ministry with a believer refers to his permanently *sustaining the saving relationship that he began at regeneration*." [52] [Emphasis added] He justifies his hermeneutic of reading backward from the New Testament into the Old:

> "An objection to the argument of this paper may be that I have read the Spirit's New Testament ministry back into the Old. However, the nature of progressive revelation must allow the New Testament to clarify some verities that permeate both testaments. For example, Christ's active role in the creation of the heavens and the earth is not explicitly affirmed in any Old Testament text, yet John 1:5 and Colossians 1:16 specifically affirm his active role. Orthodox interpreters affirm that the Old Testament allows for and implies the Son's involvement in creation, and recognize that the New Testament completes God's revelatory accounting of creation. Without the New Testament would believers know about Christ's active role in the creation week?" [53]

The fallacy in applying this example to indwelling is that we already knew of the creation act from previous revelation. That the Second Person figured prominently in creation is added information from later revelation that merely refines the interpretation of the previously established act. We're not reading the act itself back into the Old Testament. To apply this example to the elusive case of the Third Person's indwelling we would first need to know that the specific action described in the New Testament actually occurred in prior ages from the Old Testament text. Once that was accomplished, we then could refine our understanding of it from New Testament revelation.

Two lines of argument from the OT text will show that Spirit did not universally indwell OT saints. The first line of argument flows from OT passages that explicitly mention Spirit indwelling of individuals. He indwelt Joseph (Gen. 41:38), Joshua (Num 27:18), the prophets (Neh. 9:30), Daniel (Dan. 4:8; 5:11-14) as well as the tabernacle craftsmen (Exod. 31:3; 35:31). The Spirit left King Saul to indwell David (1 Sam. 16:13-14), and David prayed that the Spirit not be taken from him (Ps. 51:11). These texts, however, point to limited indwelling—limited as to the number of those indwelt and/or limited as to duration.[54]

Advocates of universal OT indwelling deny that these passages apply. McCabe writes, "I would argue that the examples of Bezaleel, Saul, and David argue for a ministry of the Spirit that focused on theocratic purposes, rather than soteriological."[55] McCabe thus stripped of any OT texts explicitly addressing indwelling of individuals has to rely completely upon reading NT

---

[51] Chafer, 122.
[52] Ibid., 263.
[53] Ibid., 256f.
[54] This coming-and-going nature of Old Testament indwelling has been pointed out for years. See, for example, Chafer, 74, and Charles C. Ryrie, *The Holy Spirit* (Chicago: Moody Bible Institute, 1965), 41-44.
[55] McCabe, 258.

theology back into the OT to elucidate a universal divine act for which there is no textual evidence. Moreover, in the case of David at least, the distinction between theocratic and soteriological functions isn't at all clear. Stallard challenges the complete divorce in Psalm 51 between a theocratic function and a soteriological (sanctification) function:

> "Saul had lost his kingdom due to a heart that turned away from God. Consequently, David senses the need to restore his fellowship with God but also may see his need to keep his kingdom. If this is so, David's focus on the kingdom does not cheapen the heart-felt individual longing to make things right with God. . . .David's experience is typical of Old Testament pneumatology. The Spirit comes upon individuals and leaves them, sometimes due to their sin. . . .[David's prayer] is. . .quite different from the New Testament experience of permanent indwelling even for carnal Christians (1 Cor. 6:18-20)."[56]

The only OT textual evidence regarding Spirit indwelling of individuals describes it as limited, not universal.

A second line of argument follows from the previous discussion concerning the Spirit's OT indwelling of Israel during the theocracy. That experience sets the context for the notion of divine indwelling in general and the Spirit's indwelling in particular. The indwelling of the tabernacle and temple wasn't because those locations needed soteriological cleansing; it was because of what surrounded those locations, i.e., the tribal communities living near the major trade routes of the ancient world. God dwelt *in* those sacred spaces in order to be *among* His people so they in turn would be a witness *to* the world (Ex. 19:6; Deut.4:5-8, 32-34).

The work of the Holy Spirit inside these sacred spaces was 'outside of the believer' and differed from whatever work the Holy Spirit was doing 'inside the believer.' Sanctification of the theocratic saints and indwelling of Yahweh's Name, therefore, were two distinguishable functions although they were related. Failure in the overwhelming majority of Israelites to submit to Yahweh from the heart eventually led to the departure of the indwelling Name and national exile. Such was the state of affairs at that point in the progress of revelation.

Both lines of argument, therefore, show that indwelling in the OT, whether the limited indwelling in select Israelites or the indwelling glory of the tabernacle and temple, does not support the claim of universal indwelling of OT saints. Indwelling and regeneration understood in the theocratic context are functionally separate. The former is not necessary for the latter.

Lordship justice and sanctification. Experiential sanctification of believers during the theocracy functioned in their relationship with King Yahweh (Mosaic contract) as well as with Him as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Abrahamic contract). Their creed of loyalty was the Shema: "Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God, the LORD is one! You shall love the LORD your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your strength" (Deut. 6:4). Yahweh ruled them physically and politically with three simultaneously functioning contracts. It was a unique relationship in world history (Deut. 4:32-34). As previously mentioned this arrangement made clear the link between ethical choices and the resultant effects in culture, economics, and nature. The ethical standard was Yahweh's righteousness which He required throughout the

[56] Stallard, 16.

length and breadth of the tribal confederation for it to prosper (Deut. 1:17; 16:20). The expression of such righteousness through the numerous statutes and judgments enforced by physical consequences was to be a testimony to all other nations (Deut. 4:7-8).[57]

To call attention to this theocratic organization and distinguish it from contemporary ideas of a just society, I will use the term "lordship justice" in contrast to "social justice." Lordship justice pertains to theocracy where God's speech defines what constitutes correct social ordering; social justice pertains to anthrocracy where man defines the "correct" ordering.[58] Theocratic saints were thus "schooled" within a Holy Spirit ordered environment radically different from our experience. Their sanctification wasn't merely that of an individual living in his private religious compartment; it was that of a husband (wife), parent, business-laborer, property-owner, and community participant. He was called to submit to what some moderns in their vaunted self-image would call an intellectual and ethical Tyrant or reap the consequences of disobedience.

This supposedly intellectual and ethical Tyrant, however, omnisciently and righteously ruled His realm far more thoughtfully and morally than any modern ever dreamed possible. He placed all educational responsibility upon the family, not on the civil authorities, and demanded that they pass on the history of His acts to each successive generation without "revising" it. Family training was the sanctifying procedure that was to put the Word of God into their heart (Deut. 6). Their historical memory was to include His exodus deliverance from the dominating empire of the day without one human weapon—a sanctifying vision of what He was capable of doing to any enemy threat in the future. It was to include His 40-year demonstration of the insufficiency of human labor alone to provide food, water, and clothing—another sanctifying vision that "man shall not live by bread alone" but must rely on this Tyrant's gracious logistics operating in the background at all times (Deut. 8). It was sanctification by historical memory.

The theocratic saint was to share his Tyrant's intolerance toward any and every competing religion. He was to smash their pseudo-sacred spaces, destroy their art, erase their history, and kill any of his brethren who adopted such man-made idolatry (Deut. 12:1-4, 29-31; 13). He was to be a monotheist, not a politically-correct, "culturally-sensitive" polytheist. He was to eat, dress, and even grieve the way he was told (Deut. 14:1-21). Financially, he was ordered to "blow away" 10% of his annual income on a super "Yahweh party" each year (Deut. 14:22-27). He was to plan his labor and business so that every 7th year he could shut it down, trusting that Yahweh would triple his income in the 6th year (Lev. 25:20-22). It was sanctification across the breadth of culture.

---

[57] Anyone familiar with the western history knows that Mosaic laws, especially the Ten Commandments, have had a profound effect on ethics and law in spite of frantic attempts by modern secular revisionists to erase this memory.

[58] Anthrocracy is the heritage of Noahic civilization and has taken many forms but ultimately proceeds from man's imagination influenced to varying degrees by his conscience and by his willingness to appropriate whatever fragments of divine revelation has come to his attention. In a similar fashion to the individual's oscillation between licentiousness and legalism, political order tends to oscillate between anarchy and totalitarianism. In contemporary secularism we observe the opposite poles of libertarianism (e.g., Ayn Rand) and totalitarianism (e.g., Karl Marx) both of which proceed from an anthropocentric starting point. In resurgent Islam we observe an attempt to create a counterfeit theocracy. Anthrocracy thus transfers infallibility from God to man.

Because Yahweh designed the theocratic order, there is far more to it than meets the eye at first or second reading. Not only was there special geophysical support available in fertility of flock and field as well as climate, the economy itself was so structured that had the nation become corporately sanctified it could have dominated international trade. Economist Gary North's analysis of the Mosaic contract's financial structure shows how Israel's superior business integrity, optimism about the future, and prohibition of inflation would have caused a significant interest rate differential and trade surplus vis-à-vis pagan nations (cf Deut. 15:1-6).[59] Sanctification would have resulted in a cultural conquest of the world.

The theocratic judicial system featured both ecclesiastic authorities (priests) and civil authorities (judges). While judges alone had civil authority to use lethal force derived from the Noahic contract, the priests were specialists in articulating the implications of the Ten Commandments that spread out through the numerous case laws (Deut. 16:18-17:13). Lordship justice required faithfulness to the Lord and His Word so the theocracy could function in a manner exactly reversed to that of the modern secular state. The civil judges were limited to applying law, not making it up on a case-to-case basis, but at the same time, with proper rules of evidence and testimonial procedures. They were commanded to exercise capital punishment as Yahweh's judgment on certain sins; not as social vengeance that ill-informed modern critics accuse.

Theocratic history bears witness to Yahweh's strict adherence to contract violations by the nation. Individual Old Testament believers—the faithful remnant—shared in the consequences of their unbelieving neighbors' bad choices. This design of the theocracy was part of their sanctification. Lordship justice incentivized them to greater trust and obedience as well as to exhort their neighbors to do so likewise. As the nation drew ever nearer to exile, the Spirit worked through the major and minor prophets to develop in them a future orientation that would carry their descendents through the post-theocratic centuries until the Messiah. Such long-range hope based upon a progressive rationale of history was utterly unknown in the pagan world.[60]

The experiential sanctification of Old Testament saints did not always end in victory. In spite of their unique situation with God Himself dwelling among them, the record shows the failure of the entire first generation in spite of forty years of Spirit-led training in the wilderness. Moses ended his life outside the promised land (Deut. 34). So much spiritual degradation would occur during the period of the judges that Yahweh refused to let Joshua drive out all the Canaanites. They were to cause much suffering for centuries (Judg. 2:20-23). Samuel's family fell into sin that led eventually to replacing the free tribal confederacy with what would become an oppressive and tyrannical monarchy (1 Sam. 8; 1 & 2 Kings). The Spirit-endowed Solomon spiritually regressed judging from the narrative of 1 Kings. The record of Mosaic contract performance shows that perseverance was on the part of Yahweh, not on the part of the nation or even the individual believers.

---

[59] Dr. Gary North has done a complete economic analysis of every book in the Bible from a strong post-millennial perspective with its replacement theology. His theonomic interest in subduing the nations with the law, however, has led to a unique exposition of the economic design inherent in it that offers some wisdom principles for society today. His work on the law is available at http://www.garynorth.com/freebooks/

[60] For its impact on world culture see footnote 3.

Ultimate sanctification.

The individual eschatology of Old Testament saints is a subject that far exceeds the limits of this paper. Suffice it to say that hope for a resurrection in the future was inferable according to Jesus from the Abrahamic contract. Since the contract was an everlasting one (Gen. 17:7) and human life consists of both the immaterial and material parts, then there must be a future resurrection of the body (Luke 20:27-40). Abraham himself seemed to have grasped this truth judging by his behavior at the ordered sacrifice of Isaac (Gen. 22:5; Heb. 11:17-19).

We can glimpse into the intermediate state between death and resurrection with Jesus parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. Lazarus resides in Abraham's bosom while the Rich Man resides in a place of torment (Luke 16:22-26). Central to this individual eschatology is the redemption coming through the Abrahamic contract once again.

Contrast with New Testament Sanctification

Sanctification under the OT theocracy differed from that of the Church age more than many scholars seem to think. A full discussion of the contrast would work through NT specifics such as Chafer's 33 "riches of divine grace," comparing each with OT textual evidence.[61] For the limited scope of this paper I will mention only the matter of the Holy Spirit indwelling.

Advocates of maximal continuity fail to let the words of the Apostle John in particular have their full effect. While quick to use John 3 to smooth over suspected discontinuities, they are reluctant to let John 7:39, 14:17 and 1 John 1:2 reveal the stark contrast between OT and NT sanctification. John 7:39 states: "The Spirit, whom those believing in Him would receive; for the Holy Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified." Jesus spoke these words near the temple during the feast of tabernacles when he shouted to the crowds "If anyone thirsts, let him come to Me and drink. He who believes in Me, as the Scripture has said, out of his heart will flow rivers of living water" (7:37-38). That He was proclaiming a major discontinuity in the job profile of the Holy Spirit is unmistakable. Such a change in the revelation of the Third Person is linked to the coming change in the revelation of the Second Person—a familiar pattern in the progressive revelation of the Trinity. McCabe, however, limits the change to a quantitative increase in revealed information about Christ, not a qualitative change in how the Spirit functions.[62] Hamilton, in contrast, devotes a chapter to showing that John 7:39 speaks of an eschatological indwelling event in the Messianic age that was then being offered to Israel.[63] It therefore denies that this new work of the Spirit was present during the OT theocracy.

John 14:17, of course, is the crux passage: "You know [the Spirit] for he dwells <u>with</u> (Greek *para*) you, and will be <u>in</u> (Greek *en*) you." Stallard comments: "the Gospels speak of the Spirit coming upon Christ and through Him to the disciples *in the same way that He operated in the Old Testament*. . . .[Thus] the New Testament makes the exact distinction that those who want to

[61] Chafer, 3:206-266.
[62] "a fuller manifestation of the Spirit's presence," McCabe, 219.
[63] Hamilton, 100-126.

accept Old Testament indwelling refuse to accept."[64] [Emphasis supplied] John 14:17 declares a change in the Spirit's relationship with believers and does so in terms of spatial or locative imagery.

Predictably, just as he minimized the discontinuity in John 7:39, McCabe minimizes the discontinuity in John 14:17 by downplaying the spatial imagery implicit in the prepositions *para* and *en.* Both prepositions refer here, he says, not to a spatial sense but to relationship: *para* to "a permanent relationship that the eleven disciples already had with the Spirit"; and *en* to "an intimate relationship the Spirit would have in the near future with Christ's disciples."[65] He sees the new *en*-relationship as empowerment for the post-Pentecostal apostolic ministry in a way similar to the Old Testament prophets.[66]

Such excruciating exegesis is unnecessary in light of what we already know from the earlier OT revelation of indwelling. The very difference between "with" and "in" was there from the establishment of the tabernacle"(Ex. 25:8). He would dwell "among" the people by dwelling "in" the tabernacle. As I concluded earlier: The Holy Spirit had been "among" the Lord's people by being "in" the chosen sacred space from the completion of the tabernacle to the desecration of the temple. God dwelt *in* those sacred spaces in order to be *among* His people so they in turn would be a witness *to* the world.

Fast forward to the gospels: the two streams of progressive revelation have now converged in One Person Who is God's presence with man as well as the human scion of David. The full scope of spiritual life—eternal life that was previously with the Father—is now observed for the first time in this Incarnate Second Person of the Trinity (1 John 1:2). Just as He had indwelt the old tabernacle and temple by means of the Spirit, He now "indwelt" a human being. Once again there existed a sacred space in history, in the land of Israel, where men could meet God (John 1:14). The Spirit *in* Jesus was *with* the disciples. At His last Passover he establishes the basis for the prophesied New contract. He completes atonement for all the sin of the whole world so that access to God's new presence, eternal life, is now available on an unprecedented scale. As the first "piece" of the coming new universe, He rises from the dead. The tension between God's justice and His justification of sinners ends. He ascends to the Father's right hand and in absentia sends the Third Person into his believing followers. All these historical acts of God—none of which had ever occurred prior to this time—move revelation forward by leaps and bounds.

Where now is the meeting place, the sacred space, between God and man? What is the new "temple"? Answer: the Church, the body of believers (1 Cor. 3:16). The Holy Spirit who was with (*para*) the disciples--within inches of them at times in the sacred space of Jesus Christ—has moved from 'outside' of them to 'inside' of them. Being now in (*en*) everyone who believes that Jesus is the Second Person Incarnate, the Third Person has created a new sacred space on earth. The exclusive location where fallen men and women meet God has now become the regenerated people, the Church, wherever it exists. The unsaved need not travel any longer to Jerusalem and

[64] Stallard, 16. For his sense, compare Ps. 51:11 with Luke 11:13.
[65] McCabe, 226,227.
[66] Ibid., 227-230.

thread their way through the culture of a Jewish theocracy to access God at a temple. They have only to meet with one whose body in a temple of the Spirit (1 Cor. 6:19) or with the inspired Scripture the Spirit has produced through such ones (2 Pet. 3:15-16; 1 John 1:3). The Spirit is now *with* mankind *in* the Body of Christ.

And what is the conclusion of this matter of the Spirit's indwelling and sanctification? Viewed from the Church age *after* the great events of Incarnation and Pentecost, the role of the Spirit within believers is "multi-tasked." On one hand He enables the individual believer in sanctification as he did for theocratic saints; on the other hand, He now also is expanding a new sacred space on earth, the growing Body of Christ, an object not only of redemption but also of doxological wonder to angels (1 Cor. 11:10; Eph. 3:10). To read all this multi-tasking of the Holy Spirit back into the Old Testament is, in my opinion, is to severely neglect the progress in the Father's show-and-tell revelation.

Conclusion

Old Testament sanctification under the theocracy can be distinguished from that in the New Testament by approaching the matter from a contract perspective. The progressive revelation of the Triune God involves Him entering into a series of contracts (conventionally called covenants) with man. By maintaining the integrity of the various contract stipulations and observing the progressive sequence of God's acts it is possible to distinguish several functions of the Holy Spirit, some doxological and some redemptive. This approach exposes several differences in God's relationship with believers between the theocracy and the Church age. These differences are not seen when one attempts to argue theologically from New Testament revelation backwards into the Old Testament with the assumption that the Incarnation and Pentecost acts made no substantial difference in progressive revelation.

Old Testament positional sanctification contained both justification and regeneration. While similar enough with their New Testament counterparts to share a common name in a formal sense, one must qualify them by narrowing their meaning to what had actually been accomplished and understood prior to Jesus. Old Testament experiential sanctification involved the elusive nature and multi-faceted functioning of the Spirit. However, we found that His indwelling of individuals was limited—limited as to those indwelt and/or limited as to duration—which implies either that this phenomenon wasn't related to sanctification (assuming static universal sanctification throughout all ages) or was related (making Old Testament sanctification different in some respects). A solution appeared with consideration of the indwelling of the sacred space of the tabernacle and temple. This kind of indwelling functioned both in a redemptive sense as well as a doxological sense. By noting that after the Incarnation and Pentecost this kind of indwelling reappeared in the Church, we were able to distinguish the New Testament indwelling phenomenon from the sanctifying work of the Spirit in theocratic saints.

Experiential sanctification under the theocratic design involved the entire tribal confederation community in lordship justice; it wasn't individualistic. Individual sanctification, therefore, cannot be isolated from the Mosaic contracts' cursings for corporate failure to trust and obey

Yahweh. Nevertheless, this very dynamic was an instrument for individual sanctification which was not in every case completely successful. Its corporate nature, however, is a reminder that in the Church age sanctification also has a social dimension. Instead of a nation, the society is the Body of regenerated ones "out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation" (Rev. 5:9).

Ultimate sanctification was not contrasted with New Testament individual eschatology due to spatial limits of this paper.

APPENDIX 1

Throughout church history there has been a spectrum of views of the continuity between OT and NT as it concerns the Holy Spirit's relationship to OT believers relative to NT believers. The following chart is adapted from Table 1 from Dr. Hamilton's study:[67]

Position	**Definition of Position**	**Proponents Throughout Church History**
Complete Continuity	Regeneration and Indwelling the same	J. Owen, T. Goodwin, S. Ferguson, G. Fredericks, D. P. Fuller, W. C. Kaiser, J. A. Motyer, J. B. Payne, B. B. Warfield, L. Wood
More Continuity than Discontinuity	Differences acknowledged, but not seen to be fundamental differences	Augustine, J. Calvin, D. I. Block, G. W. Grogan, W. Grudem, G. E. Ladd
Some Continuity, Some Discontinuity	Regenerated, but not Indwelt	M. Erickson, G. F. Oehler, J. I.Packer, L. D. Pettigrew, J. Rea, P. Toon, W. A. VanGemeren, B. A. Ware
More Discontinuity than Continuity	Operated on by God, and, by inference, his Spirit, but not Indwelt	Novatian, M. Luther, L. S. Chafer, Blaising and Bock, D. A. Caron, M. Green
Discontinuity	The Spirit had nothing to do with the faithfulness of OT believers	No representatives found
Vague Discontinuity	Indwelling denied, but the question of Regeneration is not raised.	Origen, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Chrysostom, C. K. Barrett, R. E. Brown, G. M. Burge, C. C. Ryrie, J. F. Walvoord

Hamilton includes the fifth position—Discontinuity—in spite of failing to locate anyone in church history holding to it. He does so to refute the logical fallacy of "false dilemma" used by proponents of continuity. Hamilton cites Fredericks who "has assumed that those who think old covenant saints were not indwelt conclude that the Spirit *had nothing to do with their faithfulness*. . . , a view that no one affirms. . . . A number of authors clearly speak of the Spirit's role in the lives of OT saints, while maintaining that he did not *indwell* them."[68] [Emphasis original]

[67] Hamilton, 23.
[68] Ibid., 21 n. 37.

Selected Bibliography

Albright, William F. *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan: An Historical Analysis of the Two Contrasting Faiths*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1968.

Chafer, Lewis Sperry. *Systematic Theology*. Binghamton, New York: Vail-Ballou Press, 1948.

Clough, Charles A. "A Meta-Hermeneutical Comparison of Covenant and Dispensational Theologies," *Chafer Theological Seminary Journal* 7 (April-June 2001): 59-80.

Fruchtenbaum, Arnold G. *Israelology: The Missing Link in Systematic Theology*. Tustin, California: Ariel Ministries, 1989.

Hamilton, James M. *God's Indwelling Presence: the Holy Spirit in the Old & New Testaments*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 2006.

McCabe, Robert V. "Were Old Testament Saints Indwelt by the Holy Spirit?" *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 9 (2004): 214-264

McClain, Alva J. *The Greatness of the Kingdom: An Inductive Study of the Kingdom of God*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1959 [1968 edition].

Metzger, John B. *Discovering the Mystery of the Unity of God: A Theological Study on the Plurality and Tri-unity of God in the Hebrew Scriptures*. San Antonio: Ariel Ministries, 2010.

Merrill, Eugene. *Everlasting Dominion: A Theology of the Old Testament*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 2006.

Oliphint, K. Scott. *Reasons for Faith: Philosophy in the Service of Theology*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 2006.

Poythress, Vern S. "Reforming Ontology and Logic in the Light of the Trinity: An Application of Van Til's Idea of Analogy," *Westminster Theological Journal*, 57 (1995): 187-219.

Ryrie, Charles C. *Dispensationalism*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1995.

Ryrie, Charles C. *The Holy Spirit*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1965.

Showers, Renald E. *The New Nature*. Privately published and available from Friends of Israel Gospel Ministry at http://www.foigm.org/store. 1986.

Snoeberger, Mark. A. "Second Blessing Models of Sanctification and Early Dallas Dispensationalism," *Masters Seminary Journal* 15 (2004): 92-105.

Stallard, Michael. *The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament.* Privately published and available from his website http://faculty.bbc.edu/mstallard/wp-content/uploads/2009/10/HolySpiritOT.pdf.

Walvoord, John F. *The Holy Spirit*. Findlay, Ohio: Dunham Publishing Co. 1958.

Wood, Leon J. *The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1998.